

Issue 26a		Perth Area (out with Core) North Settlements	
Development plan reference:		Bankfoot, page 92-93 Burrelton/Woodside, page 99-100 E8 - Whitelea Road, Burrelton/Woodside, page 99 H16 - School Road, Burrelton/Woodside, page 99 H17 - Church Road, Burrelton/Woodside, page 100 E9 – Dalcrue, page 104 Damside/Saucher, page 106-107 Guildtown, page 120-121 Wolfhill, page 149-150 H35 – Wolfhill, page 149	Reporter: David Buylla
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):			
Peter Howarth (00088) Thomas Huxley (00322) Chris Lamont (00397) Andrew Whamond (00419) Sandra Service (00427) William Service (00428) Wendy Sheed (00451) M Pearson (00473) Beryl Linford (00477) Susan Howarth (00506) Mr & Mrs Frank Holt (00508) Margaret Shaw (00530) Steven & Elizabeth Stuart (00585) Ima Rogers (00683) Janet Rougvie (00684) Janet Parley (00714) Mr & Mrs Ragsdell (00732) Jane Filshie (00821) Martin Laing (00865) Janice Withers (00874) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194)		Scottish Natural Heritage (05211) Mr & Mrs I Brooks (07693) Mr & Mrs John Alexander (07896) Mabel Sharp (07967) Mr & Mrs J S Milne (08022) Zurich Assurance Ltd (08816) Scone Palace and Estate (09163) The Church of Scotland General Trustees (09167) Jamie Sinclair (09289) Burrelton & District Community Council (09376) Lomond Land (09415) R T Hutton Planning Consultant (09539) Patricia Matte (09653) A & J Stephen Ltd/Stewart Milne Homes Ltd (09727) G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817) Frank Moisey (09950) Auchtergaven Community Council (10045) David Cox (10185) Rebecca Linford & Alec Campbell (10282)	
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:		Settlements outwith the Perth Core Area (north)	
Planning authority’s summary of the representation(s):			
<u>Bankfoot</u> Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/036): In the interests of good practice the Spatial Strategy Considerations section (paragraph 5.6, page 59) should reflect the outcome of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (S4_Doc_140).			

Auchtergaven Community Council (10045/1/002): Support for the Plan.

#### Bankfoot – New Sites

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/10/001): GS Brown have been working since 2005 to promote a significant housing site to the south of Bankfoot (S4\_Doc\_008). Agreement has been reached with SEPA over flooding issues and there are no significant infrastructure problems. The site would include significant landscape proposals and land would be made available to the Council to the south of Auchtergaven Primary School should that be required. A successful consultation exercise was held and the site was included in the Main Issues Report (Core\_Doc\_095).

The Church of Scotland General Trustees (09167/2/001): The Plan does not contain enough effective housing sites to meet the strategy set out in TAYplan (Core\_Doc\_099) and it is questionable if any of the identified long term sites can deliver any development during the Plan period. The site suggested (S4\_Doc\_008) is effectively meeting the tests set out in PAN2/2010 (Core\_Doc\_019) and will contribute to the effective land supply. The site is an appropriate location for housing development.

Zurich Assurance Ltd (08816/5/001): The Plan does not contain enough deliverable housing land to comply with its own strategy and national policy. Some 1905 of the 3105 houses are constrained until major new transport infrastructure can be delivered and it cannot be relied on within the period to 2024. The site at Highfield Place Churchfield Place (S4\_Doc\_008) is available now and could contribute 30 units to the effective housing supply. The site is an appropriate location for further housing development and an acceptable access could be provided via Innewan Gardens.

#### Burrelton/Woodside

Frank Moisey (09950/4/001): The extension along Whitelea Road (formerly MIR sites 238 and 239) and those on Manse Road (which were not in the MIR) (S4\_Doc\_249) are on prime agricultural land contrary to LDP Policies ER5 (S4\_Doc\_506) and RD1 (S4\_Doc\_405).

#### Burrelton/Woodside E8

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/25/001): The site is located in or adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk 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.

Mr & Mrs J S Milne (08022/1/001): Support for the Plan

#### Burrelton/Woodside H16

Patricia Matte (09653/4/001); Chris Lamont (00397/1/001); M Pearson (00473/1/001); Mr & Mrs Ragsdell (00732/2/001); Martin Laing (00865/1/001); Jane Filshie (00821/1/001): Object to Site H16 on some or all of the following grounds: the total amount of traffic generated by the proposals in the Plan (1000 houses) will give the entire A94 corridor a congested appearance; the suggested numbers would increase the population of the village by a significant number over a short period of time which would significantly alter the character of the village; the amount of expansion proposed for the village is excessive and will cause undue strain on local services and increased congestion; the recently constructed affordable housing on the edge of the village has led to an increase in anti-

social behaviour; the scale of the development is too large for the village and will result in the loss of a considerable amount of agricultural land which is environmentally important; Whitlea Road is not suitable for more traffic and more housing would add to the congestion; there is a lack of facilities in the village; there is no drainage capacity; the school needs upgrading before any further building is considered; construction traffic will be too large for the existing road and poses an unacceptable risk to children using the school; the existing primary school has poor access and extending it will only exacerbate the problem; the style of housing will not be in keeping with the village; without the new road traffic congestion will be unacceptable; and if developments are allowed to go ahead before the Cross Tay Link Road then there will be further traffic problems in Bridgend.

Frank Moisey (09950/1/001); John Alexander (07896/1/002); Janet Parley (00714/1/001): Object to the scale of the development proposed for site H16 on some or all of the following grounds: the large size of the site will have an adverse effect on the landscape character type and the village will lose some of its rural setting; the development of the site will not meet the LDP place making policies (S4\_Doc\_396, S4\_Doc\_515 & S4\_Doc\_496); the site was originally designated as low density so that the character of the village was not destroyed; the proposals for the site do not comply with LDP Policy RD1 (S4\_Doc\_405); the access to the site is limited; there are flooding issues with flash flooding affecting the properties at Altnasheil and Midway House 2-3 times per year; the village is too remote and not well served by public transport to accommodate this scale of development; and the scale of development proposed will lead to more car travel since there are few employment opportunities in the village

Mr & Mrs J S Milne (08022/2/001): The site boundary should remain as shown in the adopted Perth Area Local Plan (S4\_Doc\_782); Whitelea Road cannot sustain any more traffic.

Andrew Whamond (00419/1/001): Support for the Plan providing that Bridgend bottleneck is addressed, water supply is improved, and gas pressure maintained.

#### Burrelton/Woodside H17

Patricia Matte (09653/4/002); Sandra Service (00427/1/001); Chris Lamont (00397/1/002); Bill Service (00428/1/002); Wendy Sheed (00451/1/003); Mr & Mrs Ragsdell (00732/1/001); Jane Filshie (00821/1/002); Martin Laing (00865/1/002): Object to site H17 on some or all of the following grounds: the total amount of traffic generated by the proposals in the Plan (1000 houses) will give the entire A94 corridor a congested appearance; development of the site will breach the natural boundary of the village; the density is too high and when counted with other sites will result in a 50% increase in population; the suggested numbers would increase the population of the village by a significant number over a short period of time which would significantly alter the character of the village; any future development along the A94 corridor should be shelved until the Cross Tay Link Road is a reality and not a budget proposal; development should not take place until the Cross Tay Link Road is completed; increasing the village size without putting in place other amenities will change the nature of the village and is contrary to the policy of keeping a sense of rurality; the amount of expansion proposed for the village is excessive and will cause undue strain on local services and increased congestion; the recently constructed affordable housing on the edge of the village has led to an increase in anti-social behaviour; it is difficult to see how a suitable boundary can be achieved on this site which is outwith the natural boundary of the village; object to use of Cameron Walk as access; the access via Cameron Walk will mean that exiting residents will have no privacy and safety will be reduced; interruption to wildlife by crossing of burn; the field floods badly when the burn rises; increased noise pollution; higher risk to children using

pathway to cross fields; if developments are allowed to go ahead before the Cross Tay Link Road then there will be further traffic problems in Bridgend; without the new road traffic congestion will be unacceptable; and the existing primary school has poor access and extending it will only exacerbate the problem.

Frank Moisey (09950/1/002); Janet Parley (00714/1/002): Object to the scale of the development proposed for site H17 on some or all of the following grounds: the large size of the site will have an adverse effect on the landscape character type and the village will lose some of its rural setting; the scale of development will destroy the rural nature of the village; the development of the site will not meet the place making policies set out in the Plan (S4\_Doc\_396, S4\_Doc\_515 & S4\_Doc\_496); the sites were originally designated as low density so that the character of the village was not destroyed; the proposals for the site do not comply with LPD Policy RD1 (S4\_Doc\_405); the access to the site is limited; the village is too remote and not well served by public transport to accommodate this scale of development while meeting the aim of reducing the need to travel by car.

Mr & Mrs J S Milne (08022/3/001): The suggested extension (S4\_Doc\_249) would allow ample housing in the central part of the village rather than elongating it as proposed in the LDP. The access should be via Cameron Walk with a service road to keep pedestrians safe from A94 traffic.

Andrew Whamond (00419/1/002): Support for the Plan providing that Bridgend bottleneck is addressed, water supply is improved, and gas pressure maintained.

Mabel Sharp (07967/1/001): Support for the Plan

#### Burrelton/Woodside New Sites

John Alexander (07896/1/001): A better location for development would be to the west of Manse Road (S4\_Doc\_249) which would be a more discrete location less visible than the large site identified in the LDP. It may also be able to provide the offer the sporting facilities that the village needs.

A & J Stephen Ltd & Stewart Milne Homes Ltd (09727/1/002): TAYplan (Core\_Doc\_099) recognises that smaller sites in non-principal settlements can contribute to housing supply. 86% of Perth and Kinross Council housing requires Cross Tay Link Road completion. The village is capable of greater expansion than is shown in the Plan and this would be benefit to the residents by improving community facilities such as education and open space. Though predominately housing led a phased mixed use expansion of the village is proposed including, business units, local retailing, primary school etc. Phase 1 is the LDP site while phases 2 and 3 are land to the south and west (S4\_Doc\_249). The calculation of the effective housing land supply cannot be made until there is clarity on the timescale of the Cross Tay Link Road. Any developer contributions will have to satisfy the 5 tests set out in Circular 1/2010 (Core\_Doc\_097). A masterplan is required for the long term planned expansion of the village and the expansion will make a significant contribution to the effective land supply and will bring certainty to the local community.

#### Dalcrue E9

Thomas Huxley (00322/1/003): The Conservation Area at Pitcairngreen village is being degraded by HGVs resulting from planning permissions for developments round the periphery including at site E9 in Dalcrue. E9 was allocated for employment uses because of its use during WWII as a storage site. Although there was considerable traffic using the roads at that time as a result vehicles today have more impact due to their

increased size and weight. Conservation Area designation is adversely affected and the LDP should recognise that action must be taken to halt the wrong kind of development at these peripheral sites.

#### Damside/Saucher

Peter Howarth (00088/1/001); Susan Howarth (00506/1/001); Rebecca Linford (10282/1/001); Beryl Linford (00477/1/001); Margaret Shaw (00530/1/001); Janet Rougvie (00684/1/001); Ima Rogers (00683/1/001); Jamie Sinclair (09289/19/001); Janice Withers (00874/1/001): Object to the proposed settlement boundary for Damside/Saucher for some or all of the following reasons: Saucher is a long established hamlet round a village green but the collection of dwellings to the north are not known collectively as Damside; defining a settlement boundary linking Saucher and Damside purely for the LDP is spurious, contrived and is an attempt to force the unwelcome creation of larger villages; there is no relationship between Damside and Saucher and they should not be referred to as one settlement; the Draft Perth Area Local Plan 2004 (Core\_Doc\_128) correctly presented them separately and rounded off the housing at Damside in an appropriate way; the unique character and identity of each area should be protected and preserved but the proposed settlement boundary will not improve character or environment (refer LDP Policy RD1 (S4\_Doc\_405)); the layout of Saucher is unique and should be preserved; the individuality of the two areas should be preserved; residents wish these to remain separate and don't want to be part of large developments; the two areas are not connected and have different postcodes; Saucher has its own style and residents don't want this changed; more appropriate to continue to treat villages separately and not artificially link them; and it is unclear as to the benefits of joining these communities.

Peter Howarth (00088/1/001); Burrelton & District Community Council (09376/1/002); Susan Howarth (00506/1/001); Rebecca Linford (10282/1/001); Beryl Linford (00477/1/001); Margaret Shaw (00530/1/001); David Cox (10185/1/001); Janet Rougvie (00684/1/001); Ima Rogers (00683/1/001); Janice Withers (00874/1/002 & 00874/1/003): Object to the principle of further residential development within the proposed settlement boundary on some or all of the following grounds: the main access is a busy single track road used by large agricultural vehicles and the exit from the road at Saucher is hazardous given the volume of heavy lorries using the road to Collace quarry; Kinnochtry Burn flowing through the area is subject to flooding and further development upstream could increase flood risk, SEPA are concerned about water pollution from agricultural practices and further residential development would exacerbate this; there would need to be a communal sewage system as effluent cannot drain into Kinnochtry Burn; there are no local services, minimal public transport links, and utilities infrastructure is basic; there is already outline planning permission for 9 houses (S4\_Doc\_252) within the settlement boundary proposed in the 2004 Draft Local Plan (Core\_Doc\_128) which would double the number of houses in the area – the impact of these should be assessed first; proposed construction of houses is inappropriate and excessive and has the potential to seriously distort this small hamlet; the argument for infill would hinge on the availability of the field nearest to Saucher otherwise the two areas would not be joined but this field was not proposed by landowners for the MIR, it is unsuitable as it floods very readily and should be retained as flood plain to alleviate problems downstream; other areas within proposed settlement boundary also flood (refer specifically to field around Mill Cottage); the inclusion of the area to the north/north east of Mill Cottage is an extension of the settlement boundary not infill; infill development is to be of similar density to its environs (refer LDP Policy RD1 (S4\_Doc\_405)) but the proposed settlement boundary could support a large number of houses which would not be in keeping with existing density; infill might not be possible leaving two separate settlements; nearby Kinrossie is a

conservation area seeking to protect the character and historic integrity of the area; the land surrounding Kinrossie, Damside and Saucher is prime agricultural land and should remain so; proposals for infill development seem disproportionate and will surely put undue pressure on access and local amenities; electricity and water supply would need to be upgraded; there are enough houses and residents don't want any more built; only one house has been built since the last Local Plan in 2004 so do not understand proposals to build more when impact on surrounding area and residents is unclear; and developer contributions would be necessary to improve the access to Damside area by road and increase public transport.

Jamie Sinclair (09289/19/001): The area encompassed by the proposed settlement boundary would accommodate an additional 65 houses even at low density in what are presently two very small, highly nucleated settlements. The settlement boundary proposed would encourage development away from the existing public foul drainage system at Saucher. A more natural extension of Saucher would be additions to the perimeter. Smaller land areas would promote higher densities in keeping with existing character. Additional development on sites proposed would contribute to demand for affordable housing, could be contained within existing landscape framework, and could improve the public foul drainage network. Small infill development around the nucleus at Damside would preserve the small settlement feel rather than creating a single lengthy joined up settlement. Two settlements could have a joint written statement in the LDP but without being linked by a shared boundary.

Mr & Mrs I Brooks (07693/4/001): Support for the Plan.

#### Guildtown

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/022): There is scope for further development on the west side of Guildtown to provide for sustainable growth (S4\_Doc\_339). There are no environmental designations or flood risk affecting the sites proposed. Scottish Water will progress improvements to provide for existing allocations and Scone Estates could provide additional land for further extensions to the sewage treatment works. There is a strategic need to protect the setting of Perth so expansion of surrounding villages is inevitable. There is a longer term opportunity for Guildtown to form the basis of a new settlement for Perth given proximity to the proposed Cross Tay Link Road. A more substantial land allocation would assist in creating economies of scale, avoid piecemeal development, and help support and encourage investment in services and facilities.

#### Wolfhill H35

Mr & Mrs Frank Holt (00508/1/001): The site is better reduced in size and shown for 12 houses like H67 of the Perth Area Local Plan (S4\_Doc\_254). The development of the site will create a road safety issue by increasing the volumes of traffic using a hazardous bend on the entrance to the village. The cesspit outfall for Wolfhill House is located on the extended site. The development will increase the carbon footprint requiring people to travel further to obtain services and put the existing services under greater pressure. The development will result in the loss of agricultural land and there is sufficient brown land to provide extra housing.

Steven & Elizabeth Stuart (00585/1/001): Extending an existing housing site to the west will not improve its appearance. The reference to green buffer strip should relate to the west edge of the village not the south. The location of the site is such that it would materially alter the village away from its heart contrary to the terms of paragraph 2.2.3 (S4\_Doc\_783) of the plan. Wolfhill is not a suitable location for development as it has limited public transport and facilities. Identifying the site is pointless as it requires the

Cross Tay Link Road before an embargo is lifted and the site will not contribute to the housing numbers (refers paragraph 80 of SPP (S4\_Doc\_099)).

#### Wolfhill New Sites

R T Hutton Planning Consultant (09539/2/001): The site (S4\_Doc\_009) should be identified for 8/9 houses to avoid exacerbating the problems associated with air quality. A generous allowance could be made for tree planting along the eastern boundary. Access could be taken from the exiting road to the west and there are no physical constraints known which would limit development.

Lomond Land (09415/7/001): A substantial tree belt could be provided along the eastern boundary and the site (S4\_Doc\_009) would be designed to integrate with the permission already granted for the poultry sheds to the north. The site is in the control of a house builder and considered suitable for early development contributing to the housing supply.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### Bankfoot

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/036): Include either suggested mitigation measure Option A or Option B below:

Option A: add the following text in the Spatial Strategy Consideration section (paragraph 5.8.2, page 92):

*'Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.'*

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

Option B: incorporate the following new policy 'EP15: Development within the River Tay Catchment Area' into the Plan (page 60):

*'The Council will seek to protect and enhance the nature conservation interests within the River Tay Catchment area.'*

*In order to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay SAC, all of the following criteria will apply to development proposals at Acharn, Balnaguard, Camserney, Croftinloan/Donavoured/East Haugh/Ballyoukan, Fortingall, Grandtully/Strathay/Little Ballinluig, Logierait, Tummel Bridge, Concraigie, Craigie and Kinloch, and criteria (b) and (c) to development proposals at Bankfoot and Kirkmichael.*

- (a) *Drainage from all development should ensure no reduction in water quality.*
- (b) *Construction Method Statement to be provided where the development site will affect a watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment.*
- (c) *Where the development site is within 30m of a watercourse an otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required.*

*Note: Supplementary Guidance 'River Tay Special Area of Conservation' provides detailed advice to developers on the types of appropriate information and safeguards to*

*be provided in support of planning applications for new projects which may affect the River Tay SAC.'*

And, insert the following text in the Spatial Strategy Considerations section (paragraph 5.8.2, page 92):

*'Bankfoot lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy EP15 sets out the relevant criteria for development within this area.'*

#### Bankfoot New Sites

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/10/001): A site should be identified for housing on the south side Forestry Place and Nicoll Drive (S4\_Doc\_008) as shown in the Main Issues Report and our previous representations.

The Church of Scotland General Trustees (09167/2/001): A site should be identified for housing development at Auchtergaven Glebe, Bankfoot (S4\_Doc\_008).

Zurich Assurance Ltd (08816/5/001): A site should be identified for 30 houses at Highfield Place/Church field Place Bankfoot (S4\_Doc\_008).

#### Burrelton/Woodside

Frank Moisey (09950/4/001): Remove the extension to the settlement boundary along Manse Road and Whitelea Road

#### Burrelton/Woodside E8

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/25/001): 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.

#### Burrelton/Woodside H16

Patricia Matte (09653/4/001); Chris Lamont (00397/1/001); M Pearson (00473/1/001); Mr & Mrs Ragsdell (00732/2/001); John Alexander (07896/1/002); Delete site H16.

Martin Laing (00865/1/001): The development of site H16 should not be considered until the Cross Tay Link Road is under construction, not a '*committed project*'. The primary school should be replaced, not extended.

Jane Filshie (00821/1/001): The sites should be developed at low density and the embargo should be in place until construction of the Cross Tay Link Road begins.

Frank Moisey (09950/1/001): Any development should be at a low density of 5 per hectare rather than the 20 per hectare proposed and the development should be scaled back to that shown as VH17 of the 2004 Draft Plan (S4\_Doc\_253).

Janet Parley (00714/1/001): The site should be identified for low density development.

Mr & Mrs J S Milne (08022/2/001): The site should not be extended on the west side and should remain as shown in the adopted Perth Area Local Plan ALT 10 (S4\_Doc\_782). Housing should be low density.

Andrew Whamond (00419/1/001): No specific modification sought but wishes that the Bridgend bottleneck is addressed, water supply is improved, and gas pressure maintained.



Burrelton/Woodside H17

Patricia Matte (09653/4/002); Sandra Service (00427/1/001); Chris Lamont (00397/1/002); Bill Service (00428/1/002); Wendy Sheed (00451/1/003); Mr & Mrs Ragsdell (00732/1/001): Delete site H17.

Jane Filshie (00821/1/002): The sites should be developed at low density and the embargo should be in place until construction of the Cross Tay Link Road begins.

Martin Laing (00865/1/002): The development of site H17 should not be considered until the Cross Tay Link Road is under construction, not a '*committed project*'. The primary school should be replaced, not extended.

Frank Moisey (09950/1/002): Any development should be at a low density rather than medium density.

Janet Parley (00714/1/002): The site should be identified for low density development.

Mr & Mrs JS Milne (08022/3/001): Extend the site westwards into MIR sites 235 and 236 (S4\_Doc\_249).

Andrew Whamond (00419/1/002): No specific modification sought but wishes that the Bridgend bottleneck is addressed, water supply is improved, and gas pressure maintained.

Burrelton/Woodside New Sites

John Alexander (07896/1/001): Add site to the West of Manse Road (S4\_Doc\_249) for small scale development. This is assumed to be the area of land immediately north of the identified area of open space in the northern end of the settlement.

A & J Stephen Ltd & Stewart Milne Homes Ltd (09727/1/002): Additional sites should be identified for a housing led mixed use development on the south and west of the village (S4\_Doc\_249) and the village boundary adjusted accordingly.

Dalcruie E9

Thomas Huxley (00322/1/003): No specific modification sought but implied that site E9 should not be allocated for employment land.

Damside/Saucher

Peter Howarth (00088/1/001); Susan Howarth (00506/1/001); Rebecca Linford (10282/1/001); Janice Withers (00874/1/003): Boundaries in the Draft Perth Area Local Plan 2004 (S4\_Doc\_784) should be retained for the Saucher and Damside areas.

Beryl Linford (00477/1/001); Margaret Shaw (00530/1/001); Janet Rougvie (00684/1/001); Ima Rogers (00683/1/001); Janice Withers (00874/1/001 & 00874/1/002): No specific modification sought but assumed that the LDP should not encourage further development at Damside/Saucher and the two settlements should not be joined together.

Burrelton & District Community Council (09376/1/002): No specific modification sought but implied that the settlement boundary should be redrawn more tightly so as not to allow for infill development.

David Cox (10185/1/001): Proposals for infill housing at Damside should be dropped or the number of houses reduced.

Jamie Sinclair (09289/19/001): Amendments should be made to the settlement boundary for Damside/Saucher as per submitted maps.

#### Guildtown

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/022): Settlement boundary for Guildtown should be more generously drawn to the west (S4\_Doc\_339).

#### Wolfhill H35

Mr & Mrs Frank Holt (00508/1/001); Steven & Elizabeth Stuart (00585/1/001): The removal of site H35 and its substitution by the site with planning consent and the reduction in numbers to 12 with subsequent amendments to the plan in accordance with the above.

#### Wolfhill New Sites

R T Hutton Planning Consultant (09539/2/001): The village boundary should be extended to include a small infill area of 8-9 houses on the east side of the village (S4\_Doc\_009).

Lomond Land (09415/7/001): A site for housing for 10-15 units single or single and a half storey houses should be included at Castle Road, Wolfhill (S4\_Doc\_009).

### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

#### Bankfoot

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/036): It is considered that amending the Plan to incorporate the mitigation measures as set out in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (S4\_Doc\_140) of the Proposed Plan, and detailed in the 'Modifications Sought' section would provide greater clarity and transparency for applicants as to which settlements and in what circumstances the provisions of the Plan's Policy NE1: International Nature conservation Sites (S4\_Doc\_389) will apply, and would also set out what will be expected of them in making their planning application.

If the Reporter is so minded to amend the Plan in line with the suggested additional text by the respondent, in the interests of keeping the Plan as short and succinct as possible, the Council's preference would be to incorporate suggested mitigation Option B (proposed Policy EP15) as it would result in the least amount of additional text and repetition in the Plan.

#### Bankfoot New Sites

G S Brown Construction Ltd (09817/10/001); The Church of Scotland General Trustees (09167/2/001); Zurich Assurance Ltd (08816/5/001): There are a number of significant issues with further development of Bankfoot. In particular the risk of flooding from the burn and of the area to the south is a matter of concern. As identified in the SEA Environmental Report Appendix D (S4\_Doc\_785) there was widespread flooding in Bankfoot in 1993 and 2004 resulting from the overtopping of watercourses, blocked screens, collapsed culverts, a lack of capacity in piped/culverted watercourses and road drains and run off from surrounding fields. Development of land to the north could also potentially increase the flood risk of lower lying parts of the settlement. The capacity of the existing sewerage network is a constraint on further development of the settlement. Auchtergaven Primary School site is also constrained – the suggestion that it could expand southwards would involve crossing the burn and the site is located in the floodplain. In light of the above even if sites were to be identified for housing it is unlikely that they could be made effective within the life of the Plan. Bankfoot is not within the Perth Core Area where the majority of housing allocation is to be directed in line with

TAYplan Policy 1 (S4\_Doc\_067), nor is it identified in TAYplan as a tiered settlement. It is however a well served settlement and there may be some scope for future expansion but only once the issues identified above have been resolved. It is therefore considered that any additional development in Bankfoot should be reserved for a future LDP.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Burrelton/Woodside

Frank Moisey (09950/4/001): The boundary is a logical extension to the settlement matching the form along the north side of Whitlea Road. Land is prime quality classified 3.1 but its development is not contrary to national policy if part of a settlement strategy (SPP paragraph 97 (S4\_Doc\_108)). LDP Policy ER5 (S4\_Doc\_506) applies outside settlements and Policy RD1 (S4\_Doc\_405) would guide future development.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Burrelton/Woodside E8

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/25/001): The site is not shown as an area of flood risk. However due to its proximity to an at risk area the proposed modification is considered acceptable as it would ensure that no new development is at risk of flooding or would increase flooding to existing areas.

If the Reporter is minded to accept the proposed modification the Council would have no objection to a Flood Risk Assessment being added as a Site Specific Developer Requirement.

#### Burrelton/Woodside H16

Patricia Matte (09653/4/001); Chris Lamont (00397/1/001); M Pearson (00473/1/001); Mr & Mrs Ragsdell (00732/2/001); John Alexander (07896/1/002); Martin Laing (00865/1/001); Jane Filshie (00821/1/001); Frank Moisey (09950/1/001); Janet Parley (00714/1/001); Mr & Mrs J S Milne (08022/2/001); Andrew Whamond (00419/1/001): The site is class 3.1 prime land national policy is that this should not be developed unless it is an essential component of a settlement strategy (SPP paragraph 97 (S4\_Doc\_108)). As this site together with site H17 are the best sites for the expansion of the village development complies with national guidance. It is intended that the main access to the site be taken from Whitea Road as School Road is not suitable to deal with traffic from the development. Whitlea Road is suitable as an access to the site. The style of the development is a matter of detail best dealt with through planning applications and the density (20 per hectare) is comparable with surrounding properties and in the medium range identified in the Plan. Part of the site is shown in the existing local plan but only for 15 houses. This allocation has no link to Whitlea Road and does not make best use of the site. The increased density on the site is part of the strategy to meet the housing land requirements for the plan period and will enable the improvement of local facilities through developer contributions. The development of the site will assist in increasing housing choice and provide an element of affordable housing in an area where there is a particular need. The route of construction traffic is a matter of detail which will require consideration of the phasing and design of development through the planning application process, as will any upgrading of water supply and gas pressure maintenance. It is suggested that the development embargo should be in place until such time as the Cross Tay Link Road is under construction however this could cause significant issues for the house building industry. The timing of both the Cross Tay Link Road being a committed project and the embargo being lifted is considered critical to the delivery of housing in the Perth Area. This is discussed in detail in Schedule 4 number 24 and in the Council's

**Delivering Infrastructure Background Paper (S4\_Doc\_440).**

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

**Burrelton/Woodside H17**

Patricia Matte (09653/4/002); Sandra Service (00427/1/001); Chris Lamont (00397/1/002); Bill Service (00428/1/002); Wendy Sheed (00451/1/003); Mr & Mrs Ragsdell (00732/1/001); Jane Filshie (00821/1/002); Martin Laing (00865/1/002); Frank Moisey (09950/1/002); Janet Parley (00714/1/002); Mr & Mrs J S Milne (08022/3/001); Andrew Whamond (00419/1/002); There is no existing physical feature which provides a robust village boundary, the proposed development at site H17 will assist in the creation of a more robust boundary. The site was the subject of an appeal which was dismissed due to the unsuitability of the access. Church Road is a private road and at the time there were difficulties in the obtaining the necessary visibility splays. The development at Cameron Walk does provide a potential access route and would be appropriate for the scale of development proposed. However there may be other ways to access the site. The development of the site together with the development of site H16 for 100 houses will improve services in the village. The density (20 per hectare) is in the medium range identified in the Plan and is considered appropriate for the area. A flood risk assessment is required as a specific developer requirement. Any required upgrading of the water supply and gas pressure maintenance is a matter which will be considered through the planning application process. It is suggested that the development embargo should be in place until such time as the Cross Tay Link Road is under construction. As mentioned above the timing of both the Cross Tay Link Road being a committed project and the embargo being lifted is considered critical to the delivery of housing in the Perth Area. This issue is addressed in detail in Schedule 4 number 24 and in the Council's Delivering Infrastructure Background Paper (S4\_Doc\_440). Extending the site westwards is something that could be considered during a future review of the plan but is not considered desirable or necessary for this Plan period. Any increase in the land allocation would be unlikely to deliver more effective housing land supply during the life of the Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

**Burrelton/Woodside New Sites**

John Alexander (07896/1/001): The site proposed (S4\_Doc\_249) is white land within the settlement boundary. It is therefore accepted that it may have some development potential providing an acceptable scheme is put forward.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

A & J Stephen Ltd/Stewart Milne Homes Ltd (09727/1/002): The identification of land for a large expansion in three phases to the south and west of the village does not conform to the strategy set out in TAYplan Policy 1 (S4\_Doc\_067) and the level of development identified (50ha and around 1200 houses) would require a strategic allocation and would be a matter for a future review of the Strategic and Local Development Plan. The number of units identified in the LDP for site H16, together with the site at H17, is considered to be an appropriate scale of development for this size of settlement over the life of the Plan. Any increase in the land allocation would be unlikely to deliver more effective housing land supply during the life of the Plan. Part of the site lies within the pipeline consultation zone.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Dalcrue E9

Thomas Huxley (00322/1/003): This is an existing employment site. It is a brownfield site and access is via public roads. The impact of any additional development on roads and traffic-related issues would be assessed under LDP Policy TA1B (S4\_Doc\_387).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Damside/Saucher

Peter Howarth (00088/1/001); Susan Howarth (00506/1/001); Rebecca Linford (10282/1/001); Beryl Linford (00477/1/001); Margaret Shaw (00530/1/001); Janet Rougvie (00684/1/001); Ima Rogers (00683/1/001); Burrelton & District Community Council (09376/1/002); David Cox (10185/1/001); Jamie Sinclair (09289/19/001); Janice Withers (00874/1/001, 00874/1/002 & 00874/1/003): There was pressure for development at Damside which was moving southwards and a number of planning consents have been granted for individual houses (S4\_Doc\_252). It is considered that there are opportunities for a limited amount of further infill residential development across the Damside/Saucher settlements. No specific number of houses is proposed in the Plan. The identification of a settlement boundary was to give some structure to the future development of this area over the life of the Plan and to create a sense of cohesion. In a wider context it was also to create some development opportunities in the wider countryside. Concerns raised in the representations regarding access, flooding etc are matters of detail which will be assessed against other LDP policies through the planning application process. The Plan seeks to address concerns about the potential for merging of what are considered in the representations to be two distinct settlements, by identifying the important areas of open space to ensure their maintenance and protection. The settlement boundaries also limit the development of prime agricultural land in line with SPP (S4 Doc 108). Policy RD1 will require the scale and form of development to be compatible with the character of the settlement.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Jamie Sinclair (09289/19/001): At Saucher the areas proposed for development are largely outwith the proposed settlement boundary and are fairly substantial in size in comparison with the size of the existing settlement. The boundary at Saucher has been purposefully drawn tightly round the existing houses to retain the character of this area as a small group of houses built round a village green. The existing housing at Damside is more linear in nature and it is therefore considered that there is more scope for additional small scale development here, taking into account the existing planning consents. At Damside the area proposed for development is already within the proposed settlement boundary.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Guildtown

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/022): Guildtown lies outside the Perth core area and is a small linear settlement with a population of around 300. Planning permission exists for 90 houses on the east side of the village on three sites which have yet to be implemented. The settlement boundary has been drawn to allow the linear form of the settlement to be replicated by some limited infill development during the life of the Plan but the northern quarter of this area is required for a Sustainable Urban Drainage System pond as part of the development of 20 houses on the other side of the road. The level of expansion proposed is sufficient for the life of the Plan but it may be that the western side of the village could accommodate development in future plans. The area could be

revisited once the existing consents have been implemented but it is considered that any increase in the land allocation would be unlikely to deliver more effective housing land supply during the life of the Plan. It should be noted that the extreme northern section of the area lies within a gas transmission pipeline consultation zone.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Wolfhill H35

Mr & Mrs Frank Holt (00508/1/001); Steven & Elizabeth Stuart (00585/1/001): The size of site as proposed in the LDP is considered to be a reasonable expansion to Wolfhill over the life of the Plan. Concerns over drainage and road safety issues will be assessed against other Plan policies at planning application stage.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Wolfhill New Sites

R T Hutton Planning Consultant (09539/2/001); Lomond Land (09415/7/001): The Plan already identifies site H35 for 24 houses which is considered a reasonable scale of expansion for this scale of settlement over the life of the Plan. Furthermore planning consent has been granted for a small development of four houses on the site of the former poultry sheds to the north which will offer further choice to house purchasers.

However the site can be considered an infill site and as such if the Reporter was minded to identify this site for a small scale residential development the Council would have no objection to this as it would not have any implications for any other aspect of the Plan.

### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### Bankfoot

1. The Proposed Plan identifies extremely limited housing expansion potential during the Plan period. All proposed housing sites in Bankfoot are affected by the lack of capacity in the local primary school and the fact that there is no potential to extend that school in order to accommodate a larger intake. There are also flooding issues for a number of existing properties, which affect the development potential of vacant land, and the council has identified a sewerage capacity constraint.

2. The site that is promoted to the south of the settlement could potentially provide land onto which the village primary school could expand, which would address one of the identified constraints to development. The prospective developer is also confident that flooding concerns could be overcome. However, the proposed development would be wholly disproportionate to the size of the existing settlement and to its status within the settlement hierarchy. Bankfoot is not identified as a principal settlement in TAYplan. As such, it is not a location to which significant development should be directed. Policy 1 of TAYplan, with which the Proposed Plan must be consistent, gives clear priority to principal settlements. The examination of Issues 20c and 20e has confirmed that, in accordance with this principle, the Proposed Plan has identified a generous supply of housing land to meet the requirement identified in TAYplan. A further concern is that only some of this site was identified as a potential development option in the Main Issues Report (MIR). It is possible therefore that the full implications of the site have not been considered in terms of adequate publicity for the proposal and proper consideration of its implications under the Proposed Plan's Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA).

3. The site at Highfield Place/Churchfield Place, which is proposed for 30 units, is prominent from the southbound A9 to the north of the settlement and the site proposed to the east of the Manse on the eastern edge of the village would illogically extend the settlement out into the surrounding countryside. Neither has been subject to statutory publicity or to consideration under the SEA or HRA processes. As outlined above, the Proposed Plan provides for a generous supply of housing land without having to rely on unsuitable sites such as these in non principal settlements such as Bankfoot.

4. It would be appropriate for the Spatial Strategy Considerations section of the plan's text for Bankfoot to reflect the outcome of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal

#### Burrelton/Woodside settlement boundaries

5. The proposed settlement boundary at the northern end of Manse Road would include within the village boundary the playing fields and adjacent prime agricultural land. There is no landscape justification for the proposed boundary, which would create a much less logical edge to the settlement than Manse Road, where the settlement boundary in the Perth Area Local Plan was drawn. The playing fields would be equally well protected from development if they were excluded from the settlement boundary and, given the clear strategic policy in TAYplan to focus development on principal settlements, which Burrelton/Woodside is not, there can be no housing supply justification for the remainder of the settlement boundary extension, the effect of which would be to identify a site for development. The boundary at this point should be modified to reflect that set out in the Perth Area Local Plan (Schedule 4 document 782).

6. The proposed settlement boundary along the southern side of Whitelea Road also has no obvious landscape justification. It would enlarge the settlement onto prime agricultural land rather than following the boundaries of existing residential properties as the settlement boundary in the Perth Area Local Plan did. The recommended modification to the settlement boundary on the opposite side of Whitelea Road (see the consideration of site H16 below) further reduces any landscape justification for the proposed boundary on the southern side of the road. In accordance with the clear expectations in TAYplan that non principal settlements such as Burrelton / Woodside should not be the focus for significant levels of development and the conclusions reached elsewhere in this examination that the Proposed Plan identifies a generous supply of development land, there is no justification in land supply terms for the proposed settlement boundary. The settlement boundary at this point should be modified to reflect that in the Perth Area Local Plan (Schedule 4 document 782).

#### Burrelton/Woodside E8

7. Given the identified potential for this site to be at risk of flooding, it would be appropriate to modify the site-specific developer requirement to confirm that a flood risk assessment needs to be carried out prior to submitting a planning application, to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

#### Burrelton/Woodside H16

8. The roads around the site are narrow but there is no convincing evidence that they would be incapable of supporting the proposed level of development. The extension of the settlement into surrounding countryside would detract from the local landscape character but, subject to extensive landscaping of the site's northern and western boundaries, the degree of such harm might be acceptable if the site could be

demonstrated to be essential in order to meet the Proposed Plan's housing strategy. However, Burrelton is a small settlement with very few services and limited employment opportunities. It is not identified as one of the Plan area's principal settlements, which TAYplan Policy 1 requires to be the focus for the majority of development. The proposed 100 houses on this site would represent a very significant enlargement of the settlement with no obvious strategic justification. Bearing in mind that it has been concluded elsewhere in this examination that the strategic housing sites in west / north west Perth and the range of other proposed sites elsewhere are likely to be capable of delivering significant housing numbers during the plan period, the achievement of the plan's housing land requirement cannot be argued in justification of this site. And, as the Proposed Plan provides an adequate range and choice of housing sites in locations within the principal settlements and elsewhere, no significant weight should be attached to any additional market choice that this site would provide. A further significant consideration is that the site would be subject to the proposed development embargo that will remain in place until the Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR) is a committed project. As has been concluded under Issue 24, there is no likelihood of that occurring within the Plan period and it is unlikely therefore that the site could make any contribution to the housing supply during the plan period even if it were allocated. Bearing these factors in mind, site H16 should not be allocated. The settlement boundary at this point should be modified to reflect that in the Perth Area Local Plan (Schedule 4 document 782).

#### Burrelton/Woodside H17

9. This site would provide a much smaller level of development than is proposed for site H16, and would be more in scale with the size of the settlement. It was allocated for development in the Perth Area Local Plan and there is no reason to suspect that there has been any physical change in circumstances that would justify not taking this site forward into the Proposed Plan. The introduction of TAYplan represents a significant change in strategic policy, as it sets out a clear expectation that the majority of development be directed to principal settlements. However, it does not absolutely preclude development elsewhere and it is considered, on balance, to be appropriate to retain the allocation in the Proposed Plan. Issues of detail that have been raised by representors who are opposed to the site, such as the adequacy of the site access, are matters that would be resolved at the planning application stage. There is no evidence to suggest that they would pose any insurmountable problems.

#### Burrelton/Woodside New Sites

10. It has been concluded above that the settlement boundary that is drawn in the Proposed Plan at the northern end of Manse Road is inappropriate. The site that is proposed to the west of Manse Road, which would enlarge the settlement boundary beyond the proposed line, would for similar reasons, represent an unjustified and unnecessary expansion of the settlement, which would detract from its setting and result in the loss of prime agricultural land. The development land that would be created by the proposed modification would be disproportionate to the size of the settlement and would be contrary to the expectations of TAYplan for a non principal settlement. Any improvement to existing sporting facilities would not outweigh these reasons for not accepting the proposed modification.

11. The proposed further expansion of site H16 would provide further phases of development (identified as phases 2 and 3 in the representation) incorporating housing, business units, community facilities and local retailing. This very significant scale of development would be entirely at odds with the existing size and role of the village and,



for the same reasons that are set out in respect of site H16 above, would not be required in order to achieve the housing land requirement or to provide adequate choice within the market. It is recognised that some development in smaller settlements is potentially acceptable under TAYplan. But not of the scale that is proposed in this representation. This proposed modification, which would be inconsistent with the expectations of TAYplan Policy 1, is therefore not justified.

#### Dalcrue E9

12. Dalcrue as a location for vehicle repair and dismantling options, is illogical, given its relatively remote rural location. However, it is an established use and the land which is proposed for further employment development has a history of employment activity. Concerns over the potential that a further employment allocation might encourage additional large goods vehicles to use the minor rural road network are understandable. However, it cannot necessarily be assumed that the proposed allocation would lead to a material increase in such traffic or that the effects of any such increase would be objectionable. Such issues could be considered at the planning application stage.

#### Damside/Saucher

13. It is difficult to see the logic in drawing a settlement boundary around the small group of houses at Saucher and this becomes impossible when one considers the proposed inclusion of Damside Farm and houses to the north, which includes land up to 600 metres away. The stated intention of the plan's approach (to provide further opportunities for further infill residential development to create a more cohesive settlement) is undermined by the fact that these scattered small groups of houses cannot reasonably be regarded as a settlement in functional or visual terms. The additional infill opportunities that would be afforded by the proposed settlement boundary could accommodate a ten fold increase in the number of dwellings. No justification has been provided for such a significant level of development in a relatively remote rural location that lacks the services and facilities required of a sustainable development location. The landscape and visual impact of additional residential development in this location, even if carried out to a high standard, would also inevitably have a harmful and urbanising effect on the locality. The proposed identification of this location as a settlement with a defined settlement boundary when there is clear evidence that the nature/scale of land use required to deliver the plan is likely to be capable of being accommodated in more sustainable locations (see Issues 20c and 20e), is inconsistent with the approach expected of local development plans in TAYplan.

14. Taking all factors into account, there are no grounds to support the identification of Damside/Saucher as a settlement with a settlement boundary.

#### Guildtown

15. Guildtown is a small village with limited facilities or employment opportunities. There is already planning permission for 64 houses, which is likely to see the village population increase by over a third. The proposed settlement boundary along the west of the A93 will permit a further 15 or so houses. The requested modification would permit a very significant number of houses which would be disproportionate to the size of the settlement. This area is subject to the proposed development embargo pending the CTRL becoming a committed project. It has been concluded in Issue 24 that this is most unlikely to occur within the plan period. Therefore even if there had been a shortage of sites in more sustainable locations on which to meet the plan's housing requirement

(which, as confirmed above, there is not) there is no likelihood that development here would in fact be effective within the plan period.

### Wolfhill H35

16. The existing development at Fraser Avenue, being of single storey height and having mature landscaping within gardens, does not form an objectionably harmful western edge to this very small settlement. And even if it had, the development of Site H67 in the Perth Area Local Plan, which lies within the existing settlement boundary, would have provided an opportunity to address this. There is therefore no justification in landscape terms for extending the settlement boundary so significantly into the adjacent countryside. Indeed the effect of the site H35, even with a generous landscape buffer at its western edge, is likely to be significant detriment to the character of the surrounding landscape. Of equal significance is the fact that Wolfhill has virtually no services or sources of employment. The proposed settlement boundary at the south eastern side of the settlement and the land which is identified as H67 in the local plan will permit a number of new houses to be built and, if the proposed plan is to be consistent with TAYplan, there is no justification for the additional housing that would be provided by site H35. Site H35 should be deleted and the settlement boundary at the western edge of the village should be aligned with the western edge of site H67 in the Perth Area Local Plan.

### Wolfhill new sites

17. The site that is proposed to the east of the village would extend the settlement onto open grazing land. When one considers Wolfhill's relative remoteness, the lack of any services, employment opportunities or public transport connections and the fact that it is not identified in TAYplan as a principal settlement, there is no justification for any additional housing development beyond that which will be facilitated by the proposed settlement boundary. The proposed site would also be inappropriate in landscape terms. There are some low sheds to the north of the site, which it is understood are to be replaced with housing and some limited development on the opposite side of the road but these do not provide a logical landscape framework into which the settlement could expand. Even with generous landscaping, the proposed settlement enlargement would detract from the character of the local landscape by appearing as an incongruous expansion of built development into the surrounding countryside.

## **Reporter's recommendations:**

### Bankfoot

1. Modify the Spatial Strategy Considerations text by the addition of the following two paragraphs at the end of that section.

*"A Construction Method Statement shall be provided where a development site will affect a watercourse. The methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation."*

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

Burrelton/Woodside settlement boundaries

2. Modify the settlement boundary at the north of Manse Road to reflect that set out in the Perth Area Local Plan (Schedule 4 document 782).
3. Modify the settlement boundary along the southern side of Whitelea Road to reflect that set out in the Perth Area Local Plan (Schedule 4 document 782).

Burrelton/Woodside E8

4. Modify the site-specific developer requirements by the addition of the following:

*“A flood risk assessment will be required 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.”*

Burrelton/Woodside H16

5. Delete site H16 from the plan. Modify the settlement boundary at this point to reflect that set out in the Perth Area Local Plan (Schedule 4 document 782).
6. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11.

Damside / Saucher

7. Delete section 5.15 and the accompanying settlement plan from the plan.

Wolfhill H35

8. Delete site H35 and align the settlement boundary at the western edge of Wolfhill with the western edge of site H67 in the Perth Area Local Plan.
9. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 5.1.11.