

Issue 21	Perth Strategic Development Area - West/North West Perth	
Development plan reference:	5.1.11 – Housing land supply table, page 69 H7 - Berthapark, page 77 H70 - Perth West, page 78 E38 - Ruthvenfield Road, page 80	Reporter: David Buylla
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Margaret Lennon (00101) M Jamieson (00117) Jann Heigh (00119) Sarah Wilson (00120) Michael Nairn (00121) Joyce Nairn (00122) Mr & Mrs T Aitken (00123) Mr & Mrs L Morton (00124) Mary Cameron (00125) Mr & Mrs W Murray (00126) Catherine McCabe (00127) G Faulkner (00128) Mr & Mrs B Hood (00129) Mr & Mrs B Lewis (00130) Logan Fitchie (00131) Mr & Mrs L Slowman (00132) Mr & Mrs A Nixon (00137) Mr & Mrs D Orr (00143) ADIE Kennels & Cattery (00146) Kenny Montgomery (00154) Iris Temple (00155) Mr & Mrs I McIntyre-Miller (00156) Donald Sutherland (00157) J McIntosh (00158) Mr & Mrs K Campbell (00159) E Wilkie & E F Wilkie (00160) B Wilkie (00161) Jean Taylor (00162) Margaret Brown (00163) Mr & Mrs Stuart Cameron (00164) Mr & Mrs T McCash (00165) Mr & Mrs R Melville (00166) Sheena C Wright (00167) Mr & Mrs W Stewart (00168) W Birrell (00169) N Nicholson (00170) Mr & Mrs J Kennedy (00171) David Abercrombie (00172) Lorna Abercrombie (00173) Mr & Mrs C Shannon (00174) Mr & Mrs B Beekie (00175) Clive Wood & Liz Watson (00176)	Claire Milne (00193) Heather Brand (00275) A Thom (00303) P K & G B Johnston (00325) Mr & Mrs J Carratt (00343) Mr & Mrs A Mackintosh (00467) Stewart Milne Homes (00659) Mr & Mrs Walter Smith (00675) Harriet Lindsay (00698) Stewart McIntosh (00707) Mr & Mrs Michael Jackson (00740) Mr & Mrs Murray Flett (00753) Dorothy Guthrie (00763) Luncarty, Redgorton & Moneydie Community Council (00924) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194) Scottish Natural Heritage (05211) The Muir Group (07690) MBM Planning & Development (07693) Persephone Beer (07744) A Ritchie & Son/M & S M Bullough (08651) Forestry Commission Scotland (08988) Springfield Properties Ltd (09017) J W K Properties (09055) The Pilkington Trust (09086) Joan McEwen (09098) John Dewar Lamberkin Trust (09166) Methven & District Community Council (09221) CKD Galbraith (09289) SSE plc (09311) Burrelton & District Community Council (09376) Arklay Guthrie (09692) G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817) Dr Charles N Turner (09934) Jackie Turner (09935) Alistair Godfrey (09941) Margaret Simpson (10182) John Munro (10277)	

Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Strategic Development Areas within the Perth Core.
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>Almondvalley</u> John Munro (10277/1/006): Almond Valley Area is more suitable than the large areas west of the by-pass for housing.</p> <p>G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/6/003): Almond Valley has been identified as the long term expansion area for a significant period of time and is the most appropriate area for expansion well related to The City and contained within its landscape setting. The Plan was changed by the Council based on a spurious objection that the development will never happen. A planning application for the development was in the hands of the Council when the decision was made.</p> <p>The Pilkington Trust (09086/1/004): Almond Valley should be reinstated if there is to be any housing growth in the Perth core in the short term. Neither H7 Bertha Park nor H70 Perth West has the ability to deliver housing in the short or medium term. Not to do so will significantly impair the Council's ability to deliver sustainable economic growth and effectively disadvantages The City as Scotland emerges from recession. H70 is flawed through the requirement to provide an additional new major junction at Broxden as well as by ownership, landscape, visual impact and local access issues. Almond Valley is a long standing strategic housing site, which has been thoroughly assessed by both Officers of the Council, statutory bodies and professional advisors to the Pilkington Trust to establish that it can deliver in the short term.</p> <p>Stewart Milne Homes (00659/9/001): The decision to remove Almond Valley contradicts the spatial strategy of the proposed Strategic Development Plan (Core_Doc_099), Structure Plan (Core_Doc_093) and extant Local Plan (Core_Doc_003). The decision removes confidence needed by developers to deliver sites to the market. The site is the most logical place to accommodate expansion in the Perth Area and should be carried forward in preference to H7 Bertha Park.</p> <p>Joan McEwen (09098/2/007): Support for the reduction in numbers but the area can accommodate some housing rather than complete removal.</p> <p>Margaret Lennon (00101/1/001); Mr & Mrs D Orr (00143/1/001); ADIE Kennels & Cattery (00146/1/001); Kenny Montgomery (00154/1/001); Iris Temple (00155/1/001); Mr & Mrs I McIntyre-Miller (00156/1/001); Donald Sutherland (00157/1/001); M Jamieson (00117/1/001); J McIntosh (00158/1/001); Mr & Mrs K Campbell (00159/1/001); Mr & Miss E Wilkie (00160/1/001); B Wilkie (00161/1/001); Jean Taylor (00162/1/001); Margaret Brown (00163/1/001); Mr & Mrs Stuart Cameron (00164/1/001); Mr & Mrs T McCash (00165/1/001); Mr & Mrs R Melville (00166/1/001); Sheena Wright (00167/1/001); Mr & Mrs W Stewart (00168/1/001); W Birrell (00169/1/001); N Nicholson (00170/1/001); Mr & Mrs J Kennedy (00171/1/001); David Abercrombie (00172/1/001); Lorna Abercrombie (00173/1/001); Mr & Mrs C Shannon (00174/1/001); Mr & Mrs B Beekie (00175/1/001); Mr & Mrs C Watson (00176/1/001); Jann Heigh (00119/1/001); Sarah Wilson (00120/1/001); Margaret Simpson (10182/2/001); Michael Nairn (00121/1/001); Joyce Nairn (00122/1/001); Mr & Mrs T Aitken (00123/1/001); Mr & Mrs L Morton (00124/1/001); Mary Cameron (00125/1/001); Mr & Mrs W Murray (00126/1/001); Catherine McCabe (00127/1/001); G Faulkner (00128/1/001); Mr & Mrs B Hood</p>	

(00129/1/001); Mr & Mrs B Lewis (00130/1/001); Logan Fitchie (00131/1/001); Arklay Guthrie (09692/1/001); Mr & Mrs L Slowman (00132/1/001); Mr & Mrs A Nixon (00137/1/001); Claire Milne (00193/1/001); A Thom (00303/1/001); Heather Brand (00275/1/002); JWK Properties (09055/1/002); Mr & Mrs Walter Smith (00675/1/001); Methven & District Community Council (09221/1/019); Harriet Lindsay (00698/1/001): Support the non-inclusion of the Almond Valley Village in the Plan. Representations refer to the Climate Change: Scottish Implication Scoping Study 2003 (Core_Doc_125), Checklist of the Plants of Perthshire 1992 (Core_Doc_126), Development Control Committee minutes 7 Dec 2011 (S4_Doc_188) and the Council Meeting minutes of 7 Dec 2011 (S4_Doc_200) to support their position.

E38: Ruthvenfield Road

P K & G B Johnston (00325/1/001): There should be a buffer between the industrial estate and residential uses. The fire last year demonstrated how important this was. The area is rural and residential in nature and should remain so. The site should be designated as green/agricultural/open space.

Mr & Mrs A MacKintosh (00467/1/001): The western half of the site should not be identified for employment uses, a more suitable boundary would be the line of the new Cross Tay Link Road. The west side of the site would be better developed for housing as it has housing on its southern and western boundaries (S4_Doc_382). There is a natural boundary of mature trees which could form the boundary of the site. A planning application 11/02138/IPL (S4_Doc_201) has recently been granted for the area nearest the houses and this could be extended to include the remaining two fields.

Mr & Mrs Murray Flett (00753/1/001): There should be a reasonable buffer between the proposed employment area and the adjoining residential uses and the south west corner of the site is an area of existing woodland as identified in the Perth Area Local Plan 1995 (Core_Doc_003). The boundary should be redrawn along the lines shown in the attached map.

A Ritchie & Son/M & S M Bullough (08651/6/002): Would question whether the scale of the employment land is required in this strategic development area. The Employment Land Audit (Core_Doc_145) identifies a significant surplus of employment land in the Perth Core Area which brings into question the merit of significant employment land allocations in the short term.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/30/001): The site is located in or adjacent to a functional flood plain or area of flood risk. Studies indicate there may be issues with the East Pow and Mill Lade. The area suffered flooding in 1993 and 1999. The developable area may be constrained by flood risk and a flood risk assessment needs to be carried out prior to submitting a planning application to inform the scale layout and form of development. This guidance follows from national planning policy and the duties placed on local authorities to reduce the overall risk of flooding and the Site Specific Developer Requirements should be used to inform the scale layout and form of the development. The requirement should specify that no built development should take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.

Methven & District Community Council (09221/1/025): Modify Site Specific Developer Requirements to replace '*Green corridors...*' with '*The Lade, River Almond and River Tay...*' to correct the geography of the statement.

Springfield Properties Ltd (09017/1/006): There is no indication as to how the required integration of the Masterplans for Bertha Park, Perth West and E38 will be achieved. The Council should provide a framework so as not to delay the development process

Kenny Montgomery (00154/1/002); Iris Temple (00155/1/002); Donald Sutherland (00157/1/002); J McIntosh (00158/1/002); E Wilkie & E F Wilkie (00160/1/002); B Wilkie (00161/1/002); Jean Taylor (00162/1/002); Margaret Brown (00163/1/002); Mr & Mrs Stuart Cameron (00164/1/002); Mr & Mrs T McCash (00165/1/002); Mr & Mrs R Melville (00166/1/002); Sheena Wright (00167/1/002); Mr & Mrs W Stewart (00168/1/002); W Birrell (00169/1/002); N Nicholson (00170/1/002); Mr & Mrs J Kennedy (00171/1/002); Mr & Mrs C Shannon (00174/1/002); Mr & Mrs B Beekie (00175/1/002); Jann Heigh (00119/1/002); Sarah Wilson (00120/1/002); Margaret Simpson (10182/2/002); Michael Nairn (00121/1/002); Joyce Nairn (00122/1/002); Mr & Mrs T Aitken (00123/1/002); Mr & Mrs L Morton (00124/1/002); Mary Cameron (00125/1/002); Mr & Mrs W Murray (00126/1/002); Catherine McCabe (00127/1/002); G Faulkner (00128/1/002); Mr & Mrs B Lewis (00130/1/002); Logan Fitchie (00131/1/002); Mr & Mrs L Slowman (00132/1/002); Mr & Mrs A Nixon (00137/1/002); Claire Milne (00193/1/002); A Thom (00303/1/002): Support Site E38.

H7: Bertha Park

Springfield Properties Ltd (09017/1/007 & 09017/1/003): Reference to Schedule 4 no 20d Effectiveness of Strategic Sites 09017/1/001 Springfield Properties Ltd is highlighted for further information on this issue. The provision of a district heating system should not be a mandatory requirement but should be part of a balanced approach to sustainable development. There is an area of land of around 8ha (S4_Doc_383) which should be included within the development site. It may have potential for a park and ride or district heating system and it is well contained by structural landscaping.

There is no indication as to how the required integration of the Masterplans for Bertha Park, Perth West and E38 will be achieved. The Council should provide a framework so as not to delay the development process.

Stewart Milne Homes (00659/1/003 & 00659/9/002): The allocation of 3000 houses and 25 ha of employment land taken with the allocation at Perth West exceeds by a significant margin the strategy set out in TAYplan (Core_Doc_099) (2000 houses and 25ha of employment land). The allocation is completely at odds with both the extant Structure Plan (Core_Doc_093) and the Strategic Development Plan. Circular 1/2009 (Core_Doc_001) requires the Local Development Plan to be consistent with the Strategic Development Plan and the Council are in breach of their legal requirements. The scale of development is 50% above that required by TAYplan and is not deliverable within the timescales allowed. The Main Issues Report (Core_Doc_095) recognises that the delivery of infrastructure constrains the delivery of the site. The allocation of H7 jeopardises the delivery of the A9/A85 junction. The site is remote and will encourage private car use which is contrary to advice contained in Scottish Planning Policy (Core_Doc_048).

Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/012): The proposals for housing to the north and west of The City would increase its size by a third without any justification.

SSE plc (09311/1/012): Some of the east coast transmission line upgrading (likely to impact on Berth Park site H7 and proposed route of the Cross Tay Link Road) and associated substation development (proposals for a substation close to Alyth) should be fully recognised in the Local Development Plan.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/20/001): SNH should be added to the list of participants in the Action Programme for the development of a Masterplan to ensure this process takes into account current Scottish Government Policy on Designing Places and Scottish Planning Policy. The Masterplan requirement should initially establish broad landuse and Placemaking principles for the site as the current allocation is unrefined and does not provide information to ensure the protection of natural heritage, landscape biodiversity and the wider environment. The Site Specific Developer Requirements should seek the ecological survey requirements and the preparation of a recreation and access plan for the site to minimise the impacts on woodland and mitigate potential ecological effects, green space and green links, the proposed treatment at the interface of the development with the countryside and overall sustainability. The indicative landscape areas /woodland may need to change in response to the master planning process.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/028): The Site Specific Developer Requirements should reflect the outcomes of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (S4_Doc_139).

Dr Charles Turner (09934/1/004); MBM Planning & Development (07693/17/001); Luncarty, Redgorton & Moneydie Community Council (00924/1/005); Jackie Turner (09935/1/004): The field to the north of the thick tree belt is isolated from the main development area and should not be part of the site (S4_Doc_383). It was not shown in the Main Issues Report (Core_Doc_095). No map has been provided defining which area of land is being referred to.

Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/002): The Site Specific Developer Requirements identifies enhancement of biodiversity but no protection which is an omission given the importance of the Bertha Park habitats.

Mr & Mrs C Watson (00176/1/002): We are concerned that a number of developments are planned on the west of Perth without consultation with local residents. Any further development on the west of The City will have a serious impact on traffic congestion and on the lifestyle of the people who live in this rural area. Support the development of a Masterplan.

Forestry Commission Scotland (08988/1/022): Wish to be involved in detailed planning for the site and all aspects of Masterplan. Like to see advance planting, fully integrated green network, and a detailed phased programme of works to improve and enhance green network.

Mr & Mrs Walter Smith (00675/1/004); Mr & Mrs A Nixon (00137/1/004); Jann Heigh (00119/1/004); Mr & Mrs T Aitken (00123/1/004); Mr & Mrs L Morton (00124/1/004); Mr & Mrs W Murray (00126/1/004); Logan Fitchie (00131/1/004); Mr & Mrs L Slowman (00132/1/004); Iris Temple (00155/1/003); Donald Sutherland (00157/1/004); J McIntosh (00158/1/004); Mr & Miss E Wilkie (00160/1/1004); B Wilkie (00161/1/1004); Mr & Mrs Stuart Cameron (00164/1/004); Mr & Mrs R Melville (00166/1/004); Mr & Mrs W Stewart (00168/1/1004); W Birrell (00169/1/1004); N Nicholson (00170/1/1004); Mr & Mrs J Kennedy (00171/1/004); David Abercrombie (00172/1/1002); Lorna Abercrombie (00173/1/002); Mr & Mrs B Beekie (00175/1/1004); Margaret Simpson (10182/1/1004): Support the development of a Masterplan for the site and seek that it is prepared in conjunction with local residents and the community council.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/23/002): Support the Site Specific Developer Requirements which refers to the protection of the existing woodland.

Mr & Mrs D Orr (00143/1/003); ADIE Kennels & Cattery (00146/1/002); Michael Nairn (00121/1/003); Joyce Nairn (00122/1/003); Persephone Beer (07744/1/003); Dorothy Guthrie (00763/1/004): Support site H7.

H70: Perth West

A Ritchie & Son/M & S M Bullough (08651/3/002): Support the allocation of a long term strategic development site but a first phase should be identified at Huntingtower View taking access from the A85. The site will be able to deliver 500 houses in the short term (with a further 300 in the second phase) and a mixed use site for employment/primary school. (Illustrative Masterplan attached) The illustrative Masterplan shows the good linkages that the area has with Perth including core paths and cycle routes. The later expansion of the site will take access from the A9 but there is also potential for a park and ride site on the west side of the bypass to take pressure off the existing Huntingtower interchange.

John Dewar Lamberkin Trust (09166/16/001): Support for the allocation of land to the west of Perth for a strategic development and submit a concept Masterplan and supporting information. Seek adjustment to the site boundaries to reflect the concept Masterplan (S4_Doc_384).

The Muir Group (07690/2/002): The site should be extended to the southwest (S4_Doc_384) as it would establish a new and more robust boundary based on advance planting and a strong shelterbelt/woodland framework.

Mr & Mrs J Carratt (00343/1/001): The development will increase the risk of flooding on the A85. The development will result in the loss of agricultural land which is contrary to national policy. More traffic will be encouraged on to the A85 which is already at capacity. Extra primary and secondary school will need to be funded. The land bordering Tibbermore Road opposite Agricar and Kings is particularly unsuitable for development. Development will exacerbate Perth's air quality problem. West Huntingtower's rural setting should be preserved. The community council and local residents should be consulted over any Masterplan.

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/6/001): It has been a fundamental principle of planning policy since the 1970s that the site is the most obtrusive location for residential development and would constitute a major violation of The City's landscape setting. Almond Valley is a much better location and should be chosen in preference. The Council ignored the advice of its Officials in reaching its decision to exclude Almond valley and substitute Perth West.

John Munro (10277/1/005): The allocation for housing to the west of the by-pass is subject to strong winds and is some distance from the city centre. Consequently it does not meet government policy about making use of existing infrastructure and services. The new road access could cost £100M in public funds.

CKD Galbraith (09289/24/001): The traffic from the development will place a considerable strain on the existing road network unless considerable upgrades are required. The area lies in an Area of Great Landscape Value (S4_Doc_666) which has been used to refuse planning applications for housing in the area in the past. The development of the site would breach the guidance for areas immediately adjacent to the Air Quality Management Area (Core_Doc_043). The historic site of the battle of Tibbermore lies in close proximity to the site and it should be protected. There are more suitable sites available for housing. The site should be in the Green Belt

Mr & Mrs Michael Jackson (00740/1/001): Object to H70 on grounds that the development will significantly increase traffic on the A85 which is already at capacity. There is unlikely to be a market for the homes. The development will destroy wildlife and important archaeological sites. The Council would be better concentrating its efforts on Perth City centre where sites are continuing to fall empty. Request that the field located along Tibbermore Road, adjacent to Agricar be removed from the site designation and kept as a greenfield site (S4_Doc_384). (No Plan was submitted identifying the specific field which is referred too in this Representation.)

Mr & Mrs Walter Smith (00675/1/003): The settlement of West Huntingtower should be retained and tree planting or bunding should surround it.

Mr & Mrs A Nixon (00137/1/003); Jann Heigh (00119/1/003); Sarah Wilson (00120/1/003); Michael Nairn (00121/1/004); Joyce Nairn (00122/1/004); Mr & Mrs T Aitken (00123/1/003); Mr & Mrs L Morton (00124/1/003); Mr & Mrs W Murray (00126/1/003); Logan Fitchie (00131/1/003); Mr & Mrs L Slowman (00132/1/003); Iris Temple (00155/1/003); Donald Sutherland (00157/1/003); J McIntosh (00158/1/003); Mr & Mrs R Melville (00166/1/003); Mr & Mrs W Stewart (00168/1/1003); W Birrell (00169/1/1003); N Nicholson (00170/1/1003); Mr & Mrs J Kennedy (00171/1/003); Mr & Mrs C Shannon (00174/1/1003); Mr & Mrs B Beekie (00175/1/1003); Margaret Simpson (10182/1/1003): A masterplan should be created for H70 and it should include landscaping and access.

Stewart McIntosh (00707/1/001): The A85 road is already congested and it is not feasible to take access for 300 houses onto this road as it cannot take the level of traffic which will be generated by the development.

Mr & Mrs Walter Smith (00675/1/002); G Faulkner (00128/1/003); Mr & Mrs B Hood (00129/1/002); Kenny Montgomery (00154/1/003); Mr & Mrs K Campbell (00159/1/002); E Wilkie & E F Wilkie (00160/1/1003); B Wilkie (00161/1/1003); Mr & Mrs Stuart Cameron (00164/1/003); Mr & Mrs T McCash (00165/1/003): Support the requirement for a Masterplan but the access to the site should not be dependant on the A85 which is already overcrowded. These details should all be set out in the Masterplan.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/21/001): Support the development of a Masterplan but it should be ensured that this process takes into account current Scottish Government Policy on Designing Places (Core_Doc_138) and Scottish Planning Policy (Core_Doc_048). The Masterplan requirement should initially establish broad landuse and Placemaking principles for the site as the current allocation is unrefined and does not provide information to ensure the protection of natural heritage, landscape biodiversity and the wider environment. The Site Specific Developer Requirements should include a framework of new native planting/green network and woodland corridors, and protected species where required. This is of importance to mitigate potential ecological effects, green space and green links, the proposed treatment at the interface of the development with the countryside and overall sustainability.

Springfield Properties Ltd (09017/1/005): There is no indication as to how the required integration of the Masterplans for Bertha Park, Perth West and E38 will be achieved. The Council should provide a framework so as not to delay the development process.

The Muir Group (07690/1/001): Support for Plan and puts forward initial Masterplan principles and concept showing how site can be developed.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/23/001): Support the Site Specific Developer Requirements which refers to the protection of the existing woodland.

Mr & Mrs D Orr (00143/1/002); ADIE Kennels & Cattery (00146/1/003); Burrelton & District Community Council (09376/1/003); John Dewar Lamberkin Trust (09166/4/002); Methven & District Community Council (09221/1/024); Dorothy Guthrie (00763/1/005): Support site H70.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Almondvalley

John Munro (10277/1/006); G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/6/003); The Pilkington Trust (09086/1/004); Stewart Milne Homes (00659/9/001): Modify the Plan to identify Almond Valley as a Strategic Development Area.

Joan McEwen (09098/2/007): Modify the Plan to allow some residential development to be accommodated in Almond Valley.

E38: Ruthvenfield Road

P K & G B Johnston (00325/1/001): Remove site allocation and designate as green/agricultural land/open space.

Mr & Mrs A MacKintosh (00467/1/001): Modify the Plan to exclude land west of the Cross Tay Link Road for employment use and to include the three fields to the north of Ruthvenfield House for residential use (S4_Doc_382).

Mr & Mrs Murray Flett (00753/1/001): Modify the site boundary to exclude the south west corner (S4_Doc_382) which should remain as an area of woodland and to exclude land west of the Cross Tay Link Road for employment use.

A Ritchie & Son & M & S M Bullough (08651/6/002): Delete the site.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/30/001): A flood risk assessment should be included in the Site Specific Developer Requirements and should specify that no built development should take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.

Methven & District Community Council (09221/1/025): Modify Site Specific Developer Requirements to replace '*Green corridors...*' with '*The Lade, River Almond and River Tay...*'.

Springfield Properties Ltd (09017/1/006): The Plan should include a framework identifying how the Masterplans for the Strategic Development Areas will integrate.

H7: Bertha Park

Springfield Properties Ltd (09017/1/007 & 09017/1/003): Reference to Schedule 4 no 20d Effectiveness of Strategic Sites 09017/1/001 Springfield Properties Ltd is highlighted for further information on this issue.

Modify the Plan to identify a first development phase of 300 homes taking access via the Inveralmond roundabout in advance of the Cross Tay Link Road and Almond crossings being in place.

Modify the Site Specific Developer Requirements to include that the requirement for a district heating system becomes an option as part of a mix of infrastructure requirements promoting sustainable development.

Modify the site boundary to include 8ha around Broxy Kennels as defined on submitted plan (S4_Doc_383).

The Plan should include a framework identifying how the Masterplans for the Strategic Development Areas will integrate.

Stewart Milne Homes (00659/1/003 & 00659/9/002): Delete the site and transfer the allocation to Almond Valley.

Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/012): Delete the site from the Plan.

SSE plc (09311/1/012): Modify the Site Specific Developer Requirements to recognise the constraint the existing 275kV line and the future 400kV line will place on the development of site H7.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/20/001): Include Scottish Natural Heritage in the list of participants in the Action Programme for the development of a Masterplan.

Modify the first Site Specific Developer Requirement to '*A Masterplan will be required for the comprehensive development of this site. The first stage of this process will be to establish broad landuse and place making principles for the site ...*'

Modify the Site Specific Developer Requirement to add ecological survey requirements and a Recreation & Access Plan.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/028): Modify the Site Specific Developer Requirements to include:

'Construction Method Statement to be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.'

'Where the development of the site is within 30m of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.'

Dr Charles Turner (09934/1/004); MBM Planning & Development (07693/17/001); Luncarty, Redgorton and Moneydie Community Council (00924/1/005), Mrs Jackie Turner (09935/1/004): Modify the site boundary to exclude area to the north east of the site between thick tree belt and A9 (S4_Doc_383).

Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/002): Modify the Site Specific Developer Requirements to replace '*Enhancement of Biodiversity*' with '*Enhancement and protection of biodiversity*'.

Perth H70

A Ritchie & Son/M & S M Bullough (08651/3/002): Modify the Plan to identify a first development phase of 500 houses and a mixed employment/school site at Huntingtower View and a second phase for 300 houses.

Modify the Site Specific Developer Requirements to specify that the district heating system and combined heat and power infrastructure utilising renewables is not mandatory.

The Plan should include a framework identifying how the Masterplans for the Strategic Development Areas will integrate.

John Dewar Lamberkin Trust (09166/16/001); The Muir Group (07690/2/002): Modify the site boundary (S4_Doc_384).

Mr & Mrs J Carratt (00343/1/001): Modify the Site Specific Developer Requirements to ensure community consultation through the Masterplan process.

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/6/001); John Munro (10277/1/005): Delete the site.

CKD Galbraith (09289/24/001): Delete the site from the Plan.

Alternatively, the Site Specific Developer Requirements should identify the requirement for screening on the western boundary and the removal of the land identified on the supplied map (S4_Doc_384).

Mr & Mrs Michael Jackson (00740/1/001): Modify the Site boundary to exclude field adjacent to Tibbermore Road and identify it as open green field. (S4_Doc_384).

Mr & Mrs Walter Smith (00675/1/003): Modify the Plan to identify the provision of tree planting or bunding between the site and West Huntingtower.

Mr & Mrs Nixon (00137/1/003); Jann Heigh (00119/1/003); Sarah Wilson (00120/1/003); Michael Nairn (00121/1/004); Joyce Nairn (00122/1/004); Mr & Mrs T Aitken (00123/1/003); Mr & Mrs L Morton (00124/1/003); Mr & Mrs W Murray (00126/1/003); Logan Fitchie (00131/1/003); Mr & Mrs L Slowman (00132/1/003); Iris Temple (00155/1/003); Donald Sutherland (00157/1/003); J McIntosh (00158/1/003); Mr & Mrs R Melville (00166/1/003); Mr & Mrs W Stewart (00168/1/1003); W Birrell (00169/1/1003); N Nicholson (00170/1/1003); Mr & Mrs J Kennedy (00171/1/003); Mr & Mrs C Shannon (00174/1/1003); Mr & Mrs B Beekie (00175/1/1003); Margaret Simpson (10182/1/1003): Modify the Plan to require the creation of a Masterplan providing details on landscaping and access.

Stewart McIntosh (00707/1/001): Modify the Plan to identify how the site will be accessed.

Mr & Mrs Walter Smith (00675/1/002); G Faulkner (00128/1/003); Mr & Mrs B Hood (00129/1/002); Kenny Montgomery (00154/1/003); Mr & Mrs K Campbell (00159/1/002); E Wilkie & E F Wilkie (00160/1/1003); B Wilkie (00161/1/1003); Mr & Mrs Stuart Cameron (00164/1/003); Mr & Mrs T McCash (00165/1/003): Modify the Plan to show that the Masterplan should show that the site access is not dependant on the A85.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/21/001): Modify the first Site Specific Developer Requirement to *'A Masterplan will be required for the comprehensive development of this site. The first stage of this process will be to establish broad landuse and place making principles for the site ...'*

Modify the Site Specific Developer Requirements to include '*a framework of new native planting/green network and woodland corridors*' and '*protected species surveys*'.

Springfield Properties Ltd (09017/1/005): The Plan should include a framework identifying how the Masterplans for the Strategic Development Areas will integrate.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

The following responses are supported by the Council's Delivering Infrastructure Background Paper (S4_Doc_440) which outlines the key infrastructure requirements and proposed timescales to deliver the strategic development areas.

Almondvalley

John Munro (10277/1/006); G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/6/003); The Pilkington Trust (09086/1/004); Stewart Milne Homes (00659/9/001): This site has an extensive history (S4_Doc_250) and was identified for residential use in the Perth Area Local Plan 1995 (S4_Doc_667). A planning application for the site was refused by the Council in December 2011 (S4_Doc_668) and a subsequent appeal of this decision refused (Core_Doc_201). The applicants have sought a judicial review of the appeal decision and the timescale for the completion of this process is not yet set. The Council acknowledges the significant support for the removal of this site from the Plan through both the Main Issues Report stage and in response to the Proposed Plan. This is contrasted with the support for the sites inclusion by a number of established house builders and the land owners. The case for its inclusion is based on the fact that the site is effective and the only one capable of immediate development to meet short term housing needs. The second reason for inclusion is that the required roads infrastructure improvements at the A9/A85 junction cannot be funded without the identification of this site for residential use.

Considering the justification for the inclusion of the site, with regards to it being effective and the ability to deliver in the short term the Council has no grounds to disagree with this statement. The Council would argue that it is not the only effective site and it is not required during the lifetime of the Plan to meet the 5 year effective housing land supply. Schedule 4 Topic 20c Housing Land Strategy and Table 5 in the Housing Background Paper (S4_Doc_442) define that the Local Development Plan has an effective land supply in place to meet the future housing land requirements if improvements in the economy are forthcoming.

The Council disagrees that development at Almond Valley is required to fund the A9/A85 Junction upgrade. The Council have committed to funding this project (S4_Doc_452) and have commissioned consultants to look at extending the link road across the River Almond into Bertha Park. A site is being considered for a new all through school to the north of Perth and Bertha Park forms one of the options. The delivery of this road link will support the early release of development land and may support the delivery of the new school.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Joan McEwen (09098/2/007): With the deletion of Almond Valley from the Plan the Council acknowledge that there may be some scope for some further residential development adjacent to Ruthvenfield. The settlement boundary has been drawn to allow for some infill development and reflects current planning permissions. In addition the area is excluded from the Green Belt which will allow consideration in the long term of the opportunity for some expansion of the existing residential areas. However for larger scale

development a detailed review of current infrastructure would be required to assess the level of development which would be economically viable. More than sufficient land is identified to meet the needs of the Plan but this position can be reconsidered through the first review of the Local Development Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

E38: Ruthvenfield Road

P K & G B Johnston (00325/1/001): The Local Development Plan supports future employment requirements through the designation of adequate employment land up to 2024 and beyond. The Inveralmond industrial estate supports a wide range of employment uses but due to access constraints it is reaching capacity. The Cross Tay Link Road and the final design of the A9/A85 junction will provide an opportunity to create additional accesses and support a natural extension to the existing employment land. The site is identified larger than the 25ha which is required and the final site boundary will be determined through the development of a Masterplan which will be informed by the final route of the road and the A9/A85 junction. The Masterplan will provide scope for a buffer between future uses and existing residential uses to be maintained.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mr & Mrs A MacKintosh (00467/1/001); Mr & Mrs Murray Flett (00753/1/001): The Plan identifies that 25ha of land should be brought forward for employment use and the site area defined through a Masterplan. The Cross Tay Link Road runs through this site and the final road line is not yet finalised. The introduction of this road provides further access routes into this area and it would not be appropriate to limit development to the east of the new road as it would be unduly restrictive when defining the final site boundaries. The Masterplan process provides scope for a buffer between future uses and existing residential uses to be maintained. No map was provided identifying which fields should be identified for residential development through Representation 00467/1/001 but the Council has identified these as the same shown through Representation 00753/1/001 (S4_Doc_382). The Council acknowledges that there could be some scope for further residential development in this area, but the settlement boundary and existing planning permissions allow for more than sufficient land to meet the needs of the Plan; however, this position can be reconsidered through the first review of the Local Development Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

A Ritchie & Son & M & S M Bullough (08651/6/002): This site provides a natural extension to Inveralmond industrial estate. The Plan identifies a range of employment sites to meet future needs up to 2024 and beyond. Not all of the sites identified are viable but it is considered that due to the provision of the Cross Tay Link Road this site is considered effective and likely to contribute towards the short to medium term supply.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/30/001): The site is not within the identified flood risk area but, due to its close proximity to the risk area on its northern boundary and the flat topography of surrounding land, the Council would have no issue with the proposed modification. This ensures no new development is at risk of flooding or would increase flooding to existing areas.

If the Reporter was so minded the Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the Site Specific Developer Requirements requiring a Flood Risk Assessment.

Methven & District Community Council (09221/1/025): The Site Specific Developer Requirements recognises the importance of the green corridors and that new development should provide these where possible. The Council considers that the existing wording is sufficient but the suggested modification could provide further clarity and transparency to applicants.

If the Reporter was so minded the Council would have no objection to the Site Specific Developer Requirements being modified to include *'Green corridors in particular along the Lade, River Almond and River Tay to link the site with Perth and wider countryside.'*

Springfield Properties Ltd (09017/1/006): The Council supports the idea behind a development framework but until the Plan is adopted and clarity provided over which two of the three strategic development options will come forward this is not possible. The draft Action Programme (S4_Doc_669) submitted with the Plan identifies the requirement for the provision of an integration framework which will be developed prior to the creation of the Masterplans for the Strategic Development Areas.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

H7: Bertha Park

Of the three strategic development sites which have been considered through the Local Development Plan process, this site has received the smallest volume of representations from the general public and the vast majority of suggested modifications are of a technical nature.

Springfield Properties Ltd (09017/1/007 & 09017/1/003): Reference to Schedule 4 no 20d Effectiveness of Strategic Sites 09017/1/001 Springfield Properties Ltd is highlighted for further information on this issue. The Transport Scotland Strategic Transport Projects Review recognises that *'Congestion at the A9 / A912 Inveralmond Roundabout is significant, and arises out of conflict between local access needs and long-distance travel demands between the central belt and the north of Scotland.'* (S4_Doc_670). The addition of 300 dwellings taking access from Inveralmond will exacerbate this issue having a negative impact on the wider strategic and local road networks. No evidence has been submitted which would support the proposed modification. Planning permission has been granted for upgrades to the A9/A85 junction and the Council has commissioned consultants to look at extending the link road across the River Almond into Bertha Park. A site is being considered for a new all through school to the north of Perth and Bertha Park forms one of the options. The delivery of this road link will support the early release of development land and may support the delivery of the new school. With the requirement to develop a Masterplan for the entire site no development is likely to take place on this site within the next two years. This will provide an opportunity for the creation of a new access negating the suggested modification.

The Site Specific Developer Requirement identifies that the provision of a district heating system and combined heat and power infrastructure utilising renewable resources should be investigated but it does not specify that it is required. It is understood that the introduction of such schemes could impact on the viability of some developments. One of the key prerequisites of financial viability is to have an anchor user. The Council proposes to construct a major school campus located in one of the strategic development

areas and would seek the inclusion of this technology within this anchor use supporting the financial viability of the site. The development requirement as stated requires that this technology is investigated which is considered to be both reasonable and allow for suitable flexibility. It will allow the Council to review this position in future years to reflect government policy.

The 8ha of land around Broxy Kennels (S4_Doc_383) is identified within the Green Belt (Reference to schedule 4 no 14 Green Belt is highlighted for further information on this issue). The final developable area of this site will be defined through the Masterplan process. No evidence has been submitted to justify the inclusion of this land or its exclusion from within the Green Belt. The site will be developed from the south around the new River Almond crossing and development of this land will not be immediately required.

The Council supports the idea behind a development framework but until the Plan is adopted and clarity provided over which two of the three strategic development options will come forward this is not possible. The draft Action Programme (S4_Doc_669) submitted with the Plan identifies the requirement for the provision of an integration framework which will be developed prior to the creation of the Masterplans for the Strategic Development Areas.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Stewart Milne Homes (00659/1/003 & 00659/9/002); Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/012): The Plan needs to identify two strategic development sites to provide an effective housing land supply. It identifies Bertha Park and Perth West both of which the Council consider are effective during the lifetime of the Plan in meeting future development needs.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SSE plc (09311/1/012): Any constraints within the site boundary due to power line upgrades have not been identified to the Council through previous consultations. The site will be developed through a Masterplan which will provide an opportunity to define how the site will develop in line with this constraint. While the Council considers the existing Site Specific Developer Requirements to be sufficient the proposed modification would provide further clarity and transparency to applicants.

If the Reporter was so minded the Council would raise no objection to the proposed modification.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/20/001): The Council has included SNH in the list of participants for the development of a Masterplan in the draft Action Programme (S4_Doc_669) submitted with the Plan. The development of the Masterplan for the site will establish the broad landuse and place making principles of the site as well as identifying the specific surveys and plans required. While the Council considers the existing Site Specific Developer Requirements to be sufficient the proposed modification would provide further clarity and transparency to applicants.

If the Reporter was so minded the Council would raise no objection to the proposed modifications.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/028): It is considered that amending the Site Specific Developer Requirements to incorporate mitigation measures as set out in the Habitats

Regulations Appraisal (Including Appropriate Assessment) (S4_Doc_139) would provide greater clarity and transparency for applicants in terms of how the provisions of the Plan's Policy NE1: International Nature Conservation Sites (S4_Doc_389) apply to this site.

If the Reporter is so minded, the suggested additional text by the respondent, as detailed in the 'Modifications Sought' section, should be added to the Site Specific Developer Requirements.

Dr Charles Turner (09934/1/004); MBM Planning & Development (07693/17/001); Luncarty, Redgorton & Moneydie Community Council (00924/1/005); Jackie Turner (09935/1/004): The area of land to the north of the tree belt is within the area of search for the Cross Tay Link Road and is likely to be subject to some built development. The final extent of the developable area will be defined through the Masterplan process including the identification of the detailed route of the Cross Tay Link Road. No justification has been provided for its exclusion from the site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/002): The existing wording infers that through the enhancement of biodiversity it will be protected but to provide greater clarity and transparency to applicants the Council would have no issue with the proposed modification.

If the Reporter is so minded the suggested additional text by the respondent should be added to the Site Specific Developer Requirements.

H70: Perth West

A Ritchie & Son & M & S M Bullough (08651/3/002): Transport Scotland is undertaking a review of the A9 between Kier Roundabout and Luncarty. The initial findings of this study will be published in June 2013 and may have a bearing on the extent of the developable area of the site and how it is accessed. Through Representation 00092/8/001 Transport Scotland has raised concern over the proposed access strategy to this allocation and do not support it at present; Reference to schedule 4 no 20d Effectiveness of Strategic Sites is highlighted for further information on this issue. A comprehensive Masterplan for the entire site will require to be developed before phasing and access arrangements can be finalised. Due to the sites strategic nature it would not be appropriate, or make planning sense, to define the phasing of only part of the site through the Local Development Plan without providing a clear understanding of how the remainder of the site will come forward.

The Site Specific Developer Requirement identifies that the provision of a district heating system and combined heat and power infrastructure utilising renewable resources should be investigated but it does not specify that it is required.. It is understood that the introduction of such schemes could impact on the viability of some developments. One of the key prerequisites of financial viability is to have an anchor user. The Council proposes to construct a major school campus located in one of the strategic development areas and would seek the inclusion of this technology within this anchor use supporting the financial viability of the site. The development requirement as stated requires that this technology is investigated which is considered to be both reasonable and allow for suitable flexibility. It will allow the Council to review this position in future years to reflect Government policy.

The Council supports the idea behind a development framework but, until the Plan is adopted and clarity provided over which two of the three strategic development options

will come forward, this is not possible. The draft Action Programme (S4_Doc_669) submitted with the Plan identifies the requirement for the provision of an integration framework which will be developed prior to the creation of the Masterplans for the Strategic Development Areas.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

John Dewar Lamberkin Trust (09166/16/001); The Muir Group (07690/2/002): Transport Scotland is undertaking a review of the A9 between Kier Roundabout and Luncarty. The initial findings of this study will be published in June 2013. The outcome of this study could have an impact on the extent of the developable area and how the site is accessed. The site will be developed through a Masterplan which will define the extent of the developable area. The proposed modified boundary extends into the Green Belt (reference to schedule 4 no 14 Green Belt is highlighted for further information on this issue) and the Council would consider that the existing site boundary is sufficient. If further land is required to facilitate access to this site this can be considered through the Masterplan process. At this stage the Council do not accept that the boundary requires to be extended.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mr & Mrs J Carratt (00343/1/001): The issues which have been raised will be considered through the development of a Masterplan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/6/001); John Munro (10277/1/005): The Plan needs to identify two strategic development sites to provide an effective housing land supply. It identifies Bertha Park and Perth West which the Council consider are effective in meeting future development needs. It is considered that a suitable landscape framework is in place to support the development of this site. The developable area will be defined through the Masterplan process.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

CKD Galbraith (09289/24/001); Mr & Mrs Michael Jackson (00740/1/001); Mr & Mrs Walter Smith (00675/1/003); Mr & Mrs Nixon (00137/1/003); Jann Heigh (00119/1/003); Sarah Wilson (00120/1/003); Michael Nairn (00121/1/004); Joyce Nairn (00122/1/004); Mr & Mrs T Aitken (00123/1/003); Mr & Mrs L Morton (00124/1/003); Mr & Mrs W Murray (00126/1/003); Logan Fitchie (00131/1/003); Mr & Mrs L Slowman (00132/1/003); Iris Temple (00155/1/003); Donald Sutherland (00157/1/003); J McIntosh (00158/1/003); Mr & Mrs R Melville (00166/1/003); Mr & Mrs W Stewart (00168/1/1003); W Birrell (00169/1/1003); N Nichelson (00170/1/1003); Mr & Mrs J Kennedy (00171/1/003); Mr & Mrs C Shannon (00174/1/1003); Mr & Mrs B Beekie (00175/1/1003); Margaret Simpson (10182/1/1003): The Site Specific Developer Requirements identifies that '*Acceptable multiple vehicular access points to the development site providing access to both the trunk road network and central Perth without detriment to the local and strategic road network*' will be required. Through the development of a Masterplan for the entire site the suitable access points will be determined, until this process is complete it is not possible to define specific access routes through the Plan. Access to the site will be taken at some point along the A85 as capacity for some development from this road exists. The assessment work being undertaken by Transport Scotland on the A9 will help inform where a secondary access will be taken. The final extent of the developable area will be

defined through the Masterplan process. Through this process the site boundary could be defined to exclude the identified areas of land and require suitable screening to be provided.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Stewart McIntosh (00707/1/001); Mr & Mrs Walter Smith (00675/1/002); G Faulkner (00128/1/003); Mr & Mrs B Hood (00129/1/002); Kenny Montgomery (00154/1/003); Mr & Mrs K Campbell (00159/1/002); E Wilkie & E F Wilkie (00160/1/1003); B Wilkie (00161/1/1003); Mr & Mrs Stuart Cameron (00164/1/003); Mr & Mrs T McCash (00165/1/003): The Site Specific Developer Requirements identifies that *'Acceptable multiple vehicular access points to the development site providing access to both the trunk road network and central Perth without detriment to the local and strategic road network'* will be required. Through the development of a Masterplan for the entire site the suitable access points will be determined, until this process is complete it is not possible to define specific access routes through the Plan. Access to the site will be taken at some point along the A85 as capacity for some development from this road exists. The assessment work being undertaken by Transport Scotland on the A9 will help inform where a secondary access will be taken.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/21/001): The development of the Masterplan for the site will establish the broad landuse and place making principles of the site as well as identifying the specific surveys and plans required. While the Council considers the existing Site Specific Developer Requirements to be sufficient, the proposed modification would provide further clarity and transparency to applicants.

If the Reporter was so minded, the Council would raise no objection to the proposed modifications.

Springfield Properties Ltd (09017/1/005): The Council supports the idea behind a development framework but, until the Plan is adopted and clarity provided over which two of the three strategic development options will come forward, this is not possible. The draft Action Programme (S4_Doc_669) submitted with the Plan identifies the requirement for the provision of an integration framework which will be developed prior to the creation of the Masterplans for the Strategic Development Areas.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Reporter's conclusions:

1. In order to obtain further information on a number of matters, the council, together with parties who made representations about the strategic sites, were asked to respond to a series of questions. Some were also invited to participate in a hearing session, which considered issues relating to Site H70. The council was also asked to confirm whether the proposed school on Site H7 had been factored into the traffic modelling. All of the additional evidence has been taken into account in examining this issue and making recommendations.

2. Reference should be made to Issue 20d, which discusses the effectiveness of strategic sites and Issue 24, which deals with transport infrastructure in the Perth area. Both have direct relevance to the matters considered here.

General points

3. Concern has been expressed that there has been insufficient consultation with local residents on the proposed Strategic Development Area to the west/north west of Perth and that there is no justification for such a significant expansion of the city. However, the council has given appropriate publicity to the Proposed Plan, in accordance with its participation statement. TAYplan, which is the document that established the principle of this Strategic Development Area, also offered local people the opportunity to comment on this issue. The Proposed Plan must be consistent with TAYplan so it is not possible for this examination to question the principle of the West/North West Perth Strategic Development Area.

Almond Valley Village

4. For Almond Valley Village to be considered suitable for inclusion within the Plan as a strategic development site, either in addition to, or as a replacement for either sites H7 or H70, an assessment must be made of the suitability and effectiveness of the sites that are proposed within the Proposed Plan and the consequent likelihood that the identified housing requirement will be met. Only if it is concluded that the Proposed Plan's approach to this issue is inappropriate or insufficient would there be grounds to recommend a modification to include Almond Valley Village.

5. It has been concluded under Issue 20d that an initial 750 unit phase of site H7, which would rely upon the delivery of the proposed new A9/A85 junction and an initial section of the Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR) project, should be regarded as effective. With regard to site H70, as is set out below and in Issue 20d, an initial phase of 550 units at the northern end of the site is also considered to be effective. However, for the remainder of that site, a new junction onto the A9, west of Broxden roundabout would be required. For reasons that are set out below and in Issue 20d, it would be inappropriate either to modify the plan so as to incorporate that access or to allocate this land for development when it could not be developed without an access (involving significant works within land that is currently proposed as green belt) for which there has been no assessment or publicity. For these reasons the majority of site H70 is unsuitable for allocation within this plan. In this respect therefore, the Proposed Plan's provisions cannot be regarded as appropriate or sufficient.

6. It has been concluded under Issue 24 that the proposed Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR) is unlikely to become a committed project within the Plan period. This has significant implications for housing delivery, as the proposed embargo on housing development to the east/north east of Perth, which has been concluded to be necessary, would rule out a significant quantum of development on which the Proposed Plan's housing strategy currently relies.

7. Against this background, the merits of any alternative strategic development site must be considered. The possibility of developing a new settlement at Craigend has been ruled out under Issue 40, due to its clear conflict with TAYplan. Other similar proposals have been ruled out for similar reasons under Issue 26b. And Almond Valley Village is the only candidate strategic site within the west /north west Perth area that has been put forward.

8. With regard to the effectiveness of Almond Valley Village, despite being allocated for housing development in the 1995 local plan, no progress has been made on developing it. However, prospective developers of the land now indicate that they are in a position to

bring it forward within the near future. The council has accepted this statement and no other party has provided convincing evidence to challenge the site's effectiveness. In order to accommodate the additional traffic that would be generated, the A9/A85 junction improvement scheme that is discussed in more detail under Issue 24, would require to be completed. The promoters of Almond Valley Village accept the need to contribute significant financial sums in order to secure the delivery of this improvement scheme and the council is committed to forward funding it so that it can be delivered within a reasonable timeframe. Planning permission for the junction works is already in place.

9. Looking at the effectiveness considerations that are set out in PAN 2/2010, the site is owned by a party which has confirmed its willingness to release the site for development. Bearing in mind its location and the surrounding land uses, the most suitable use for the land would be a housing-led scheme. There are no physical constraints that are likely to impose an insurmountable constraint to development. The only identified issue of any significance is the risk of flooding to part of the site. However the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) is content that this issue could be addressed in the site masterplanning and there is no evidence to suggest that it would have such a significant effect on the extent of developable land that the site's viability would be undermined. No significant contamination concerns have been raised and there is no requirement for public funding to make the site viable. The only significant infrastructure issue is the provision of improvements to the road network, principally the A85 and its junction with the A9. The council has confirmed that it has resolved to forward-fund the road infrastructure works that would be required, and this process would be assisted by the release of Almond Valley Village for development, as that should improve the likelihood of securing developer contributions towards those works within a reasonable time frame. Finally, there is no reason why the site would not be marketable in the short to medium term. In conclusion, there are no grounds to doubt the effectiveness of this site.

10. Turning to the suitability of the site, through its inclusion as an option in the MIR it has been the subject of environmental assessment and habitats regulations appraisal. No significant issues were identified. It has also been publicised through that process. In response, it received quite significant opposition, and this is reflected in the representations, summarised above, which offer support to its exclusion from the Proposed Plan. The development of this site for housing, by building on open fields and by adding quite significant levels of additional traffic and activity, would undoubtedly introduce a significant change to the character of the locality, which would be noticeable, to varying degrees, to existing local residents. In comparison with sites H7 and H70, which have fewer residential neighbours, the number of parties likely to be affected by the development of Almond Valley Village would be significantly higher. However, there is no reason to conclude that any effects on existing residents would necessarily be objectionable or that any potential adverse impact could not be adequately mitigated in the masterplanning process for the site.

11. Moreover, if the Proposed Plan is to be consistent with TAYplan, which it is legally required to do, land must be found in west / north west Perth for very significant levels of new development including approximately 4000 houses. The short to medium term effectiveness of most of site H7 is constrained by the uncertainty that exists over the timing of the CTRLR (see also Issues 20d and 24). And only a small portion of site H70 can be developed without a new access onto the A9, for which there is insufficient information to contemplate a site allocation and about which there is a degree of concern over the potential for significant adverse landscape impact (see below). That issue rules out the development of all but a relatively small area at the northern end of that site, which (as is discussed below) modelling confirms could be accessed from the A85. The

likely output from site H7 and the developable section of site H70 falls well short of that required to satisfy the expectations of TAYplan for a strategic expansion of west/north west Perth. And, bearing in mind the problems there will almost certainly be in delivering housing to the east/north east of Perth, where an embargo is proposed until the CTRLR becomes a committed project, the need for significant additional housing capacity in west/north west Perth becomes even more significant. If a five year effective supply is to be maintained and if the TAYplan housing requirement for the plan period is to be accommodated, additional land in this area must be found.

12. In landscape impact terms and in terms of how successfully new development could be integrated with existing community infrastructure, Almond Valley Village has much to commend it. The apparent disadvantage of having significant numbers of residential neighbours is in fact an advantage of this site in those terms.

13. Modelling work completed on behalf of the council has shown that, subject to the approved A9/A85 junction improvements being implemented and a link provided from the junction into site H7, the traffic effects of developing initial phases on Almond Valley Village, H7 and H70 would be acceptable. The costs of funding such road infrastructure improvements do not appear to be excessive and the council has taken the commendable step of undertaking to provide forward funding.

14. Taking all matters into account, it is concluded that Almond Valley Village should be allocated for development. A suitable plan defining the boundary of that allocation would be the planning application site boundary for planning application 08/00678/IPM minus the land within that boundary which is identified as site E38 and discussed below. The output from this site should be stated as 1500 units, of which 700 would be delivered within the plan period. It would be appropriate to identify the site as H73.

E38: Ruthvenfield Road

15. The Proposed Plan's overall employment land strategy is considered under Issue 20b. This concludes that the process of defining future demand for employment land is inevitably an imprecise process for which there is little national guidance. The council's approach has been to look at past trends to forecast the likely demand for employment land in the future. In the Perth area this has led to the identification of a number of sites of which E38 is one example. It is impossible to determine with any certainty whether the Proposed Plan has identified an appropriate supply of such land. However, given the level of housing development that is to be directed to Perth during the Plan period, and its role as the principal settlement within the Plan area, it is logical to make generous provision for employment land here. With the inclusion of Almond Valley Village there is no shortage of housing land and therefore no reason to designate part of E38 as a housing site.

16. This site would form a logical extension to the Inveralmond Industrial Estate. The route of the proposed CTRLR would run through the site before entering Almond Valley Village (discussed above) and entering site H7 via a new crossing of the River Almond. The Proposed Plan does not require the development of this site to make provision for this link but, in response to representations seeking greater integration of the masterplans for the west / north west Perth strategic sites, this is recommended as an addition to the site-specific developer requirements. In terms of how the different masterplans might be integrated, it is not essential for this to be specified in the Proposed Plan, as the process will depend upon the order in which strategic sites come forward for development, which cannot be predicted at this time. The council will need to ensure,

when considering each masterplan that the overall aims of the strategic development area are not prejudiced. That process would not be assisted by inserting into the Proposed Plan a requirement to follow some particular methodology.

17. There are residential neighbours to the west and south west of the site and there will be more such neighbours once site H73 is developed. However, this does not justify the identification of a buffer area within Site E38, within which employment uses would be precluded. The need to balance the productiveness of the site with the necessary protection of neighbouring residential amenity is a matter which can be dealt with adequately in the masterplanning process.

18. The developable area of the site is likely to be constrained by flood risk and it would be appropriate to specify this, and the requirement for a flood risk assessment in the site-specific developer requirements.

19. The reference to green corridors in the site-specific developer requirements is unambiguous and there would be no benefit in referring specifically to The Lade, River Almond or River Tay.

H7: Bertha Park

20. The Proposed Plan identifies Site H7 for the delivery of in excess of 3000 houses and over 25 hectares of employment land. When added to the development that is proposed on Sites H70 (as modified) and E38 and at Almond Valley Village (site H73), this will provide 50 hectares of employment land and in excess of 5000 homes. TAYplan Policy 4 requires land to be allocated within the West/North West Perth Strategic Development Area for 4000+ homes and 50 hectares of employment land. There is no inconsistency therefore between the Proposed Plan as modified and TAYplan. And in any event, TAYplan is clear that its figures are only indicative of the scale of development to be allocated.

21. The effectiveness of Site H7 is considered under Issue 20d. It is concluded there that, due to the likely delay in completing the CTRL, the majority of this site could not be regarded as effective within the Plan period. This conclusion does not necessarily undermine the predictions in the table which follows paragraph 5.1.11 in the Proposed Plan, as that predicted only 750 units would be delivered within the plan period, with a further 2500 beyond 2024. In order to test whether it is reasonable to assume that 750 houses could be delivered before 2024, further information was sought from the parties on how access to this site might be achieved in advance of the CTRL and what the traffic implications of this might be, when assessed in conjunction with a range of alternative scenarios including development on the Almond Valley Village site. This is also discussed under Issue 20d.

22. The outcome of this process was the identification of an access solution for a first phase of development on Site H7, serving 750 houses and a new secondary school (with primary and nursery schools to be added subsequently). This would involve an initial phase of the CTRL, which would access Site H7 from the new A9/A85 junction and Ruthvenfield Road spur through site E38. The revised cost of delivering this scheme has been taken into account in the council's resolution to forward-fund the A9/A85 junction improvements. Modelling work (presented in the council's document AI_23) has shown that a development of this scale in conjunction with that proposed for the northern phase of site H70 and an initial phase of Almond Valley Village would have acceptable traffic impacts in advance of the full CTRL. This modelling work originally assumed an output

from this site of 1000 houses within the Plan period. As this was conducted prior to the school being a firm commitment, the results have been reconsidered on the basis of 750 houses and the school and the results continue to confirm that there would be no unacceptable traffic implications. The site-specific developer requirement relating to the provision of the CTLR requires to be modified so as to reflect this phased approach.

23 The site-specific developer requirement to investigate the provision of a district heating system and combined heat and power infrastructure using renewable resources is a reasonable requirement of a site of this scale. It does not commit the developer to its provision, merely to investigating its feasibility.

24. There is ample land available within the boundaries of Site H7 in the Proposed Plan to accommodate the required level of development and there is no evidence that in order to incorporate a district heating system there would require to be any extension. No specific proposals have been put forward for park and ride facilities in this location. In conclusion, there are no grounds to consider the proposed site boundaries insufficient or inappropriate and therefore no reason to modify Site H7 by the inclusion of an additional eight hectares of land.

25. Any implications for development of the east coast transmission line upgrading project would be accounted for in the site masterplan as a matter of course and do not require to be highlighted in the proposed plan. It would however be appropriate for the site-specific developer requirements to be modified so as to reflect the outcome of the habitats regulations appraisal and for these requirements also to specify that the development should protect as well as enhance biodiversity by, among other measures, undertaking ecological surveys and considering appropriate access and recreation strategies for the site's wooded areas.

26 The MIR did not define site boundaries so it is not significant that a particular field that is included within Site H7 was not identified specifically at the MIR stage. The field in question to the north of a tree belt may have limited development potential, being detached from the more obviously developable areas of the site. However, as was discussed in relation to Issue 14 Green Belts, its inclusion within the site does not indicate that it would necessarily be built upon and could offer just as much protection from inappropriate development as if it had been omitted from the site and identified as green belt.

H70: Perth West (as identified in the Proposed Plan)

27. As has been referred to above, with the exception of a limited area at the north of this site (known as Huntingtower View), which could be accessed from the A85, it is not possible to access this site without the construction of a grade-separated junction on the A9 to the west of the existing site boundary, on land that is identified in the Proposed Plan as green belt. This was confirmed by all parties at a hearing session which discussed how one might gain access to this site. There has been no detailed assessment by the council of the impact of such an access on the character of the landscape, on visual amenity, ecological interests or archaeology. And the initial work that the landowner has carried out is insufficiently detailed to provide any conclusive assessment of its likely implications. Being detached from the urban edge of Perth, the landscape setting within which the proposed junction would be built is different to that around Broxden roundabout and in the immediate vicinity of the site itself, as the urbanising effect of the western edge of the city would be far less apparent. On the information that is available it cannot be concluded with any confidence that the impact of

the new junction and access (particularly in landscape and visual terms) will be acceptable. And without this, the majority of the site cannot be developed.

28. There has been no consideration of the required access in the SEA or HRA of the Proposed Plan. However, there is no evidence that any updating of such studies would be likely to identify any particular problems, so this issue could therefore have been left for the Council to address, were it recommended that the Proposed Plan be modified to incorporate the access, or could be dealt with at the development management stage, were it concluded that the site could be allocated for housing without such a modification to the plan.

29. There is however a significant problem with the lack of publicity that has been given to this essential site access. At no point in the publicity that has accompanied the preparation of the Proposed Plan has the council given any indication that such an access would be required, and it was also not contemplated at the MIR stage. The access in question would be a significant engineering project within land that is identified for designation as green belt. It would have the effect of visually extending built development westwards along the A9 into an area that at present has a more rural character than the more immediate environs of Site H70. It is an element of the development of H70 that is likely to be of considerable public interest and yet potentially interested parties, who are not necessarily just those living in the locality, have had no opportunity to make representations.

30. In conclusion, the plan's provisions for the majority of Site H70 are inappropriate and insufficient due to the reliance on an access that, on the evidence available to date is likely to cause unacceptable landscape and visual harm and which has not been properly considered or publicised. It would therefore be unsafe and inappropriate to sanction the development of this site by a specific allocation in the Proposed Plan.

31. It is conceivable that planning permission might be granted for such an access. A proposal of application notice has recently been submitted. Transport Scotland is agreeable to the principle of development on the basis that such an access would replace the at-grade junction with Tibbermore Road and provide associated road improvements by the closure of other at-grade A9 accesses and improvements to Broxden roundabout. The council considers that proposed Policy NE5 (e) might be supportive of such a proposal, on the basis that it could be described as essential infrastructure. The submission of a planning application would provide the opportunity for community engagement, which has been absent to date and would enable the full range of environmental assessment to be carried out.

32. The site itself, although prominent at present from the A9 to the south is well screened from the A9 north of Broxden. And where it can be seen clearly, this is in the visual context of the built up outskirts of Perth, which already present a rather hard urban edge to the city. Careful attention to design and landscaping could address the concerns that have been raised over landscape and visual impact. The site is somewhat detached from the city by the A9 but access for pedestrians could be improved and, in terms of pedestrian accessibility to the city, H70 is no worse than other strategic development options. Issues of traffic impact do not appear to be insoluble (albeit they would require the aforementioned A9 access) and the inevitable loss of agricultural land would not be objectionable, given the acceptance in TAYplan that significant areas of such land must be released for development in west / north west Perth if forecast housing requirements are to be met. There are no insurmountable flood risk concerns and no grounds to regard any particular part of site H70 as unsuitable for development other than for the

reason already identified above.

33. Taking all of these considerations into account, it is recommended that site H70 (with the exception of the northern phase, which could be accessed from the A85) is not allocated for residential development but is excluded from the green belt and included within the settlement boundary so as to preserve its development potential. The proposals map will require to be modified to reflect the revised site boundary and the site-specific developer requirements will need to reflect the scale and form of development which could be accommodated on the smaller site. However, it would be unnecessary to incorporate the modifications requested by Scottish Natural Heritage, as these were applicable to the much larger scale of development that was contemplated in the Proposed Plan.

Expansion of Site H70

34. Owners of the southern part of H70 propose that it is extended further to the south west in order to accommodate the access referred to above and to reflect initial concept masterplans that have been drawn up for the site. It is not proposed to increase the total number of houses on the H70 site beyond the 3000 identified in the Proposed Plan, but the site area would be very much larger.

35. The conclusions that have been set out above in respect of the proposed access apply equally to the proposed site extension. The landscape implications of a significant expansion of the site away from the built up area of Perth are likely to be a source of concern and there has been no opportunity for the public to comment on this proposal and no formal assessment of its likely environmental consequences. And as it is recommend to remove the H70 allocation from all but a relatively small area at the north of the site, it could not be appropriate to agree an extension to a site which itself has been concluded to be unsuitable for allocation in the Proposed Plan.

36. Even if there were no concerns over the lack of publicity and environmental assessment, the proposed extension would represent a very significant and (from the information that is available to date) harmful (in landscape and visual terms) expansion of the built up area of Perth into a landscape setting that, unlike the boundaries of H70 as defined in the Proposed Plan, is distinct from the existing urban form of the city. Any public benefits that have been identified (such as the opportunity to provide public access to woodland) would not overcome the issues outlined above, which indicate strongly against modifying the plan in the manner that has been requested.

37. A smaller extension has also been proposed but for the same reasons, that too must be regarded as an inappropriate modification to the Proposed Plan.

Reporter's recommendations:

Almond Valley Village

1. Add a new site, identified as H73 Almond Valley Village, the boundaries of which should be defined by the plan which accompanied planning application 08/00678/IPM minus the part of that site which is to be allocated site E38.

2. Add site-specific developer requirements for that site as follows:

Ref	Location	Size	Number
H73	Almond Valley Village		Approximately 1500

Site Specific Developer Requirements

- ⇒ A masterplan will be required for the comprehensive development of this site setting out the phased release of both the housing and community land.
- ⇒ Flood Risk Assessment
- ⇒ Delivery of a suitable road access through the site from Site E38 into Site H7 across the River Almond (phasing details to be agreed).
- ⇒ Facilities to enable connection to Perth's bus network.
- ⇒ Network of paths and cycle routes providing good active travel links to Perth and Almondbank.
- ⇒ Green corridors in particular networks to link the site with Perth and the wider countryside.
- ⇒ Enhancement of biodiversity.
- ⇒ Integration of existing landscape framework into the development.
- ⇒ New Primary School provision.
- ⇒ Investigation of the provision of a district heating system and combined heat and power infrastructure using renewable resources.

3. Modify the table under paragraph 5.1.11 to include Site H73, specifying the delivery of 700 units by 2024 and 800 thereafter.

Site E38 Ruthvenfield Road

4. Add two additional site-specific developer requirements to read as follows:

"Masterplan and phasing to incorporate a suitable road access through the site into Site H72 (Almond Valley Village) and thence into Site H7."

"The developable area of the site is likely to be constrained by flood risk. A flood risk assessment will be required."

Site H7 Bertha Park

5. Modify the fourth site-specific developer requirement to read as follows:

"Development shall be phased with the delivery of the Cross Tay Link Road. The first phase of development (for not more than 750 homes and a secondary school) shall not commence until the first phase of the Cross Tay Link Road, linking the site to the A9/A85 junction, has been provided."

6. Modify the eighth site-specific developer requirement to read as follows: *"Protection and enhancement of biodiversity."*

7. Modify the 10th site-specific developer requirement to read as follows:

"New secondary school with potential to provide an all-through school/campus."

8. Add two additional site-specific developer requirements to read as follows:

“Construction Method Statement to be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.”

‘Where the development of the site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an Otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.’

Site H70 Perth West

9. Modify the boundaries of this site on the proposals map so that they match those set out representation 08651/3/002 (Huntingtower View).

10. Modify the site specific developer requirements for the site as follows:

Ref	Location	Size	Number
H70	Perth West		A maximum of 550 with employment space and/or primary school

Site Specific Developer Requirements

- ⇒ A masterplan will be required for the comprehensive development of this site setting out the phased release of housing, community and employment land.
- ⇒ Development not to commence before the A9/A85 junction improvements are complete.
- ⇒ Flood Risk Assessment
- ⇒ Facilities to enable connection to Perth’s bus network.
- ⇒ Network of paths and cycle routes providing good active travel links to Perth
- ⇒ Green corridors in particular networks to link the site with Perth and the wider countryside.
- ⇒ Enhancement of biodiversity.
- ⇒ Integration of existing landscape framework into the development.
- ⇒ New Primary School provision to be considered.
- ⇒ Investigation of the provision of a district heating system and combined heat and power infrastructure using renewable resources.