

Issue 23a		Perth Area (within Core) Perth City Proposals	
Development plan reference:		H4 - Marshalling Yards, Perth, page 78 MU1 - Broxden, Perth, page 79 E1 - The Triangle, Dunkeld Road, Perth, page 79 E2 - Broxden, Perth, page 79 E3 - Arran Road, Perth, page 79 H2 - St John's School, Stormont Street, Perth, page 80 H3 - Gannochy Road, Perth, page 80 OP7 - Newton Farm, Perth, page 80 OP8 - Friarton Road, Perth, page 81 OP2 - Thimblorow Car Park, Perth, page 81 OP9 - Bus Station, Leonard Street, Perth, page 81	Reporter: David Buylla
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):			
Louise Crawford (00087) Janie Scott (00112) Alastair Grant (00140) James Taylor (00145) Mr & Mrs Purves (00152) James Strang (00181) Lynne Palmer (00239) H W Webb (00301) Hansteen Property Investments Ltd (00370) Louise Gauld (00425) Chris Irvine (00426) M Mailer (00489) Lucy Stott (00610) James Murray (00613) Dr & Mrs Andrew Stirrat (00620) Jane Andrew (00626) Robert Curtis (00636) Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council (00667) Rebecca Livingstone (00686) Alasdair Cant (00699) Mr & Mrs P Rodgers (00700) Annelie Carmichael (00731)		Deirdre A Beaton (00741) George Beaton (00742) Vivien Stewart (00802) Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (00844) Manse LLP (00850) Lysa Wallace (00919) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (00947) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194) S Howie (07693) Persephone Beer (07744) Kinnoull Properties Ltd (08669) Scotland's Gardens Trust (08816) Episo Boxes LP (09035) Errol Park Estate (09060) John Dewar Lamberkin Trust/Needhill LLP (09084) Joan McEwen (09098) DB Schenker (09164) Burrelton & District Community Council (09376) The Gannochy Trust (10152)	
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:		Designated sites within Perth City	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):			
H4: Marshalling Yards, Tulloch Mr & Mrs Purves (00152/1/001): Do not want Allan Terrace to become a through route as			

it will be detrimental to amenity and safety of residents. Any access to the Maltings could be a rat run for SSE staff. Fail to see how Tulloch Primary School will cope with 300 additional families.

Janie Scott (00112/1/001): Welcome houses but concerned that there is not enough capacity in Tulloch Primary School which does not have sufficient nursery places. A new school or extension should be provided.

DB Schenker (09164/1/001): The identification of the site is welcomed and it is hoped that it can be brought forward by 2014 and be fully built by 2024. The site should be designated as a housing site as mixed uses are no longer proposed for the yards. The numbers should be designed by masterplan but up to 350 units would be a more appropriate figure. The economics of developing the site are challenging and any planning gain for the site should take into account the particular and unusual development costs associated with the site so that development of this brownfield site is not inhibited.

Kinnoull Properties Ltd (08669/1/001): The site should be identified for mixed use and it appears under this heading on page 78 of the Plan. The definition should include retailing and be added to Policy RC4 (S4_Doc_497).

The site has an area of 10.6 hectares and typical densities are set out in page 65 of the Plan. The site could accommodate some high density housing which would increase the numbers on the site. The actual numbers should be designed by masterplan. The reference to open space and landscape structure should be indicative and the reference to footbridge should be potential contribution.

The area should be extended to include the open space and football pitch and create an access to Tulloch Road (S4_Doc_368). The football pitch should be relocated to the southern part of the site with some local shops provided at the Tulloch edge of the proposal.

Lynne Palmer (00239/7/001): The site could accommodate some temporary uses prior to being developed. Bee hives and wild flowers could be introduced. The sale of honey could help with the cost of buying seed and volunteers could look after the bees and hives.

Persephone Beer (07744/1/004): Support for the Plan; funding to improve the white bridge.

MU1: Broxden, Glasgow Road

Hansteen Property Investments Ltd (00370/2/001): The mixed use area on the east side of the site together with an area at Pitheavlis identified as employment land has the benefit of planning permission (S4_Doc_232).and should not be part of the main MU1 site but be shown as a separate site. In line with government policy and to promote greatest flexibility this should be identified for mixed uses with the potential uses governed by a reworded Policy ED1b (S4_Doc_483) (allowing a single use). The landscaping designation is not required as the entire site should be developed by a masterplan and the landscaping should be designed by that process

John Dewar Lamberkin Trust & Needhill LLP (09084/1/003): The eastern third of the site (the mixed use area and what was Cherrybank Gardens) is not in our clients ownership and they cannot bring forward the masterplan required for the site and the site is not

effective under the terms of PAN 2/2010 (Core_Doc_097) The boundary should be adjusted to exclude the area which should become a separate mixed use site. A detailed review indicates that the site cannot accommodate 4.5hectares of employment land and 9.6hectares of residential land and provide the required suds schemes and open space. The site can accommodate 2hectares of employment land and 7.4hectares of residential, around 200 houses. Note a planning application for the development of the site on the above basis is currently with the Council.

Scotland's Gardens Trust (08816/1/001): It is not clear who is to lead the required masterplan for the development of the site and it would be best if this role was undertaken by Perth & Kinross Council as there is more than one owner involved. While accepting that the landscaping is indicative, the site owned by Scotland's Garden Trust is a prime development site and can deliver the much needed housing for Perth. Scotland's Garden Trust expects to be involved in the masterplanning process.

Dr & Mrs Andrew Stirrat (00620/1/001): The scale of development is out of keeping with the character of this part of Perth which is an important entry to The City. The large site at Necessity Brae has been for sale for around two years without finding a buyer and a reasonable use should be found for this area before the site is developed. Development should also fund a regenerated Cherrybank Gardens or an alternative to mitigate any environmental impact and improve the area for residents and visitors.

Burrelton & District Community Council (09376/1/004); John Dewar Lamberkin Trust & Needhill LLP (09084/1/001): Support for the Plan.

E1: The Triangle, Dunkeld Road

Persephone Beer (07744/1/005): The LDP should contain more improvements for cyclists and walkers.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/23/001): A small watercourse flows along the southern boundary of the site and developers should be made aware of a potential flood risk from this. Historical records show that the site flooded in 1993. 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.

Errol Park Estate (09060/1/003): The site is at risk of flooding as shown on the Scottish Environment Protection Agency maps and cannot be a logical location for employment uses.

E2: Broxden

John Dewar Lamberkin Trust & Needhill LLP (09084/1/004): An area to the east of the site was the location of Broxden farmhouse now demolished and is vacant land suitable for employment uses. The extended site should be shown as 2.5 hectares of developable land to take account of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and high quality landscape setting.

John Dewar Lamberkin Trust & Needhill LLP (09084/1/002): Support for the Plan.

E3: Arran Road

Louise Crawford (00087/1/001): The view from my house will be ruined by the proximity of the development.

Persephone Beer (07744/1/006): Improve the level of cycle and walking provision throughout the Plan area.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/24/001): A small watercourse flows along the southern boundary of the site and developers should be made aware of a potential flood risk from this. Historical records show that the site flooded in 1993. 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.

Errol Park Estate (09060/1/004): The site is at risk of flooding on the Scottish Environmental Protection Area maps and cannot be a logical long term employment allocation.

H2: St John's School, Stormont Street

M Mailer (00489/1/001); Lucy Stott (00610/1/001); Jane Andrew (00626/1/001); Robert Curtis (00636/1/001); Mr 7 Mrs M Rodgers (00700/1/001); Alasdair Cant (00699/1/001); Rebecca Livingstone (00686/1/001); Vivien Stewart (00802/1/001); Lysa Wallace (00919/1/001); James Murray (00613/1/001): The building will require to be three stories high to accommodate 50 flats which will detract from the character of the area and affect daylight entering into adjoining properties. The opportunity should be taken to improve the area rather than allowing something that will ruin it by over development. The uncertainty over the larger population is perceived as a threat. Privacy is also a problem. Parking is already difficult and this proposal will make it worse unless parking is allocated within the site. The existing infrastructure will not be able to accommodate the development; the existing drains are easily flooded. The development will also increase the amount of air pollution in the area. The building work will be particularly disruptive.

H3: Gannochy Road

The Gannochy Trust (10152/1/001): The Trust holds land at Gannochy and Muirhall farms and is required to consider laying out additional housing schemes upon the same lines as the original model village. The Trust will provide additional Affordable Housing without public subsidy and is developing such a scheme. The site measures 2.6 hectares (not 0.3 hectares) and the Trust would like to extend the site to 5 hectares to accommodate 50 Affordable Houses together with a community hub which might be provided by the conversion of one or more of the traditional buildings (S4_Doc_478). Separate Representations have been made in relation to Green Belt policy and Affordable Housing.

Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council (00667/3/001): Supportive of potential mixed housing development but it should not be developed prior to the Cross Tay Link becoming a commitment as it will increase traffic and air pollution at Bridgend. There are little to no community development facilities in the community council area and the LDP makes no provision for any being developed. A relief road from the Perth Road should be developed to add safe road capacity access to the proposed housing development as well as a relocated Kinnoull Primary School and general access to the Kinnoull area. (Reference to the Schedule 4 number 24 (Perth Area (within Core) Transport) is highlighted for further information on this issue).

George Beaton (00742/6/001); Deirdre A Beaton (00741/6/001); Annelie Carmichael (00731/2/001): The present infrastructure in our area cannot support more housing. Roads are overburdened with Bridgend being at full capacity with air quality at Bridgend

at levels injurious to health. Other access roads (Lochie Brae, Manse Road, Muirhall Road) are dangerous and inadequate. There is a lack of sports and community facilities in our area.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/31/001): A small watercourse flows along the southern boundary of the site and developers should be made aware of a potential flood risk from this. 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.

Op7: Newton Farm

Episo Boxes LP (09035/6/001): Retail capacity and impact are two different concepts and should not be linked as they are in the Plan. As the site is identified for retail there must not be any problem with capacity. Retail impact is a relevant consideration of specific development proposals and the addition of wording relating to the sequential approach would make it clear that the potential for retail use does not supersede the sequential approach in relation to comparison goods.

Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (00844/1/012): The identification of the site for retailing will have a significant impact on the vitality and viability of the city centre and there is no justification in the LDP for introducing a step change in the network of retail centres in Perth. There would be no objections however if a food store was provided in the location provided that it was linked to housing growth at the north west side of Perth. The Plan should be amended to restrict development to convenience goods only. A restriction should be placed on mezzanine floors if the Plan is amended to provide a supermarket only. Proposals for any other retail floorspace must be subject to a sequential assessment.

Manse LLP (00850/1/009): The Crieff Road commercial centre should be extended to include site OP7 to allow the centre to expand to accommodate the additional necessary facilities notably an additional supermarket to serve new development at Perth west.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/45/001): A culverted section of the Newton Burn flows through the middle of the development site and there may be a way to restore the water channel to its natural state by removing the culvert. 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.

Op8: Friarton Road

Chris Irvine (00426/1/001): I support the allocation of the site but any proposed use must be compatible with surrounding business uses and this would complement Policy EP4 (S4_Doc_513) on health and safety consultation zones.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/46/001): A small watercourse flows through the middle of the site and developers should be made aware of a potential flood risk from this. 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.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (00947/1/022): The mitigation measures in Appendix C of SEA Addendum No.2 (Core_Doc_089) refer to the need for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to be undertaken to inform the development of this site but it has not been included in the Developer Requirements in the Proposed Plan for site Op8 Friarton Road.

Op2: Thimblelow Car Park

Alastair Grant (00140/1/001): The car park should not be redeveloped, the parking spaces are vital to the residents and business uses in the area.

James Strang (00181/1/001): The scale of development is out of keeping with the character this part of The City and any development should be no more than one storey high. Retail and business could be incompatible with the residential nature of the area. The loss of car parking would be detrimental to The City.

S Howie (07693/6/001): The removal of the successful car park would be detrimental to shoppers, tourists and commuters alike. The creation of additional retail floorspace would have an adverse effect on the retail core which is already struggling. No funding is in place and the site has not been marketed to see if there is any interest. The massing and scale suggested would have an adverse effect on the nearby listed buildings and the appearance of the adjacent conservation area.

H W Webb (00301/1/001): Development should not obscure our view to Kinnoull Hill and should be no more than one storey high.

Joan McEwen (09098/2/006): Removal of the car parking will increase air pollution by encouraging more cross town vehicle moves. The development of the site will result in the unacceptable loss of a parking area which is important for local residents, businesses and visitors. The location of the car park on the west side of The City means drivers from all directions except the east do not have to travel through the city centre but can proceed on foot thus reducing air pollution.

Persephone Beer (07744/1/007): The LDP should improve facilities and routes for pedestrians and walkers.

Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (00844/1/011): The site lies in the city centre and it is clear from the capacity exercise in our appendix 3 that it is capable of accommodating new and larger retail units whilst retaining much needed car parking.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/44/001): Historical records show that the site may be at risk of flooding. Flooding of the Ramada Jarvis in 2010 has been recorded. 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.

Op9: Bus Station Leonard Street

James Taylor (00145/1/001); Louise Gauld (00425/1/001): The bus station should be retained and upgraded as it is a good location being central for both tourists and locals. There is not enough parking for more houses and a lack of play space, schools and other facilities. It should not be lost to residential development.

Lynne Palmer (00239/6/001): The bus station should be moved so that the area can be

used for housing. There is room for another high rise block near to the Pomarium where the bus station is now. The present housing crisis means that we must build where we can. A new bus station could go where the Station Hotel garden is now, that area is at least as big as the present bus station.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

H4: Marshalling Yards, Tulloch

Mr & Mrs Purves (00152/1/001): Do not wish Allan Terrace to become a through route as a result of the development.

Janie Scott (00112/1/001): New school or funding for significant extension as developer requirement.

DB Schenker (09164/1/001): The site be identified as a housing site with the following specific developer requirements:

A conceptual masterplan will be required setting out the proposed phasing for the release of land from 2014 onwards. Subsequent planning applications for the development of phases of the site will require to be accompanied by a detailed masterplan that dovetails with the conceptual masterplan Flood Risk Assessment, taking into account any strategic actions funded by the Council in respect of the Lade, to define permanently protected open space/flood plain next to the Lade.

Improved access from Tulloch Road/Crieff Road. Links to the Lade green corridor including enhancement of biodiversity and habitats with reference to the Lade Management Plan. The conceptual masterplan to identify the linkage of paths within the site to the wider path network, including core paths. The updating of the previous contaminated land investigations together with a phased programme of appropriate remediation works. A financial appraisal for the proposed development, taking into account the decontamination and Social/Affordable Housing Contribution towards improving/replacing the White Bridge over the railway line. Contribution towards education provision.

Kinnoull Properties Ltd (08669/1/001): The site should be identified for mixed use development with the house numbers to be designed by masterplan, retailing should also be included. The reference to footbridge should read '*potential contribution*', and the landscape and open space should be indicative. The site should be extended to include the area of open space extending to Tulloch Road (S4_Doc_368) shown for local shops and housing with the football pitch relocated to the main part of the site. The extended area would also contain the main access to the site.

Lynne Palmer (00239/7/001) Temporary uses should be encouraged on the site prior to it being developed.

MU1: Broxden, Glasgow Road

Hansteen Property Investments Ltd (00370/2/001): The whole site including the area at Pitheavlis should be zoned for mixed uses and not be included with site MU1 but be a separate site. The site should not have a specific indicative landscape designation.

John Dewar Lamberkin Trust & Needhill LLP (09084/1/003): The site boundary should be redrawn to exclude an area on the eastern edge and this should be shown as a separate site for mixed use. The western portion of the site should be identified for 4.5hectares of

employment and 9 hectares of residential to accommodate 200 houses. The site should also be extended to the south west to incorporate the area to the south and west of the park and ride.

Scotland's Gardens Trust (08816/1/001): The Council should take the lead in the preparation of the masterplan for the area. The site (former Scotland's Garden) has potential for housing and should not be for landscaping.

Dr & Mrs Andrew Stirrat (00620/1/001): The site should not be identified for high density housing business etc. The site should not be developed until suitable uses are found for the site at Necessity Brae. Cherrybank Gardens should be regenerated through the development or an alternative provided.

E1: The Triangle, Dunkeld Road

Persephone Beer (07744/1/005): Safeguard cycle and pedestrian access through this site to the Riverside Path, North Muirton Commuter route and Dunkeld Road including the Triangle. Inveralmond roundabout should be made more cycle friendly. Toucan crossings required on roundabout and north side of Dunkeld Road. These should be Developer Requirements for the site.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/23/001): A flood risk assessment should be a Specific Developer Requirement used to inform the scale layout and form of the development. No built development should take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.

Errol Park Estate (09060/1/003): Delete site (assumed) in favour of an allocation at Drums of Ardgath (cross reference Schedule 4 number 26b).

E2: Broxden

John Dewar Lamberkin Trust & Needhill LLP (09084/1/004): The site should be extended eastwards to include the former site of the Broxden farmhouse with the developable area being 2.5 hectares.

E3: Arran Road

Louise Crawford (00087/1/001): An area of landscape screening adjacent to the site boundary.

Persephone Beer (07744/1/006): Safeguard cycle and pedestrian access to the riverside path north Muirton commuter route and Dunkeld Road.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/24/001): A flood risk assessment should be a Specific Developer Requirement used to inform the scale layout and form of the development. No built development should take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.

Errol Park Estate (09060/1/004): Delete the site in support of a site at Drums of Ardgath. (cross reference schedule 4 number 26b).

H2: St John's School Stormont Street

M Mailer (00489/1/001); Lucy Stott (00610/1/001); Jane Andrew (00626/1/001); Robert Curtis (00636/1/001); Mr & Mrs M Rodgers (00700/1/001); Alasdair Cant (00699/1/001); Rebecca Livingstone (00686/1/001); Vivien Stewart (00802/1/001): Delete the site (assumed).

James Murray (00613/1/001); Lysa Wallace (00919/1/001): Reduce the number of units and provide them with allocated parking within the site.

H3: Gannochy Road

The Gannochy Trust (10152/1/001): Extend the site to 5 hectares to accommodate 50 affordable houses and community facilities.

Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council (00667/3/001); George Beaton (00742/6/001); Deirdre A Beaton (00741/6/001); Annelie Carmichael (00731/2/001): That the proposed Bridgend embargo (Page 76) is extended to include this site. That any development includes the provision of facilities which can be used to develop social capital for the whole Ward 12 area. A new road be developed running south from the A94 (between Gannochy and Scone) to provide access to this site, the Murray Royal Hospital 'surplus assets' area and Muirhall Road.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/31/001): A flood risk assessment should be a Specific Developer Requirement used to inform the scale layout and form of the development. No built development should take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.

Op7: Newton Farm

Episo Boxes LP (09035/6/001): Text changed to read '*subject to a retail impact assessment and a sequential assessment in relation to any floorspace which proposed the sale of comparison goods*'.

Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (00844/1/012): Uses to be residential or convenience retailing. The following to be added to Developer Requirements;

- *'This opportunity will support the significant housing proposed for the north and west of Perth, as and when that housing is built out.*
- *A restriction will be imposed on the amount of comparison goods floor space allowed within the food store and on the ability to create mezzanine floors.'*

Manse LLP (00850/1/009): Opportunity site OP7 should be amended to refer to retail on the Newton Farm part of the site and the reference to the need to '*reveal capacity*' should be deleted.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/45/001): A flood risk assessment should be a Specific Developer Requirement used to inform the scale layout and form of the development. No built development should take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk. A feasibility study should be undertaken to assess the potential for channel restoration by removal of the culvert at the Newton Burn and this is a recommended Site Specific Developer Requirement.

Op8: Friarton Road

Chris Irvine (00426/1/001): Add a Developer Requirement that any proposed use must be compatible with surrounding uses.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/46/001 & 00947/1/022): Add the following to the Specific Developer Requirements list as per the SEA. '*A flood risk assessment should be included. In addition, we recommend that the requirement specifies that no built development should take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.*'

Op2: Thimblerow Car Park

Alastair Grant (00140/1/001); James Strang (00181/1/001); S Howie (07693/6/001): The car park should not be developed; delete the site.

H W Webb (00301/1/001): Detailed plans for the site development should be no more than one storey.

Joan McEwen (09098/2/006): The site should continue to be used as a significant parking site.

Persephone Beer (07744/1/007): Design should include through routes for pedestrians and cyclists including links to the Lade Path.

Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (00844/1/011): The site description should be amended to explain that the site is capable of helping remedy the need for new and larger floor space in the city centre.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/44/001): '*A flood risk assessment*' should be included as a Site Specific Developer Requirement. In addition, we recommend that the requirement specifies that '*no built development should take place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.*'

Op9: Bus Station Leonard Street

James Taylor (00145/1/001); Louise Gauld (00425/1/001): Delete proposals for housing and redevelop bus station as a bus station.

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.

H4: Marshalling Yards, Tulloch

Mr & Mrs Purves (00152/1/001); Janie Scott (00112/1/001); DB Schenker (09164/1/001); Kinnoull Properties Ltd (08669/1/001); Lynne Palmer (00239/7/001): It is accepted that the main use of the site will be for residential purposes though it may have some potential for some employment uses. The location in the Plan is confusing and the site would be better placed to lie with the other residential sites rather than be located under the heading mixed use sites. The site will make a useful contribution to the effective housing supply in the early years of the Plan. Allen Terrace which lies to the north and east of the site is a cul-de sac and it is not envisaged that it will provide an access to the site and consequently it will not become a through route or rat run.

The two primary schools within easy reach of this site (Tulloch and Goodlyburn) mean the details of education provision to accommodate future residents of the site have to be finalised and will be developed in association with the masterplan. Developer contributions will be required in association with the masterplan and in line with Council policy (more detail can be found in the schedule 4 No 4 on infrastructure contributions). The full impact of the Developer Requirements or the economic viability of the site can only be appraised at the masterplan or planning application stage when a detailed developer appraisal has been completed.

The site could be used for temporary uses such as bee keeping or wild flowers but these are matters for the owners and prospective apiarists rather than an LDP issue.

The footbridge (white bridge) over the Inverness railway is part of an important pedestrian link which provides a connection to the main Dunkeld Road/ASDA commercial centre and leads along the Lade to the city centre and also the two secondary schools which serve the area. The bridge will be used by residents of the site and it seems reasonable that the development assist with the improvement of this link.

The proposed extension of the site by Kinnoull Properties Ltd (S4_Doc_368) has some merits as it will better integrate this site with the adjoining communities. At this stage however it is not known if this is an effective site, in particular the viability of ground conditions and reaching agreement to relocate the football club require further investigation. The site is not considered an appropriate location for retailing other than to serve local neighbourhood need as it could attract an unacceptable level of traffic in to the area.

The area is owned by the Council and Kinnoull Juniors would have to be receptive to any relocation; again this could be part of the masterplan preparations. The masterplan needs to deal with issues in more detail than a conceptual plan and seems at odds with the concerns expressed relating to viability. The issues raised by the Representations can be dealt with through the masterplan and placemaking processes.

Due to the uncertainty over the effectiveness of the proposed site extension it is not considered appropriate to identify a larger site.

If the Reporter is minded to consider this extension the Council would not be opposed to the Developer Requirement for the masterplan to explore the potential of an extended site. There would also be a requirement if it was proposed to redevelop the football ground to ensure that equal or improved facilities are made available.

MU1: Broxden Glasgow Road

Hansteen Property Investments Ltd (00370/2/001); John Dewar Lamberkin Trust & Needhill LLP (09084/1/003): It is accepted that with the current consent on the eastern portion of the site and in the current application for the western section, the development of a single masterplan may not be appropriate. However as all three portions of the site share common issues particularly the masterplanning of the biodiversity strip along the north boundary of the site, flood risk attenuation and access difficulties, it is important that, if separate masterplans are produced, they are integrated. The general arrangement suggested in the Representations are accepted but these can be further refined by the masterplan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Scotland's Gardens Trust (08816/1/001): The site is shown as having some potential for housing but with a large requirement for landscaping, open space and biodiversity. The details will require to be finalised through the masterplan for the site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Dr & Mrs Andrew Stirrat (00620/1/001): The site has been identified for development for around 20 years and is shown in the adopted plan for business uses (Perth Area Local Plan (S4_Doc_652)). The developed site will have a significant element of landscaping

but it is not realistic to insist that Cherrybank Gardens are regenerated. The Gardens were privately owned and part of what was then the headquarters for Bell's Whiskey. The Gardens housed the national heather collection which has been taken over by the Council and relocated to its site at Rodney Park. The bid for Scotland's Garden failed and the site will not be used for this purpose. The masterplan will deal with issues of phasing.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

E1: The Triangle Dunkeld Road

Persephone Beer (07744/1/005): The site uses the flood defence bank and associated path as its northern boundary. The access issues raised are matters of detail to be dealt with by subsequent planning applications and any development will have to comply with the terms of policy TA1B of the Plan. The Inveralmond roundabout is part of the trunk road network and improvements should be achieved through the Perth Transport Futures package (Core_Doc_021) of transport measures being promoted by the Council rather than through the development of the site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/23/001): There are no objections to a flood risk assessment being a Specific Developer Requirement.

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the Representation is accepted and the Plan modified, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications for the site or other policies within the Plan.

Errol Park Estate (09060/1/003): The site was identified for business development in the Adopted Perth Area Local Plan (Core_Doc_003) and will provide a useful 6.8ha of immediately available employment land; the suggested alternative is outside the core area and does not comply with the strategy set out in TAYplan (Core_Doc_099). (Cross reference with schedule 4 number 26b on Drums of Ardgath).

No modification is proposed to the Plan

E2: Broxden

John Dewar Lamberkin Trust & Needhill LLP (09084/1/004): It is accepted that the site boundary could be extended as it is in the same ownership or it could become part of site MU1 which is at the time of writing the subject of a planning application 12/01692/IPM (S4_Doc_651).

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the Representation is accepted and the Plan modified, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications for the site or other policies within the Plan.

E3: Arran Road

Louise Crawford (00087/1/001): The site closest to Gilsay Place was identified in the adopted Perth Area Local Plan (S4_Doc_652) for business uses with criteria (b) of policy 48 indicating that business uses should contain a high proportion of landscaping. Planning permissions have been granted for development on the south side of Kilda Road which require a landscaped strip to be provided on the south side of the development (S4_Doc_653). The Council own the largest part of the remaining area which at the time of writing is the subject of a planning application (S4_Doc_655). The southern edge of the proposal is the subject of a landscaping scheme. Development of

the area will therefore improve the view from Gilsay Place and a specific landscaping policy is not required as the issues will be covered by placemaking policies set out in the plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Persephone Beer (07744/1/006): The site identified uses the flood defence bank as its eastern and northern boundary. The access issues raised are matters of detail to be dealt with by subsequent planning applications and any development will have to comply with the terms of policy TA1B of the Plan. The routes are not included within the site boundary and will not be affected by the development.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/24/001): Flood risk assessment work has been carried out for the planning application however there are no objections to this being a Specific Developer Requirement.

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the Representation is accepted and the Plan modified, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications for the site or other policies within the Plan.

Errol Park Estate (09060/1/004): The site will provide a supply of much needed employment land which will be available in the short/medium term. The site is located within Perth City and one of the essential components of the LDP and TAYplan strategy (S4_Doc_067) is to direct development to Perth and the Perth core. The suggested alternative does not meet the terms of the strategy.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

H2: St John's School Stormont Street

M Mailer (00489/1/001); Lucy Stott (00610/1/001); James Murray (00613/1/001); Jane Andrew (00626/1/001); Robert Curtis (00636/1/001); Mr & Mrs M Rodgers (00700/1/001); Alasdair Cant (00699/1/001); Rebecca Livingston (00686/1/001); Vivian Stewart (00802/1/001); Lysa Wallace (00919/1/001): St Johns School is a two and three storey brick built building dating from the 1950's, it has ceased to be used as a school and has been declared surplus to the Council's requirements. Its location is close to the centre of The City and it is surrounded by residential property which makes it an ideal location for residential development. While the building may have some potential for conversion any development would have to reflect the conservation area location and the place making policies set out in the Plan. While the suggested 50 houses set on a site measuring 0.3 hectares represents a high density it is not out of keeping with the character of the area. The site is in a sustainable location for development and it is appropriate to maximise the potential that this site will have. It will be a particularly useful location for Affordable Housing. There are various parking opportunities nearby in the city centre; however this issue and other details such as privacy, are best dealt through the planning application process. Any local issue with drainage will be improved by the development and would be a matter for Scottish Water.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

H3: Gannochy Road

The Gannochy Trust (10152/1/001); Gannochy & Kinnoull Community Council

(00667/3/001); George Beaton (00742/6/001); Deirdre A Beaton (00741/6/001); Annelie Carmichael (00731/2/001): The issues of extending the site and the associated adjustments to the Green Belt are dealt with under Schedule 4 number 22 Perth Area Green Belt. The Council is comfortable with the principle of extending the site as outlined in the representation (map H3 suggested changes S4_Doc_478), and considers it will allow the development of additional Affordable Housing which will make a useful contribution to the effective supply available in the short to medium term.

The extended site will be able to accommodate the 50 units suggested. However the site should be identified specifically for affordable housing. The provision of community facilities is also welcomed. The Plan recognises the issues in relation to congestion at Bridgend and proposes measures to provide solutions to the problem. These are detailed in paragraph 5.1.17(1) (S4_Doc_514) of the Plan; however the proposed embargoes are not intended to apply to sites within Perth where the provision of immediately available housing land is seen as more important. The road network in the area is capable of accommodating further development. which will have to comply with policy TA1B of the Plan

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the Gannochy Trust representations are accepted and the Plan modified to include an expanded site, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications on the wider Green Belt or other policies within the LDP.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/31/001): The requirement for a flood risk assessment is accepted.

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the requirement for a flood risk assessment is added to the Developer Requirements, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications for the site or other policies within the Plan.

Op7: Newton Farm

Episo Boxes LP (09035/6/001); Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (00844/1/012); Manse LLP (00850/1/009); Reference to Schedule 4 Number 7 (Retail and Commercial Development) is highlighted for further information on this issue. The 2011 retail study revealed that there was no additional capacity for retailing in The City (retail study (Core_Doc_045)). The Council has also agreed that permission should be granted for a superstore and filling station on the site of the former Auction Mart on the opposite side of the by-pass (Core_Doc_105). On this basis there is now less likelihood that this site will be required for retail use during the lifetime of the Plan however, if a requirement emerged, this site, being adjacent to a commercial centre, would be an appropriate location.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/45/001): The requirement for a flood risk assessment is accepted. The issues of the investigation of culvert removal is covered by policy EP3D

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the requirement for a flood risk assessment is added to the Developer Requirements, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications for the site or other policies within the Plan.

Op 8: Friarton Road

Chris Irvine (00426/1/001): It is accepted that the sites adjoining Op8 are used for specialist industrial processes, that there are types of employment uses that would make incompatible neighbours and that there should be some protection given to the existing uses to allow them to continue to operate successfully. However, development would be guided to site Op8 using the principles set out in Policy ED1A (S4_Doc_483) (employment uses) the second sentence of which indicates that '*any proposed development must be compatible with surrounding land uses.*'

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/46/001 & 00947/1/022): The Council has no knowledge of the site being affected by flooding.

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the requirement for a flood risk assessment is added to the Developer Requirements, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications for the site or other policies within the Plan.

Op 2: Thimblerow Car Park

Alastair Grant (00140/1/001); James Strang (00181/1/001); H W Webb (00301/1/001); Joan McEwen (09098/2/006); S Howie (07693/6/001); Persephone Beer (07744/1/007); Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (00844/1/011); The site is a large (0.8ha) edge of city centre ground level car park which was formerly an area of poor quality housing demolished in the 1960's. The site is owned by the Council and has been identified for development purposes for around 20 years. The site is identified as site O19 in the Adopted Perth Central Area Local Plan of 1997 (S4_Doc_654) and identified for a multi storey car park with mixed uses on the ground floors.

It is accepted that the car park is important to maintain the vitality and viability of the city centre and an element of car parking will need to be provided in any redevelopment proposals. However the site has potential to be developed for additional beneficial uses including retail and residential during the life of the Plan.

The site is surrounded by 3, 4 and 5 storey high buildings and the area could accommodate a multi storey development while respecting the character of the conservation area. The placemaking and design policies set out in the Plan will be important in guiding appropriate development in this area. The site is a good sustainable location for residential development and will be particularly suitable for Affordable Housing. The Old High Street part of the site will be particularly suitable for retail development as this will complete a link between the city centre and St Catherine's retail park. The detail will be dealt with through subsequent planning applications for the development of the site.

The site has only become available for development relatively recently having previously been on a long lease to National Car Parks.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/44/001): The requirements for a flood risk assessment are accepted.

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the requirement for a flood risk assessment is added to the Developer Requirements, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications for the site or other policies within the LDP.

OP 9: Bus Station Leonard Street

James Taylor (00145/1/001); Louise Gauld (00425/1/001): The wording contained in the Plan is framed to allow the bus station to be improved although housing is a suitable use if an alternative bus station is developed. Currently the Council is considering the future of the bus station and proposals will be advanced in association with the Regional Transport Partnership Tactran who have identified Perth Bus Station as a regionally important strategic interchange.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Reporter's conclusions:

H4: Marshalling Yards, Tulloch

1. When the council resolved to include this site in the Proposed Plan, it clearly intended this to be a residential site rather than one which would deliver a mix of uses. This is confirmed in the "H" (rather than "MU") designation and by the absence of any reference to non residential uses in the text of the plan. Its inclusion under the "Mixed Use Sites" heading rather than under "Residential Sites" appears either to have been a drafting error or to be a reflection of superseded proposals for the site. For the sake of clarity, the text relating to this site should be relocated adjacent to that for site H3.
2. This is an area of residential character, where the nearest employment uses, although quite close, are separated from the site by the railway, which clearly delineates the boundary between employment and residential areas. While some forms of employment use are compatible with a residential area, this is not a reason to modify the proposed housing designation when the site owner's intention is clearly to pursue a residential scheme.
3. Being outwith a town, neighbourhood or commercial centre, this is not a location where retail development would normally be appropriate and in the absence of convincing evidence of a need for local shopping provision at this location, it would be inappropriate to modify the plan to offer support for such development.
4. Extending the proposed site to include the open space to the south west might improve its integration into the surrounding area. However, there is too much uncertainty at this time over the acceptability of losing the open space and sports facilities for the Proposed Plan to be modified in this way. This would not of course prevent the council considering the matter again at some point in the future.
5. It is possible that more than 300 units could be accommodated on this site, but until issues such as flood risk, access routing and structural landscaping requirements are finalised it would be inappropriate to assume that this would be the case. The purpose of the figure quoted in the Proposed Plan is not to impose an upper limit on the site's development potential but to provide a realistic estimate of its output. The potential for a greater level of development could be considered at the development management stage.

6. Potential ground contamination from past uses and the need to relocate some rail infrastructure may have implications for the economics of developing the site. However, taking these into account, it is concluded that the site-specific developer requirements that are listed in the Proposed Plan are not, at face value, unreasonable. The need for a contribution towards education facilities and towards improvements to the very well used White Bridge are likely to be particularly important, and it is appropriate for the Proposed Plan to make this clear. Ultimately, these are matters for the developer to negotiate with the planning authority at the planning application stage, taking into account the economic factors that exist at that time.

7. Local residents' concerns over how the site will be accessed are understandable. However there is no reason to suspect that accessing this site will prove difficult or that any future development would have to rely upon unsuitable access routes. This is a matter that can be addressed through the development management process and there is no need for the Proposed Plan to specify at this stage any particular potential access routes to avoid.

8. The site could accommodate some temporary uses prior to being developed but this is not a matter for the Proposed Plan.

MU1: Broxden, Glasgow Road

9. Planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of some of the land at Pitheavlis, to the south east of the proposed MU1 allocation. Indicative plans suggested that this part of the site would be used for employment uses with the land to the north west (within the current MU1 boundary) used for residential including a care facility. However, the mixed use planning permission did not restrict the arrangement of uses in this way and the extant mixed use planning permission does not therefore necessarily restrict the land at Pitheavlis to employment use. This land is indicated in the proposals map to be existing employment land, which reflects its current use but not the extant planning permission. The boundary of the MU1 allocation should therefore be enlarged to include this additional land, although the remainder of the land at Pitheavlis should retain its existing employment designation.

10. In order for the site to be effective it might be necessary to increase the amount of residential development and reduce the employment land element. However, this is a matter to be resolved at the masterplan stage and there is insufficient evidence at this stage to justify modifying how the different use types for site MU1 are identified in the proposals map and in the text on page 79 of the Plan.

11. Multiple ownership of the site can make it more difficult to develop a single masterplan. However, it is essential that development across the entire MU1 site is coordinated so that uses are appropriately and equitably distributed and a coordinated approach is taken to landscaping, roads and other infrastructure. Even if the site were split to reflect the different ownerships, with a separate masterplan for each, it would remain essential to achieve a coordinated approach across the entire MU1 area. There would be no practical benefit therefore in subdividing site MU1.

12. The proposed rewording of Policy ED1b, which would remove the presumption against predominantly one use on a mixed use site is considered under Issue 5.

13. The masterplan will define the areas of landscaping across the site but it remains helpful for the proposals map to show, on an indicative basis, where this is likely to be

required and how extensive it should be. The masterplan process will ensure that the impact of developing this site upon local residents is adequately mitigated. No modification to the Proposed Plan is required.

14. The fact that development land in the locality has failed to attract a developer is likely to reflect the current recession and is not a reason not to allocate land for the future which is capable of meeting Perth's needs once the economy recovers.

E1: The Triangle, Dunkeld Road

15. This site would form a logical extension to the adjacent employment area. It has flooded in the past but the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) does not object to its development provided that the developable area is defined by a flood risk assessment. Subject to such an assessment being added as a site-specific developer requirements, this is a logical location for employment uses.

16. Accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians might be improved by changes to the Inveralmond roundabout. However, this would not be a necessary or reasonable developer requirement for this site, which is already relatively accessible by non-car transport modes.

E2: Broxden

17. It would be appropriate to extend this site to include the location of the former Broxden farmhouse as there is no more suitable alternative use for this land and its incorporation within site E2 would logically complete this employment land proposal.

E3: Arran Road

18. As with proposed site E1 on the opposite side of the railway, this site would logically round-off of the existing employment area. As SEPA has not objected to its development, despite the history of flooding, there are no grounds to regard it as an illogical employment location, provided that the developer is required to undertake a flood risk assessment in order to define the developable area.

19. Developing this site with any form of built development is likely to detract to some extent from the open views that are presently enjoyed by residents to the south. However, it will be possible to minimise the extent of any harm when specific proposals for the site are drawn up, through the careful placement of buildings, landscaped areas and yards. And bearing in mind the need for accessibly located employment land such as this, any minor residual adverse impact would be justified by the wider social and economic benefits.

20. For the same reason as is set out above in relation to site E1, it would not be appropriate to require the developer of this site to fund improved pedestrian / cyclist facilities at Inveralmond roundabout.

H2: St John's School, Stormont Street

21. Being situated within an established residential area which is close to the city centre and other centres of employment, this is a logical site on which to develop a high density residential scheme. It is likely that at least part of the building would require to be three stories high if the estimated 50 flats are to be delivered. However, this would be in

keeping with the local townscape and need not affect daylight to any existing property. At the planning application stage the authority will have the opportunity to control such issues, along with the level of on-site car parking so that there is no adverse impact on the area. There is no evidence that existing infrastructure will not be able to accommodate the development or that it would materially detract from local air quality. There would inevitably be some disruption from building work but this is not a reason not to allocate such a logical site for development.

H3: Gannochy Road

22. The proposed enlargement of this site to five hectares, which would allow it to accommodate 50 affordable houses and a community hub, is supported by the council, subject to all of the residential accommodation being affordable housing. As a 100% affordable development accords with the site owner's stated intentions and given the need for affordable housing sites, this is a reasonable stipulation which should be set out in the site-specific developer requirements. For a similar reason, the community council's request to provide community facilities should also be specified as a matter to be investigated in the site-specific developer requirements. And the requirement for a flood risk assessment should also be set out in this way to ensure that development avoids areas of the site that are at risk of flooding.

23. It is undeniable that developing this site will add to traffic levels at Bridgend, which are already a source of congestion and air quality concern. Issue 24 considers the development embargo that the authority is proposing along the A93 and A94 corridors until the Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR) is a committed project. However, as drafted, this embargo does not apply to sites such as this, which are within the city boundary. Bearing in mind the identified need for affordable housing and the lack of certainty as to when the CTLR will be delivered, any harm in terms of traffic and air pollution, which would be likely to result from developing this relatively modest affordable housing site prior to the CTLR becoming a committed project is more than offset by the benefits it would bring. It would be inappropriate therefore to delay the development of this site until the CTLR is a committed project.

24. Turning to the concerns that have been raised about more localised impacts of developing this site, there is no convincing evidence that local infrastructure including the local roads network could not support more housing.

Op7: Newton Farm

25. There is no evidence of a quantitative need for additional convenience retail floorspace in Perth. The most up to date evidence on this issue, in the 2011 retail study, revealed that, even taking into account the significant population growth projections, there is significant over-provision for convenience retailing in Perth in the period up to 2021. And subsequent to those findings, planning permission has been granted for a superstore development on Crieff Road and a smaller foodstore at the Highland Gateway. Minimal capacity was identified for bulky goods retailing and, although capacity for other forms of comparison retailing was identified, this was considered to be most appropriately directed to vacant town centre sites, in accordance with SPP. There is no evidence of a qualitative deficiency in either comparison or convenience retailing.

26. In the light of these findings, the allocation of this site for retail use or, as one representor has requested, its inclusion within an extended Crieff Road commercial centre, would be inappropriate. The authority has recognised the lack of capacity in its

requirement that capacity be demonstrated before the site can be considered suitable for retail development. However, as set out below, such an approach would not accord with either SPP or TAYplan.

27. SPP requires that town centres are the focus for retailing and a range of other activities, and requires a sequential approach to site selection in which opportunities to develop either within or on the edge of town centres must be considered and discounted before development in commercial centres or in out of centre locations can be considered. The effect of potentially permitting retail development in this location, which is not within a defined centre, would be to circumvent the sequential approach to site selection as it would permit development solely on the basis of there being demonstrated capacity, without considering whether that need could be satisfied by developing a sequentially preferable site.

28. Talking all factors into account, it is concluded to be inappropriate to indicate support for retail development of site Op7. The plan should be modified so that the site becomes a housing allocation, this being the other potential use for the site that is set out in the Proposed Plan. The site should be identified as H71, with an estimated output of 100 units, which is the scale indication considered in the Main Issues Report.

29. The site-specific developer requirements for this site should reflect the need for a flood risk assessment and should require the developer to investigate the potential to restore to its natural state the culverted section of the Newton Burn, which flows through the middle of the site.

Op8: Friarton Road

30. As Policy ED1A already requires all proposals in employment areas to be compatible with surrounding land uses there is no need to add this as a site-specific developer requirement. A requirement to undertake a flood risk assessment as requested by SEPA should however be added.

Op2: Thimbleterow Car Park

31. Redeveloping this well used public car park raises inevitable concerns over levels of parking provision in the town centre and the consequent effect on its attractiveness to shoppers. There is no evidence to suggest that the site would be incapable of incorporating an element of public parking in any redevelopment scheme and it would be appropriate, in addition to identifying car parking as a suitable use, to require this to be incorporated into any redevelopment scheme.

32. The existing expanse of open car parking already detracts from the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area and there is no reason why an appropriately designed redevelopment scheme would worsen this situation. Indeed, it is likely that there could be significant townscape benefits, although a single-storey development, which has been requested in representations, would be out of keeping with its surroundings and would be likely to detract from the setting of nearby listed buildings. A development which followed the scale indications that are given in the site-specific developer requirements is unlikely to preserve all existing views of Kinnoul Hill but should not otherwise impact adversely on the living conditions of existing residents. And such a scale of development would be appropriate in townscape terms for this part of the conservation area. This is a town centre location where expectations of residential amenity must inevitably be different to those in a suburban location and, bearing this in

mind, retail use should have no objectionable effect on neighbouring residents.

33. As this site is within the defined centre, there would be no justification for resisting retail development on grounds that it might compete with existing town centre sites. The purpose of the planning system, as confirmed in SPP, is to direct retail development wherever possible to town centre sites and not to favour one town centre site over others. As a new build opportunity, the site could create larger retail floorplates for comparison shopping, which is an identified requirement for Perth in the 2011 retail study.

34. Given the history of local flooding, the site-specific developer requirements for this site should reflect the need for a flood risk assessment but there is nothing in the site's location or existing characteristics to justify a site specific need for improved facilities and routes for pedestrians.

Op9: Bus Station Leonard Street

35. The bus station is an important and well located facility but the site would be suitable for residential redevelopment if a suitable location for a new bus station were found. No modification to the Proposed Plan is required.

Reporter's recommendations:

H4: Marshalling Yards, Tulloch

1. Relocate the reference to site H4 on page 78 to page 80 so that it follows the reference to site H3 under the heading "Residential Sites".

MU1 Broxden

2. Modify the boundary of the MU1 allocation so that it includes that part of the land at Pitheavlis which is included within the boundary of planning application 11/00933/FLM.

E1: The Triangle, Dunkeld Road

3. Add to the list of site specific developer requirements the following text:

"Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site."

E2: Broxden

4. Extend the site boundary to include the location of the former Broxden farmhouse.

E3: Arran Road

5. Add to the list of site-specific developer requirements the following text:

"Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site."

H3: Gannochy Road

6. Modify the site boundary in the proposals map to reflect the extended boundary set out in the plan at Schedule 4 document 478.

7. Modify the reference to the site on page 80 to indicate an output of 50 units and make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11.

8. Add the following site-specific developer requirements:

“All units to be affordable housing.”

“Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site.”

“Investigate the potential for providing on-site community facilities.”

Op7: Newton Farm

9. Reallocate the site for housing. Modify the reference to the site on page 80 to replace the Op7 designation with H71 and indicate an output of 100 units. Modify the first of the site specific developer requirements to read as follows:

“A masterplan will be required for the comprehensive development of the site setting out the phased release of the housing areas and incorporating the restoration of the culverted section of the Newton Burn to its natural state where this is practicable. The masterplan should be informed by a flood risk assessment, which will identify which areas of the site are suitable for development.”

10. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11.

Op8: Friarton Road

11. Add to the list of site specific developer requirements the following text:

“Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site.”

Op2: Thimblerow Car Park

12. Add to the list of site specific developer requirements the following text:

“Flood Risk Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site and which ensures that no built development takes place on the functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.”

And

“Scheme to incorporate an element of public car parking.”