Issue 25d	Perth Area (within Core) West Settlements	
Development plan reference:	5.5 – Almondbank, Pitcairngreen and Cromwell Park, page 87-88 E5 - West Cromwell Park, page 87 E6 - Cromwell Park, page 87 5.30 – Methven, page 136-137	Reporter: David Buylla

# Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):

Heather Brand (00275) Thomas Huxley (00322) J P Fullerton (00364) Scottish Government (00778) Peter Hutchinson (00864) J Halley (07693) Joanne Murdoch (08938) Dach Planning (09078) Scone Palace & Estate (09163)	A & J Stephen Ltd/David Smythe (09094/3) David Smythe (09094/6) Philip Sloan (09128) Scone Palace & Estate (09163) Methven & District Community Council (09221) G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817) Alistair Godfrey (09941)
--	--

Provision of the
development plan
to which the issue
relates:

Designated and new sites within Almondbank, Pitcairngreen,

Cromwell Park and Methven.

# Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):

#### Almondbank Settlement

Heather Brand (00275/1/001): Support for the Plan.

Joanne Murdoch (08938/1/001): Support for the Plan (village boundary at Scroggiehill).

# E5: West Cromwell Park

Thomas Huxley (00322/1/002): The road network, particularly through Pitcairngreen, is not suitable for the heavy traffic which is generated by the industrial development on the old admiralty sites.

J P Fullerton (00364/1/001): The road is unsuitable to handle industrial traffic and is particularly hazardous in winter weather. There is no electrical or water supply. The site is used frequently by walkers and ramblers and is a valuable community asset.

Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/010): The importance of biodiversity and woodland habitats in these areas is not recognised.

Scottish Government (00778/1/001): As well as supporting use of the site for employment purposes they also indicate that the site has potential for some residential use. The access road is owned by the Scottish Ministers and could be considered for Council adoption at some point in the future.

# E6: Cromwell Park

Thomas Huxley (00322/1/001): The road network, particularly through Pitcairngreen, is not suitable for the heavy traffic which is generated by the industrial development on the old admiralty sites.

Dach Planning (09078/2/001): The site has potential for renewable energy development such as a biomass plant to produce energy for surrounding residential properties. The site benefits from being self-contained with clearly defined boundaries which will provide a clear backdrop to any development. The respondent makes reference to the following Scottish Government documents in support of their representation: the Renewables Action Plan (June 2009) (Core\_Doc\_135), and the Draft Electricity Generation policy statement 2012 (Core\_Doc\_136).

Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/011): The importance of biodiversity and woodland habitats in these areas is not recognised.

Peter Hutchinson (00864/1/001): The changes are requested to respect the quality of the environment and provide adequate safeguards for:

- Public access (compatibility with Policy CF2) (S4\_Doc\_485).
- Community use (compatibility with Policy CF3) (S4 Doc 486).
- Public safety (compatibility with Policy ED1) (S4\_Doc\_483).
- Adjacent amenity value (compatibility with Policy ED3) (S4\_Doc\_395).
- Light Pollution (compatibility with Policy EP5) (S4 Doc 487).
- Noise Pollution (compatibility with Policy EP8) (S4\_Doc\_488).
- Green Infrastructure (compatibility with Policy NE4) (S4\_Doc\_415).
- Place making (compatibility with Policy PM1) (S4\_Doc\_369).

# Almondbank new site

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/8/001): The site (S4\_Doc\_530) is a logical infill within the village envelope in an area of predominately residential character.

### Pitcairngreen new site

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/019): The existing south east boundary of Pitcairngreen could be improved by being developed (S4\_Doc\_004). The existing farm buildings are no longer used and these listed buildings together with new development could create an attractive edge to the village. Though a small watercourse runs through the site it does not pose any flooding threat. The site has good access to local facilities. The village (and Green Belt) boundary (S4\_Doc\_004) would have to be adjusted accordingly.

## Methven settlement support

Methven & District Community Council (09221/1/027): Support for the Plan.

### Methven new sites

Philip Sloan (09128/5/001): Additional housing allocations are required in Methven to assist in the delivery of the strategy for delivery of housing land set out in TAYplan (Core\_Doc\_099). A 3 hectare site to the north of Methven should be identified for 60 units (S4\_Doc\_007). The site is well related to infrastructure and has good landscape containment. Amenity woodland with public access could be provided.

A & J Stephen Ltd & David Smythe (09094/3/001): Methven is a principle settlement in the Perth Core outwith the Green Belt and this is at odds with the Plan's stated strategy of not allocating any further land for development in the village. A small site should be identified to the south of the village to increase variety and housing choice. The allocation of the site (S4\_Doc\_007) would create a focus for the village and improve off street parking close to retail facilities. The site would be limited to less than 0.5 hectares and not be affected by the embargo on development.

David Smythe (09094/6/001): Site (S4\_Doc\_007) is in the Perth Core and is a TAYplan (Core\_Doc\_099) principal settlement; it is strange that there are no land allocations. The identification of a site for mixed uses would provide an opportunity for effective housing and employment land. The site would be a gateway into the village from the west and provide a safe access road from the A85. There is strong support for the proposal from a recent public consultation exercise.

J Halley (07693/7/002): Methven has a good range of community and commercial facilities and it is one of the principal settlements located within the Perth Core Area. Significantly it is also located outwith the proposed Green Belt. The Plan refers to the fact that the existing site on the eastern side of the village is currently being developed and this seems to be the justification for there being no need to identify any additional sites.

We consider that there is an opportunity to identify a further site on the west side of the village (S4\_Doc\_007) which would help meet the overall housing requirement. We therefore object to the fact Methven is the only principal settlement listed within the Core Area where no housing site allocations are proposed.

Due to the topography of the proposed site, development could take place without any adverse impact on the village and without any wider visual impact as it would not be seen from the A85. Development of the site would offer the potential for road safety improvements at the south east corner of the site adjacent to College Road. The existing built up areas are already located along the south and eastern boundaries and development on this site would be read as forming part of the wider settlement at this point.

The site is free from constraint and can contribute to the overall housing land supply and should be brought forward as a suitable alternative in the Proposed Plan.

## Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

# E5:West Cromwell Park

Thomas Huxley (00322/1/002): The Plan should contain requirements to control the type of traffic generated by the development.

J P Fullerton (00364/1/001): Delete the site.

Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/010): Enhancement of biodiversity should be a Developer Requirement.

Scottish Government (00778/1/001): Identify the site for some residential use.

### E6:Cromwell Park

Thomas Huxley (00322/1/001): The Plan should contain requirements to control the type of traffic generated by the development.

Dach Planning (09078/2/001): Extend the site and identify as 'Cromwell Environmental Enterprise Park'.

Alistair Godfrey (09941/1/011): Enhancement of biodiversity should be a Developer Requirement.

Peter Hutchinson (00864/1/001): I would like the Plan changed to include adequate safeguards (Site Specific Developer Requirements) for:

Public access - to respect the well used public access routes that pass through the site to access the River Almond, and associated amenity woodland.

Community facilities - to respect the high amenity value of the site for the public (for informal recreation and associated health benefits).

Public safety - to recognise that the access road is narrow, with poor sight-lines and no pavement, and therefore development could increase the risk to public safety (both to residents and those using the core path network – the access road is regularly used by cyclists, walkers and horse riders).

Adjacent amenity value - to minimise the impact of development on the adjacent residential properties.

Light pollution - to prevent obtrusive and intrusive lighting on neighbouring properties.

Noise pollution - to prevent noise pollution on neighbouring properties.

Green Infrastructure - to recognise that the site is part of the local green infrastructure and it's 'open space' and surrounding woodland has a positive contribution to local biodiversity.

Place making - to encourage development that respects the character and amenity of the place.

# Almondbank new site

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/8/001): The site (S4\_Doc\_530) should be allocated for residential development.

### Pitcairngreen new site

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/019) The village and Green Belt boundary should be moved to the south and east and a site (S4 Doc 004) should be identified for housing.

# Methven new sites

Philip Sloan (09128/5/001): A site (S4\_Doc\_007) should be identified to the north of Methven for 60 houses with associated landscaping.

A & J Stephen Ltd & David Smythe (09094/3/001): A small scale residential development should be identified on the south side (S4\_Doc\_007) of the village and the text and Plan be amended accordingly.

David Smythe (09094/6/001): New mixed use site (S4\_Doc\_007) proposed for south west of the settlement.

J Halley (07693/7/002) The revised settlement boundary (S4\_Doc\_007) for Methven to incorporate the inclusion of the site to the north and east shown on the attached plan as a designated housing site.

# 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.

# E5 and E6: West Cromwell Park and Cromwell Park

Thomas Huxley(00322/1/001 & 00322/1/002); J P Fullerton (00364/1/001); Alastair Godfrey (09941/1/010 & 09941/1/011); Peter Hutchinson (00864/1/001); Scottish Government (00778/1/001): The sites are both former admiralty workshops which are served by access roads which do not meet current standards. However both sites are brownfield land capable of accommodating further development making a useful contribution to the supply of employment land available during the life of the Plan. Any development will have to comply with the policies contained in the Plan, particularly TA1B: New Development Proposals (S4\_Doc\_387) on transport standards and accessibility standards. The local roads network and THOSE through Pitcairngreen are public without any restrictions. A core path (S4\_Doc\_531) runs through the site E5 and will be protected in any development. The policy framework contained in the Plan protects biodiversity (Policy NE3) (S4\_Doc\_406). The location and lack of accessibility of the site E5 means that it is not felt suitable to be identified for housing and it would not comply with the guidance contained in SPP (paragraph 78 and 80) (S4 Doc 099) in relation to the location of housing land. In particular bringing the roads up to an adoptable standard for housing development is unlikely to be economically viable.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

# Cromwell Park: E6

Dach Planning (09078/2/001): In principle a biomass plant would be an acceptable use on the site and conform to the employment policy framework. However there are issues of scale, traffic and design which require consideration, but it is more appropriate that these are dealt with through the planning application process. The Specific Developer Requirements listed are part of the policy framework of the Plan and do not need to be repeated.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

# Almondbank New site

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/8/001): The site is shown as being within the village and residential development would comply with Policy RD1: Residential Areas (S4\_Doc\_405) on infill development, access and flooding are issues which require solutions and further investigation. The site is shown as lying within the 1:200 flood risk area on the Scottish Environment Protection Agency's Indicative Flood Risk Map (S4\_Doc\_530).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

# Pitcairngreen New Site

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/019): Reference to the Schedule 4 no. 22 (Perth Green Belt) is highlighted for further information on this issue.

The Council accept that the representation has some merit. It is accepted that the village and Green Belt boundaries which follow some poorly defined property boundaries around this part of Pitcairngreen are not particularly robust. The proposed development

(S4\_Doc\_004) could create a better defined and more robust Green Belt and village boundary. However the site can only accommodate a limited number of houses (6) and will only make a very limited contribution to the effective housing land supply; the site should, therefore, not be formally identified as a housing site. A watercourse runs through the middle of the site and does not feature on Scottish Environment Protection Agency's indicative flood risk maps but any development in the area would require to undertake a flood risk assessment. Design would have to reflect the site's edge of conservation area location and adjacent B listed Inn, but the area is not critical to the overall integrity or objectives of the Green Belt. Sensitive development of the site would produce a more robust Green Belt and village boundary in line with the Green Belt Policy objectives (NE5) (S4\_Doc\_404) and the principles set out in SPP; the details could then be determined through a subsequent planning application for infill development (SPP paragraph 162) (S4\_Doc\_075).

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the Representation is accepted and the Plan modified to alter the Green Belt and village boundary 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.

## Methven New Sites

Philip Sloan (09128/5/001): The site lies significantly above the 95m contour (S4\_Doc\_007) in a exposed position and its development would adversely affect the setting of the village. The rest of the village does not extend above this height. The area was not considered suitable for expansion in the Perth Landscape Capacity study (Core\_Doc\_162). The proposed access to the site is restricted being a field access between two houses. The development will not be able to meet the design standards set out in SPP (paragraph 78) (S4\_Doc\_099) for new development in relation to settlements particularly in relation to the landscape setting of the village.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

A & J Stephen Ltd & David Smythe (09094/3/001): The site is a small field with direct access onto Main Street and is considered to be an appropriate location for this type of development. The design and layout as submitted is acceptable in principle and could form the basis for the development of the site. The site is not prime agricultural land and could provide an immediately available, effective housing site.

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

David Smythe (09094/6/001): The Plan identifies the existing site on the east side of the village which is within the village boundary, and this site represents the main source of expansion during the life of the Plan. Methven was not identified for further expansion in the MIR because of this. The site suggested would provide a similar sized area for expansion on the west side of the village with the added advantage that it would provide an opportunity to create a new access from the A85 which would serve the site and the existing white land within the village boundary. This site may have long term development potential and should be considered again during the next review of the Plan. The market would not support two similar sized sites in Methven.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

J Halley (07693/7/002): The site lies on sloping ground which sits above the 95m contour and significantly extends the village above the Harrietfield/College Road. The rest of the village does not generally extend above this height. The area was not considered suitable for expansion in the Perth Landscape Capacity study (Core Doc 162). The site is prime agricultural land which should not be developed unless part of a settlement strategy (SPP paragraph 97 (S4\_Doc\_108)). The north and east boundaries of the site are poorly defined and developing the area would create a very ragged settlement edge which would be particularly prominent when approaching from the north and east along College/Harrietfield Road as the lower slopes down to the A85 would not be developed. College Road slopes up steeply from the village and a difficult right angled bend exists on the south east corner of the site. It is difficult to see how the junction could be improved without significant roadworks and realignment. In any event the Council does not have any knowledge of road traffic accidents on this stretch of road, As there is already a consented site on the east side of the village for 103 houses it is considered that no further housing development is required in the village during the life of the Plan. In addition the likely build rates mean that the addition of approximately 70 houses would not add to the effective housing land supply during the Plan period, and would place an unacceptable strain on the existing infrastructure in particular the primary school.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

# Reporter's conclusions:

# E5: West Cromwell Park and E6: Cromwell Park

- 1. The former Royal Navy workshops are an important source of local employment, which the Proposed Plan recognises by formally identifying them as existing employment sites. The proposed additions to these sites, in the form of proposed sites E5 and E6 are, in comparison with the size of the existing employment land, of very modest scale, amounting to two hectares in total. Although the allocation of additional employment land could be expected to increase traffic levels, including of large goods vehicles, on local roads, the likely increase over the existing situation would be insignificant. In the absence of any objection from the roads authority, it would be unreasonable to constrain the proposed modest expansion of these sites on traffic grounds.
- 2. No body with responsibility for nature conservation has raised concern over the potential biodiversity impact of the proposed allocations and there is no convincing evidence that the land in question has such habitat value that it should not be allocated for development.
- 3. There is no evidence that either site would be incapable of securing water or electricity supplies. Issues concerning the potential impact of employment development on a range of receptors are covered by a number of policies in the Proposed Plan, against which any proposal would be assessed. There is no need for the site-specific developer requirements to reiterate these.
- 4. Although there are a few houses in the locality, residential use would be inappropriate at site E5, as it is too remote from community facilities and, as demonstrated in Issues 20c and 20d, the Proposed Plan has already identified a generous supply of housing land.

# E6: Cromwell Park renewable energy potential

5. Designation of this site for employment purposes would offer support to the principle of a biomass plant. However, in the absence of details of the potential impacts of such a proposal it would be inappropriate for the plan to offer more specific support.

# Almondbank new site

6. The proposed site is situated within the settlement boundary as defined in the Proposed Plan. It would therefore be supported in principle for residential development regardless of whether it were identified as a housing allocation. Due to its proximity to the river, flood risk may present a significant development constraint. This factor and the modest size of the site mean there would be no benefit in allocating it for housing development.

# Pitcairngreen new site

7. The implications of modifying the green belt boundary at this location have been discussed under Issue 14. These former farm buildings might be suitable for conversion but this would not require the proposed new build addition to the village, which would harmfully encroach upon its countryside setting to the detriment of the character and appearance of the countryside and the openness and rural character of the green belt.

## Methven new sites

- 8. TAYplan expects the majority of development to be directed to principal settlements such as Methven. However, the Proposed Plan does not allocate any new development sites in this settlement. This would have been inconsistent with TAYplan had there been no other encouragement for the settlement population to expand in accordance with TAYplan's expectations. However, there is an existing site with permission for 103 houses, which the Proposed Plan includes within the settlement boundary. Therefore, even if the extant permission is not implemented, this will allow for a significant expansion of the settlement, in line with TAYplan expectations.
- 9. The new sites that are proposed to the north of Strathview Place and to the north of College Road would be unacceptably prominent on the hillside above the settlement and would incongruously extend it out into the surrounding farmland. Any benefits from providing amenity woodland with public access, which are proposed on the Strathview Place site would not overcome these concerns. As is discussed under Issues 20c and 20d, the supply of housing land, which the plan proposes to allocate, is considered to be sufficient to satisfy the housing demand within the plan period and beyond. There is therefore no need to consider unsuitable sites such as these in order to provide adequate effective housing land.
- 10. The relatively small site that is proposed to the south of Main Street would quite logically round off the settlement boundary at that point and would be unlikely to cause any harm to the character of the settlement or the surrounding countryside. However, the site was not considered in the Main Issues Report (MIR) and has not received any publicity or consideration in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). Therefore, it would not be appropriate to recommend that the plan be modified to incorporate this site, particularly when the Proposed Plan already identifies a generous supply of housing land.

# PERTH AND KINROSS PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

11. The large mixed-use site that is proposed at the western entrance to the settlement was also not considered in the MIR. It is notable that the Proposed Plan does not allocate any employment land within the settlement and this site could have addressed that issue. However, notwithstanding any community support that may have been expressed in response to informal consultation, the necessary statutory publicity and environmental considerations have not been undertaken. It would be inappropriate for it to be allocated without this. Again, the Proposed Plan's generous provision of housing and employment land means there is no pressing need to find additional land for development and the merits of this site should be considered in the next Local Development Plan.

Reporter's recommendations:	
No modifications.	