

Issue 26c	Perth Area (out with Core) South Settlements and Landward Sites	
Development plan reference:	5.1.11 Housing Land Table, page 69 Aberargie, page 82-83 Abernethy, page 84-86 E4 - Newburgh Road, Abernethy, page 86 H8 - Hatton Road, Abernethy, page 86 H9 - Station Road, Abernethy, page 86 H10 - Newburgh Road (South), Abernethy, page 86 H11 - Newburgh Road (North), Abernethy, page 86 Forgandenny, page 115-116 H22 - County Place, Forgandenny, page 115 Glenfarg, page 118-119 H23 - Duncrieve Road, Glenfarg, page 118	Reporter: Hugh M Begg
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<div>Wendy McKerchar (00089) Mr & Mrs Gray (00099) Andy Proctor (00114) Dinah Morren (00139) James Ogilvie Gray (00141) Margaret Shaw (00192) Anne Petrie (00196) Angus MacIntyre (00208) Thomas M McDonald (00211) Trevor Abell (00238) Mr & Mrs Ptak (00259) Mr & Mrs Rose (00260) D & I Buchan (00300) Dr David Booth (00316) Geo P Taylor (00317) David Nichol (00318) Robert & Lynda Jones (00319) Sheila Douglas (00321) David Willington (00323) Philip Segaud (00362) Felicity Legge (00365) Douglas, Christina & Jennifer Cleeton (00372) Mr & Mrs W Melville (00416) Trevor Goody (00417) Irene Morrison (00418) George Brown (00436) M Gray (00443) Elizabeth Matthews (00471) Ronald Archer (00472) K Duguid (00485) Kathleen Taylor (00486) Mr & Mrs E D Manos (00505)</div> <div>Alison Leeper (00577) Charles Wemyss (00602) Alison Anderson (00619) Lewis Bowers (00676) Mr & Mrs G McLaren (00677) Jessie Brown (00681) Elizabeth & Mary Rose Reville (00687) T Marlow (00690) K Harker (00691) Ian Dunsire (00692) David McLaughlan (00693) Alexandra McLaughlan (00694) Sue Ternent (00696) Danny Ternent (00697) Chris Williams (00730) S W Marlow (00835) Neil Campbell (00861) Andrew Sinclair (00904) Councillor Michael Barnacle (02633) Councillor Alan Jack (03030) A & J Stephen (Builders) Ltd (03068) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194) Branston Ltd (09022) Muir Homes Ltd (09035) The Rennie Family Trust (09052) Dach Planning (09078) Yeoman McAllister Architects (09099) Abernethy & District Community Council (09215) William Thomson (09289) Shell UK Ltd (09313) Duncan Scott (09389)</div>		

Mr & Mrs J Leggate (00510) Alexander Hamilton (00527)	Earn Community Council (09922) BP North Sea Infrastructure (09994)
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Landward settlements to the South of the Perth Housing Market area with development proposals.
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>Aberargie settlement</u> Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/4/001): Settlement boundary should not extend to the south of the main road, it is not a defined boundary but subdivides fields and will detract from the distinctive character of Aberargie. The number of houses this extended area would contribute to the overall housing land requirement is negligible therefore the existing boundary should be retained. The proposed boundary is contrary to TAYplan (Core_Doc_099) and the LDP which direct development to the Core Area and large villages.</p> <p>Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/5/001): Information relating to Abernethy primary school serving Aberargie is considered inaccurate; the extension is only commencing April 2012 and is a result of lack of accommodation following two large housing developments in Abernethy. Open space is suitable but serious safety concerns will arise should there be development on the opposite site of the busy main road.</p> <p><u>Abernethy settlement</u> Angus MacIntyre (00208/1/001); Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/7/001): The 2001 census population for Abernethy is 945 but approx 200 houses built since then so actual population will be nearer 1500-2000. Undercount will undoubtedly reflect on the infrastructure capabilities to cope with further development.</p> <p>Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/6/001): Information relating to the primary school is inaccurate. Site specific developer requirement relating to primary school capacity suggests under-estimation is likely as was the case with the previous housing developments which were not properly accounted for in terms of school capacity.</p> <p><u>Abernethy E4</u> Andy Proctor (00114/2/001): Site E4 was allocated for housing in the previous Local Plan; previous planning application for this site was for storage with a bund and planting but this has not been completed. A sewer was routed along the south of E4 to service future housing development. Site should be retained for housing.</p> <p>Branston Ltd (09022/3/002): Support the allocation of site E4. Additional land to the north (currently allocated as part of site H11) will also be required to maintain the existing business and accommodate future expansion within the life of the LDP. The existing business is a major employer in the area and without additional investment and expansion to provide indoor workspace the long-term sustainability of the business may be threatened. Purchase of the former garage on Newburgh Road was intended to enable increased traffic management and improvements to the local road network. A substantive boundary with new housing at site H11 would be provided, a masterplan approach for the entire area is proposed to link existing business with additional facilities, traffic management improvements and parking facilities.</p>	

Lewis Bowers (00676/1/001): Trees were planted to provide screening for houses from the potato packing plant, they are well established and have biodiversity interest.

Abernethy H8

Angus MacIntyre (00208/1/005): Information relating to the primary school is inaccurate. Site specific developer requirement relating to primary school capacity suggests under-estimation is likely as was the case with the previous housing developments which were not properly accounted for in terms of school capacity.

Anne Petrie (00196/1/001); George Brown (00436/1/001); Mr & Mrs W Melville (00416/1/001): Objecting to site H8: Hatton Road is unsuitable as the access; requires land purchase to allow road widening; Ballo Burn is an identified flood risk and the road would have to be heightened to accommodate a culvert thus increasing the flood risk to neighbouring properties. Due to site levels the alternative access from Perth Road would require screening to be provided to protect amenity of neighbouring properties. Detrimental visual impact and should be left as green open space area.

D & I Buchan (00300/1/001): Owners of site H8 have not been approached by any builders or developers and do not have intentions to develop the site in the foreseeable future.

Dr David Booth (00316/1/001): Objecting to allocation of site H8: there are more suitable areas for development within the village and environs; site is rural, open backland and not within the village envelope; site is raised and development would result in loss of privacy for existing houses; existing undeveloped housing sites and identification of larger areas for housing which can be more efficiently serviced would better meeting the housing land requirement; concerns about ability of local infrastructure - specifically school and healthcare - to provide for a larger population.

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/8/001): Site H8 should be retained as open space as it contributes to village character, it is adjacent to the conservation area, and it is well used for recreation. If the housing allocation is retained more thought as to site access is required - access from Perth Road should be relatively manageable but access via Hatton Road may raise safety and flooding issues.

Abernethy H9

Angus MacIntyre (00208/1/002): Information relating to the primary school is inaccurate. Site specific developer requirement relating to primary school capacity suggests under-estimation is likely as was the case with the previous housing developments which were not properly accounted for in terms of school capacity.

Dinah Morren (00139/1/001); Wendy McKerchar (00089/1/001); Margaret Shaw (00192/1/001); Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/9/001); Douglas, Christina & Jennifer Cleeton (00372/1/001): Object to development of site H9 for the following reasons: would be too dense, site not big enough for 16 houses; country site with narrow busy roads and limited passing places for agricultural vehicles; query whether the drainage system can accommodate proposal; additional housing will create parking difficulties and adversely affect quiet nature of area; concern over loss of green space; proximity to conservation area; will create capacity problems at the school and other local infrastructure.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/32/001): Site H9 is in or adjacent to the functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk and as such part of the site may not

therefore be suitable for development. Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (Core_Doc_059), National Planning Framework (Core_Doc_020).

Culverted section of Nethy Burn possibly runs through the site. Inclusion of developer requirement to remove the culvert would restore the water environment to its natural state in keeping with the Council's duties as a responsible authority under the Water Environment and Water Services (Scotland) Act 2003 (Core_Doc_102).

Abernethy H10

Angus MacIntyre 00208/1/003): Information relating to the primary school is inaccurate. Site specific developer requirement relating to primary school capacity suggests under-estimation is likely as was the case with the previous housing developments which were not properly accounted for in terms of school capacity.

Mr & Mrs E D Manos (00505/1/001): Removal of further green areas would erode sense of place and further decline of town centre, amenities and identity; loss of views of open space which contribute to village character; loss of residential amenity and use of site for walking etc; adverse impact on biodiversity; soil disturbance creating dust etc causing negative health impacts; accentuate existing water pressure problems; increase traffic with associated traffic management issues; lack of school capacity; impact on the character of the conservation area; and increase land drainage issues if further soft ground is lost.

The Rennie Family Trust (09052/5/001): Site H10 is not physically well suited for development; constrained by the railway line and A913 where residential amenity could be adversely impacted by noise. Development would be prominent and difficult to integrate without undue physical impact. Concerns about future school capacity, lack of local employment opportunities and poor local bus service suggest further housing allocations are inappropriate.

Muir Homes Ltd (09035/2/001): Support for the Plan

Abernethy H11

Andy Proctor (00114/1/001); Angus MacIntyre (00208/1/004); The Rennie Family Trust (09052/5/002): Objecting to site H11 for some or all of these reasons: 50 units is too dense; concerns over the school capacity; lack of local employment opportunities and poor local bus service; site H11 is physically not well suited for development and would result in the loss of an attractive rural edge to village. Adopted Perth Area Local Plan (Core_Doc_003).

Branston Ltd (09022/3/001): The southern part of site H11 is not available for housing development. Site boundary should therefore be altered to reflect the ownership and intention of the owners to expand their existing business. There is no objection to the remainder of H11 being allocated for housing.

NOTE - there is confusion in representations 09052/5/001 and 09052/5/002 between sites H10 and H11 however, it is highlighted all points are responded to in the 'summary of responses by planning authority' section.

Abernethy new sites

Yeoman McAllister Architects (09099/1/001 & 09099/2/001): It is considered there is demand for more than the 132 houses allocated in the LDP and the proposed sites could be constrained for various reasons. Site at land east of Southfield shown on submitted

plan and the site at Midfield are both unconstrained and would meet any immediate housing shortfall.

Duncan Scott (09389/4/001): H10 requires two accesses in line with Designing Streets (Core_Doc_014); a single access off the roundabout would create a cul-de-sac contrary to guidance. Other access points are constrained. Addition of the land at Thorn Bank to H10 (as shown on submitted plan) offers scope for provision of an access and the opportunity to increase the number of units on the site. Resulting boundary for the enlarged H10 would also provide a more satisfactory settlement boundary by incorporating the existing buildings at Glendale.

NOTE - assumed that references to H11 in the representation should read H10.

Forgandenny settlement

William Thomson (09289/16/001): Support for the settlement boundary as proposed.

Forgandenny H22

James Ogilvie Gray (00141/1/001); Sheila Douglas (00321/1/001); K Duguid (00485/1/001): H22 is an unsuitable, other gaps sites and brownfield sites are better; contrary to brownfield first policy; its development would cause transport problems in County Place.

Elizabeth Matthews (00471/1/001); Mr & Mrs J Leggate (00510/1/001); M Gray (00443/1/001); T Marlow (00690/1/001); Earn Community Council (09922/1/001); Mr & Mrs Ptak (00259/1/001); Mr & Mrs Rose (00260/1/001); Geo P Taylor (00317/1/001); Trevor Abell (00238/1/001); David Willington (00323/1/001); Thomas M McDonald (00211/1/001); Trevor Goody (00417/1/001); Irene Morrison (00418/1/001); Felicity Legge (00365/1/001); Philip Segaud (00362/1/001); Kathleen Taylor (00486/1/001); Charles Wemyss (00602/1/001); Alison Anderson (00619/1/001); Danny Ternent (00697/1/001); Sue Ternent (00696/1/001); Alexandra McLaughlan (00694/1/001); David McLaughlan (00693/1/001); K Harker (00691/1/001); Elizabeth & Mary Rose Reville (00687/1/001); Jessie Brown (00681/1/001); Chris Williams (00730/1/001); Neil Campbell (00861/1/001); Ian Dunsire (00692/1/002); Alison Leeper (00577/1/001); Councillor Alan Jack (03030/1/002): Objecting to site H22 for some or all of the following: development would adversely impact on the character of the village; too dense; would affect setting of a conservation area; is subject to flooding; would remove a flood plain which protects Forgandenny; loss of prime agricultural land; local infrastructure including drainage and school at capacity; poor local public transport; could not be sustained in employment terms by the village; H22 access to Kinnauld Road and County Place is too narrow and there would be a dangerous increase in traffic for other road users including horse riders; there are bats and red squirrels; broadband services are already stretched. There are other brownfield sites within the village Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147).

Proposed link road should be opposite Strathallan School entrance.

Ronald Archer (00472/1/001): Site subject to flooding; H22 is part of a natural flood plain which protects Forgandenny. Respondent suggests that the terms of a historic legal covenant prevent H22 from coming forward for development.

Alexander Hamilton (00527/1/001): Site forms no natural extension to the village and the two phase proposal makes clear further expansion westwards is planned over open fields with no natural boundary. H22 is prime agricultural land; site is subject to frequent

flooding; local primary school is over capacity and public transport is poor; local water and drainage infrastructure is inadequate. There are better brownfield sites within the village (Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147)). The development would be out of character with the village.

Mr & Mrs Gray (00099/1/001): H22 outside the village boundary on prime agricultural land; development too dense, out of character and impact on the landscape and views, it will also impact on sunlight. No employment in Forgandenny to support the development and local amenities are insufficient, school is already at capacity. Access roads are subject to flooding and the water and sewage infrastructure are inadequate. The respondent considers that they were not notified during discussions in 2009.

David Nichol (00318/1/001); Mr & Mrs G McLaren (00677/1/001); Robert & Lynda Jones (00319/1/001); S W Marlow (00835/1/001): Objecting to H22 for all or some of the following: the site is outside of the village on prime agricultural land SPP paragraph 97 (S4_Doc_108) ; edge of a conservation area; site is subject to frequent flooding Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (Core_Doc_059), SPP paragraph 204 Flood Risk Framework (S4_Doc_109) ; no local employment to support the site; local amenities are inadequate, the school is over capacity and public transport is poor; the local water and drainage infrastructure is inadequate. There are better brownfield sites within the village; other sites identified in the Draft Local Plan Dec 2004 (VH22 and V47) (S4_Doc_241) have been ignored as have MIR site 430. The development would be out of character with the village and would affect listed buildings contrary to SPP (Core_Doc_048) and Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP), policy 9, Dec 2011 (Core_Doc_026). The link road would be better running along the front of Strathallan School Gates. The village will be over populated.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/36/001): This site is located in or adjacent to the functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. As such, part of the site may not be suitable for development. A small watercourse flows along the southern boundary of the development site. The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (Core_Doc_059), National Planning Framework (2009, paragraph 177) (S4_Doc_258)

Dach Planning (09078/1/001): Supports H22, compatible with the neighbouring land use and development in this location would represent a logical approach to the settlement strategy for Forgandenny. New homes will help to sustain the community and local businesses.

Forgandenny new sites

Mr & Mrs Gray (00099/1/002): Site number 430 Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147) north and west of Strathallan School is mostly brownfield and is to the north of the village where it will have no visual impact from the B935 and would not have much visual disturbance to the school.

Mr & Mrs Gray (00099/1/003): Site 432 Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147) is considered to be the logical extension to Forgandenny offering the opportunity to link the northern side of the village to the southern end and the community hall. The site has excellent access and is big enough to accommodate the housing proposed on site H22. A new road could also be added to ease the tight access into Kinnaird Road and enabling future development of further sites within.

A & J Stephen (Builders) Ltd (03068/13/001): The 2.4ha site, on the southern side of Forgandenny Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147) represents the

most logical extension to the village and will help maintain and enhance existing services. Landscaping along the southern and eastern boundaries will provide strong containment of the site. Although the Proposed LDP allows for frontage development along the B935 a better solution would be the identification of this site allowing for creation of a through route from the main road to Kinnaird Road. The site owner also owns land opposite the village hall and he will be making a separate submission regarding an alternative location for the provision of car parking to serve the village hall.

Alexander Hamilton (00527/1/002): Wants to see site 432 (Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147)) from the MIR (located to the south-east of the village of Forgandenny) identified as the preferred site for future housing in the village and included in the LDP. Site 432 is most logical extension to Forgandenny, complimenting the rural characteristics of the village, and is contained within the existing village by Kinnaird Road to the west and the B935 to the north. It provides a natural limit to the village by the rising terrain to the south-east and existing field boundary and proposed planting. Site 432 is not prime agricultural land and is used for permanent rough grazing.

Alexander Hamilton (00527/1/003): Site H22 favoured because it can provide additional parking for the village hall and a new through route from the main B935 road joining with County Place preventing a cul-de sac type development. Site 432 can do this and better. A & J Stephens have proposed a new through route from the B935 joining with Kinnaird Road and parking could be on site 431 opposite the village hall. Propose that a portion of this field can be acquired by the Council as part of any future planning approval at zero cost to provide the required parking for the hall (subject to contract). Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147)

Glenfarg settlement

Councillor Michael Barnacle (02633/1/028): Support for the Plan

Glenfarg H23

Shell UK Ltd (09313/3/004): Welcome the recognition of the pipeline consultation zone but wish the HSE re-consulted on the development of the site to ensure that there are no conflicting issues.

A & J Stephen (Builders) Ltd (03068/9/001): Support for the Plan

BP North Sea Infrastructure (09994/4/001): Support for the Plan

New Landward Site

Andrew Sinclair (00904/1/001): Site on submitted plan should be included within the Dron village area as suitable for housing. Additional housing would add to the village and help create a community; area appears to be a natural extension of the existing housing.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Aberargie settlement

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/4/001): Settlement boundary at Aberargie should remain as existing and not extend south of Main Road.

Abernethy settlement

Angus MacIntyre (00208/1/001): Population figure for Abernethy needs to be corrected - likely to be nearer 1350-1500.

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/7/001 & 09215/5/001): Para 5.4.1 should contain correct population figure - should be nearer 2000. Para 5.4.2 should be amended - school extension only due to commence in April 2012.

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/6/001 & 09215/7/001): Population of Abernethy should be corrected. Site specific developer requirement for H8, H9, H10 and H11: 'This site may require to be phased to ensure sufficient space is available in the primary school' should also be referred to in paragraph 5.4.3.

Abernethy E4

Andy Proctor (00114/2/001): Site E4 should be retained for housing.

Branston Ltd (09022/3/002): Site E4 should be extended northwards into part of proposed site H11 as shown on submitted plans. E4 schedule on p.86 should be amended to reflect the increased site size.

Lewis Bowers (00676/1/001): Triangular area of trees on the west side of Site E4 (adjacent to Newhaven and St Brides) should be retained as it is.

Abernethy H8

Anne Petrie (00196/1/001); D & I Buchan (00300/1/001); Dr David Booth (00316/1/001); Mr & Mrs W Melville (00416/1/001); George Brown (00436/1/001): Not stated but assumed that site H8 should be deleted from the Plan; site should be left as open space.

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/8/001): Site H8 should be retained as open space. Should the housing allocation be retained more thought is required as to site access.

Abernethy H9

Dinah Morren (00139/1/001); Wendy McKerchar (00089/1/001); Margaret Shaw (00192/1/001): Not stated but assumed site H9 should be deleted from the Plan.

Douglas, Christina & Jennifer Cleeton (00372/1/001): Site H9 should be deleted from the Plan for housing and instead designated as 'Green Belt'.

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/9/001): Site H9 should be retained as open space. If the housing allocation is retained the number of housing should be reduced.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/32/001): A flood risk assessment should be included as a site specific developer requirement which specifies that no built development should take place on the functional floodplain or within an area of known flood risk. A feasibility study to assess the potential for channel restoration by removing the culvert should be included as a site specific developer requirement.

Abernethy H10

Mr & Mrs E D Manos (00505/1/001); The Rennie Family Trust (09052/5/001): Site H10 should be deleted from the Plan.

Abernethy H11

Andy Proctor (00114/1/001): Number of units on site H11 should be reduced.

Branston Ltd (09022/3/001): Boundary of site H11 should be reduced to exclude the southern part of the site as shown on submitted plans. H11 schedule on p.86 should be amended to reflect the reduced site size and residential capacity (30 units suggested).

The Rennie Family Trust (09052/5/002): Site H11 should be deleted from the Plan.

Abernethy new sites

Yeoman McAllister Architects (09099/1/001): Land east of Southfield, Abernethy should be allocated for residential as shown on submitted plan.

Yeoman McAllister Architects (09099/2/001): Land west of Midfield, Abernethy should be allocated for residential as shown on submitted plan.

Duncan Scott (09389/4/001): Site at Thorn Bank, Abernethy adjacent to site H10, as shown on submitted plan, should be included within the settlement boundary and allocated for housing.

NOTE - assumed that references to H11 in the representation should read H10.

Forgandenny H22

James Ogilvie Gray (00141/1/001): Delete site H22 from Plan and replace with a more appropriate site e.g. 430, 431 or 432 (MIR references) Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147).

Sheila Douglas (00321/1/001); T Marlow (00690/1/001); Elizabeth Matthews (00471/1/001); Ronald Archer (00472/1/001); M Gray (00443/1/001); Mr & Mrs J Leggate (00510/1/001); K Duguid (00485/1/001); Earn Community Council (09922/1/001): Delete H22 and replace with a brownfield site or alternative sites in the village - possibly former quarry site, site down Station Road or sites within the (unextended) village boundary.

Alexander Hamilton (00527/1/001); Mr & Mrs Gray (00099/1/001); Mr & Mrs Ptak (00259/1/001); Mr & Mrs Rose (00260/1/001); Geo P Taylor (00317/1/001); David Nichol (00318/1/001); Robert & Lynda Jones (00319/1/001); David Willington (00323/1/001); Thomas M McDonald (00211/1/001); Trevor Goody (00417/1/001); Irene Morrison (00418/1/001); Philip Segaud (00362/1/001); Kathleen Taylor (00486/1/001); Charles Wemyss (00602/1/001); Alison Anderson (00619/1/001); Danny Ternent (00697/1/001); Sue Ternent (00696/1/001); Alexandra McLaughlan (00694/1/001); David McLaughlan (00693/1/001); K Harker (00691/1/001); Elizabeth & Mary Rose Reville (00687/1/001); Jessie Brown (00681/1/001); Mr & Mrs G McLaren (00677/1/001); Councillor Alan Jack (03030/1/002); Chris Williams (00730/1/001); S W Marlow (00835/1/001); Neil Campbell (00861/1/001): Delete site H22 from the Plan.

Trevor Abell (00238/1/001); Felicity Legge (00365/1/001): Delete H22 and retain previous development boundary.

Ian Dunsire (00692/1/002): Delete H22 and extend the present conservation area.

Alison Leeper (00577/1/001): Reduce H22 density.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/36/001): 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.

Forgandenny new sites

Mr & Mrs Gray (00099/1/002): Include site number 430 north and west of Strathallan School in the Plan Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147).

Mr & Mrs Gray (00099/1/003): Add site number 432 land to the east of Kinnaird road into the Plan Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147).

A & J Stephen (Builders) Ltd (03068/13/001): Add a site to the Plan west of Kinnaird Road and south of Kinnaird Place/B935 in Forgandenny.

Alexander Hamilton (00527/1/002): Inclusion of new site (432 MIR reference) to replace H22 Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147).

Alexander Hamilton (00527/1/003): Identification of new site for parking, site 431 (MIR reference).

Glenfarg H23

Shell UK Ltd (09313/3/004): HSE wish to be re-consulted on the specific proposal to ensure that there are no conflicting issues.

New Landward Site

Andrew Sinclair (00904/1/001): Site on submitted plan should be included within the Dron village area as suitable for housing.

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.

Aberargie settlement

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/4/001): The extension of the boundary southwards allow the area to be considered under the terms of Policy RD1 (S4_Doc_405) which would allow certain types of development compatible with the residential nature of the area. Currently the settlement lies on the north side of the Abernethy Road and appears urbanised with street lighting, maintained open space, and a speed limit. The Plan proposes to guide development to the south side of the road therefore allowing balanced growth during the Plan period. The boundary does not reflect any natural features and a village boundary will have to be created through development. The boundary has been drawn as part of a strategy of allowing small scale development in the smaller settlements.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/5/001): The primary school extension at Abernethy is underway to deal with the increased housing need, financial contributions will be required in line with the Council's policy.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Abernethy settlement

Angus MacIntyre (00208/1/001); Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/6/001):

The population quoted reflects the 2001 census. It is accepted that it has increased since then, unfortunately the results of the 2010 census are not yet available but it is estimated that the population is around 1470.

It is not considered necessary to amend paragraph 5.4.2 as proposed as the school extension works have commenced and at the time of the Plan's publication will have been completed, prior to the adoption of the Plan. The sentence is therefore accurate.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/7/001): The proposed modification to paragraph 5.4.3 to take account of the site specific developer requirement regarding phasing to take account of the primary school would be duplication and is not necessary.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Abernethy E4

Andy Proctor (00114/2/001): A small part of E4 was allocated for housing in the Perth Area Local Plan 1995 (Core_Doc_003). The site adjacent to E4 is currently in employment use and there is a current planning permission pertaining to E4 for storage. The employment site is considered necessary to support local employment and the sustainability of the community, and adequate housing had been allocated within the settlement for the future housing needs during the Plan period. It is worth noting the landowner in representation 09022/3/002 supports the allocation and seeks a small extension to it which is dealt with below.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Branston Ltd (09022/3/002): The proposed allocation of E4 was considered adequate at the time of publication to support the expansion of the current business. The landowner has submitted their representation that in order for their business to continue and expand E4 needs to be enlarged.

If to facilitate the viable economic expansion of the current business the Reporter is so desired the Council would have no objection to the proposed modification increasing the site size to include the southern part of the site H11 for employment use and updating the Plan to reflect this.

Lewis Bowers (00676/1/001): As stated in the representation the established trees planted provide screening for the neighbouring residential area to the west from the business use, this could be dealt with during any planning application process and is not considered necessary to be stated in the Plan.

If the Reporter is minded the Council would have no objection to the requirement to retain the trees as a developer requirement.

Abernethy H8

Anne Petrie (00196/1/001); D & I Buchan (00300/1/001); Dr David Booth (00316/1/001); Mr & Mrs W Melville (00416/1/001); George Brown (00436/1/001): Abernethy does not lie within the Perth Core Area. Consequently, the allocation is in line with the LDP's strategy of identifying small scale development sites in villages out with the core. The site is within the LDP settlement boundary as proposed. The primary school capacity is currently being enlarged and any future lack of capacity in the school provision at the time of the

submission of a planning application will be dealt with by the education contributions policy. Scottish water has not made any representations on the proposal. SEPA has not made a representation regarding this site and it is not in a known area of flood risk however, due to its proximity to the burn the developer requirements suggest a flood risk assessment. The site is raised and the issues this presents will be dealt with during the planning process once a planning application is submitted.

With respect to the landowners not having been approached by developers this may be the case but the Plan should prepare for the future and this is therefore not of relevance.

No modification is proposed for the Plan.

Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/8/001): H8 is considered an appropriate infill site to meet housing need and should therefore be retained. H8 is separated from the conservation area by the main road. Whilst the Council considers that access can be dealt with through the planning application process if the Reporter was so minded the Council would have no objection to the access being revised in the developer requirements in the Plan to provide access from Perth Road and to investigate potential access from Hatton Road and allow access to the west to facilitate future development.

Abernethy H9

Dinah Morren (00139/1/001); Wendy McKerchar (00089/1/001); Margaret Shaw (00192/1/001); Douglas, Christina & Jennifer Cleeton (00372/1/001); Abernethy & District Community Council (09215/9/001): H9 is a continued housing allocation (H40) from the Perth Area Local Plan 1995 (Core_Doc_003) and is not currently designated as open space. The landowner has been contacted and wishes it to remain available as a housing site. The proposed development density is within the medium density range identified in paragraph 4.3.13 of the Plan (S4_Doc_498). It reflects the density of existing neighbouring development and attempts to make the best use of the site.

The site is close to the main road and a modest scale of development can be accommodated with careful design so as not to exacerbate problems with the narrow road network. The site has not previously been identified as open space, and is separated by the main road from the conservation area.

The primary school capacity is currently being enlarged and any future lack of capacity in the school provision at the time of the submission of a planning application will be dealt with by the education contributions policy. Scottish Water has not made a representation regarding this site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/32/001): The site is not within an identified flood risk area but due to its proximity to the risk area the proposed modification can be considered acceptable. It is noted though the Council feel that Policy EP2 (S4_Doc_407) would allow for a flood risk assessment to be requested in appropriate circumstances and Policy EP3D (S4_Doc_428) would ensure the restoration of natural watercourses. Both of these policies will ensure no new development is at risk of flooding or would increase flooding to existing areas.

If the Reporter was so desired the Council would have no objection to the proposed modifications to the Site Specific Developer Requirements requiring a specification to the Flood Risk Assessment requirement that no build development should take place on a

functional flood plain, and a feasibility study regarding the channel restoration by removing the culvert be included.

Abernethy H10

Mr & Mrs E D Manos (00505/1/001); The Rennie Family Trust (09052/5/001): Site H10 is considered to be a logical extension to the settlement and creates a solid settlement boundary around it. Its development will also contribute to improving the gateway entrance to the settlement from the east. The site is not currently designated as open space. The site is not adjacent to the conservation area and will have little impact on the character of the conservation area. There is no justification that the site will lead to further decline of the town centre or amenities. The increase in traffic associated with development will be limited as the site is accessed from the main road. The issue of school capacity has been dealt with in earlier responses above. The issue of soil disturbance creating dust can be controlled through the planning application process.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Abernethy H11

Andy Proctor (00114/1/001); The Rennie Family Trust (09052/5/002): H11 will help to create a more attractive eastern village boundary as well as improve the gateway entrance to the settlement. The site is physically suitable for development and the density proposed is at the upper end of the Medium density range in paragraph 4.3.13 of the Plan (S4_Doc_498) which is considered appropriate in this location. The site is to provide a mix of housing including low cost therefore the upper end of the Medium density range proposed is appropriate to accommodate these typically smaller housing units and reducing the numbers would not make the best use of the site.

The primary school capacity is currently being enlarged and any future lack of capacity in the school provision at the time of the submission of a planning application will be dealt with by the education contributions policy.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Branston Ltd (09022/3/001): H11 is considered appropriate for housing however if to facilitate the viable economic expansion of the current business the Reporter was so desired the Council would have no objection to the proposed modification reducing the site size to exclude the southern part of the site and updating the Plan to reflect this; site capacity would have to be adjusted to reflect the smaller site area.

Abernethy New Sites

Yeoman McAllister Architects (09099/1/001): This site is outside the settlement boundary and would therefore be an extension to the settlement; the Council is not seeking to recommend any further extension of the settlement. Currently its inclusion is not considered appropriate but this may be reconsidered in a future Plan.

No evidence is submitted of more housing demand than that allocated or of the sites being constrained. The level of expansion proposed is in line with primary school capacity during the life of this Plan and the market is unlikely to sustain a greater level of growth.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Yeoman McAllister Architects (09099/2/001): This small site is not considered appropriate for allocation; there are physical constraints due to the narrow access which has poor visibility.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Duncan Scott (09389/4/001): This site is outside the settlement boundary and would therefore be an extension to the settlement; the Council is not seeking to recommend any further extension of the settlement. It's considered there is enough housing land allocated in this settlement and the addition of this site is unlikely to increase the housing land supply during the life of this Plan. The level of expansion proposed is in line with primary school capacity during the life of this Plan and the market is unlikely to sustain a greater level of growth.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Forgandenny H22

James Ogilvie Gray (00141/1/001): As highlighted above in the last two responses MIR sites 430, 431 and 432 Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147) are not suitable for development. Site H22 should be retained in order to meet the required housing land supply in the settlement.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Sheila Douglas (00321/1/001); T Marlow (00690/1/001); Elizabeth Matthews (00471/1/001); Ronald Archer (00472/1/001); M Gray (00443/1/001); Mr & Mrs J Leggate (00510/1/001); K Duguid (00485/1/001); Earn Community Council (09922/1/001); Alexander Hamilton (00527/1/001); Mr & Mrs Gray (00099/1/001); Mr & Mrs Ptak (00259/1/001); Mr & Mrs Rose (00260/1/001); Geo P Taylor (00317/1/001); David Nichol (00318/1/001); Robert & Lynda Jones (00319/1/001); David Willington (00323/1/001); Thomas M McDonald (00211/1/001); Trevor Goody (00417/1/001); Irene Morrison (00418/1/001); Philip Segaud (00362/1/001); Kathleen Taylor (00486/1/001); Charles Wemyss (00602/1/001); Alison Anderson (00619/1/001); Danny Ternent (00697/1/001); Sue Ternent (00696/1/001); Alexandra McLaughlan (00694/1/001); David McLaughlan (00693/1/001); K Harker (00691/1/001); Elizabeth & Mary Rose Reville (00687/1/001); Jessie Brown (00681/1/001); Mr & Mrs G McLaren (00677/1/001); Councillor Alan Jack (03030/1/002); Chris Williams (00730/1/001); S W Marlow (00835/1/001); Neil Campbell (00861/1/001); Trevor Abell (00238/1/001); Felicity Legge (00365/1/001); Ian Dunsire (00692/1/002); Alison Leeper (00577/1/001): In response to the objections raised regarding site H22:

There are no suitable brownfield sites in the village large enough to meet the required housing needs and therefore site H22 should be retained. H22 is also the most suitable development site.

The site is identified for 30 houses or 22 per hectare. The density proposed for the site is very similar to that of the surrounding housing in Glenearn Park, County Place, Kinnaird Road. This is within the range for medium density for housing development in the plan area shown on the table at page 65 (S4_Doc_502).

The site is class 2 prime land; national policy is that this should not be developed unless it is an essential component of a settlement strategy. As this is the best site for the expansion of the village its development complies with national guidance.

There is a small watercourse on the southern boundary of the site which runs parallel with County Place then between the properties on Glenearn Park and County Place before running through the grounds of Strathallan School and eventually into the Earn. The watercourse does not feature on SEPA's flood risk maps.

Forgandenny does not lie within the Perth Core Area. Consequently, the allocation is in line with the LDP's strategy of identifying small scale development sites in villages out with the core. The village does have a post office shop, village hall, recreation facilities and bus service as services. Any lack of capacity in the school provision at the time of the submission of a planning application will be dealt with by the education contributions policy. Scottish Water has not made any representations on the proposal.

The site is part of a large flat field on the west boundary of the village. Apart from the village hall (a former free kirk) which is C listed development adjoining the site is relatively recent, Glenearn Park having been developed through identification in the Perth Area Local Plan 1995 (Core_Doc_003). The site contains no features which are worthy of retention, and it forms a logical extension to the village.

The site can be accessed from the B935 and there is a requirement for a link to be provided to County Place. Topography and the line of the road means that it will be more difficult to achieve good access for a development site on the east side of the village.

No modification is proposed to the plan.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/36/001): The site is not within the identified flood risk area but due to its proximity to the risk area the proposed modification is considered acceptable. This ensures no new development is at risk of flooding or would increase flooding to existing areas.

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

Forgandenny new sites

Mr & Mrs Gray (00099/1/002): Site 430 Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147) is highly prominent particularly from the roads on the north side of the Earn and the Glasgow/Aberdeen/Inverness railway it will also change the form of the village pulling it further northwards to a location that has no good linkages with the existing village and consists of mainly of property associated with Strathallen School. The site can not be considered as brownfield and is not a suitable site for development during the life of this Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mr & Mrs Gray (00099/1/003); A & J Stephen (Builders) Ltd (03068/13/001); Alexander Hamilton (00527/1/002) : Site 432 Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147) is partly shown within the settlement boundary indicating that it does have some development potential. However extending further south would require development on the more prominent slopes which would then dominate and be out of keeping with the character of the rest of the village. The site can not be considered as brownfield. Regarding site 431 Forgandenny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147) proposed for car parking it lies within the conservation area and its retention as open space is important to its character and setting it should therefore not be developed for

buildings or car parking.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Alexander Hamilton (00527/1/003): Site 431 Forgandeny pre-MIR Site Assessments (Core_Doc_147) lies within the conservation area and its retention as open space is important to its character and setting it should therefore not be developed for buildings or car parking.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Glenfarg H23

Shell UK Ltd (09313/3/004): The settlement is clearly shown as a pipeline consultation zone in the Plan. Any planning application within an HSE pipeline consultation zone goes through the PAHDI process during its consideration so it is not felt there is any need to repeat that in the Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However, if the Reporter is so minded the Council have no objection to adding a Site Specific Developer Requirement advising developers that the HSE be re-consulted on the development of the site at planning application stage to ensure that there are no conflicting issues.

New Landward Site

Andrew Sinclair (00904/1/001): The Plan does not show the smaller settlements nor include settlement boundaries on such small settlements as Dron. In line with this the Plan does not allocate development sites in these small settlement but where development can be accommodated it will be determined through the planning application process and covered by the Housing in the Countryside policy.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Reporter's conclusions:

Preliminary Matters

1. TAYplan sets the strategic framework for the Proposed Plan and identifies the Perth Core Area as being the location for the majority of development in the Perth Housing Market Area. Policy 1: Location Priorities identifies the hierarchy composed of 3 tiers within each of which a sequential approach to prioritising land release whether for residential or other uses must be adopted. The policy allows for some development in settlements which are not defined as principal settlements but only where this can be accommodated and supported by the settlement. In rural areas (i.e. outside of boundaries of settlements) the release of land must genuinely contribute to the objectives of TAYplan and meet specific local needs or support regeneration of the local economy.
2. Policy 5: Housing of TAYplan at its subsection C states a presumption against land release in areas surrounding the Perth Core Area where that would prejudice the delivery of any of the Strategic Development Areas. These are identified in Table 1: Strategic Development Areas of Policy 4: Strategic Development Areas.
3. Applying that policy framework to Issue 26c it is concluded that:
 - A release on any one of Abergardie, Abernethy and Forgandenny would not prejudice the delivery of any of the Strategic Development Areas identified in Table

- 1: Strategic Development Areas which is incorporated within Policy 4 of TAYplan.
- None of the settlements referred to is identified a principal settlement in TAYplan i.e. falls within Tier 1, or Tier 2, or Tier 3.
- It has been established elsewhere in this report that there is sufficient land allocated to deliver the housing requirements of TAYplan within, or on the edge of, principal settlements.

4. With these conclusions in mind, the critical tests to be applied to each of proposed land releases referred to in this Issue are:

- For proposals within established settlement boundaries whether the release could be accommodated and supported by the settlement.
- For proposals outwith established settlement boundaries the release of land genuinely could contribute to the objectives of TAYplan and meet specific local needs or support regeneration of the local economy.
- Whether there are any other material considerations which would justify setting aside these strategic policy considerations to accommodate the strategy of the Proposed Plan to allocate limited growth to those settlements with a range of facilities capable of serving local needs.

Aberargie Settlement

5. All of the built up area of Aberargie is located to the north of the Abernethy Road. The settlement is composed of housing, it has no land allocated for employment uses, and it has no facilities to support any further residential development. Accordingly, there is no justification for the considerable realignment which is proposed and the settlement boundary should be modified to that delineated within the adopted Perth Area Local Plan

Forgandenny Settlement

6. There are numerous features which do not run in favour of the allocation at H22. In particular, the council refers to a need for housing at Forgandenny but does not provide any justification for that statement let alone the reasoning adopted to underpin the estimate of 30 units to be provided in the vicinity of County Place. It has been established elsewhere in this report that there is sufficient land allocated to deliver the housing requirements of TAYplan within, or on the edge of, principal settlements. Forgandenny is not a principal settlement. Accordingly, it would run contrary to the requirements of TAYplan if the Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan were to draw the boundaries of Forgandenny simply in order to make room for an additional housing allocation.

7. The council has acknowledged that community facilities are limited to a village hall and school. It has not provided any evidence to support a view that the proposed allocation could be accommodated and supported by the settlement. A land release for housing would increase rather than reduce the need to travel to access services. The proposal requires a release of land outside the established built up area into open countryside. That release would not work with the grain of the established settlement and, hence, it would be contrary to Policy 2 of TAYplan: Shaping better quality places.

Abernethy Settlement

8. In the absence of small area statistics from the 2011 Census the council has estimated the population of the settlement at around 1470 and this requires a modification to paragraph 5.4.1. A site inspection confirmed that the primary school

extension is far advanced. Accordingly, there is no need for a modification to either paragraph 5.4.2 or paragraph 5.4.3.

Abernethy H8

9. The owners of the land allocated as H8 state that *“At the present time there is no thought for this proposal to go ahead in the foreseeable future.”* In response the council states *“With respect to the landowners not having been approached by developers this may be the case but the Plan should prepare for the future and this is therefore not of relevance.”*

10. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) at paragraph 72 states that *“Local development plans should allocate land on a range of sites which is effective or capable of becoming effective to meet the housing land requirement up to year 10 from the predicted year of adoption, ensuring a minimum of 5 years effective land supply at all times.”* The Glossary makes it clear that *“the effective housing land supply is the part of the established housing land supply which is free or expected to be free of development constraints in the period under consideration, and will therefore be available for the construction of housing.”*

11. Planning Advice Note 2/2010 confirms that a site is only considered effective where it can be demonstrated that within 5 years it will be free of constraints relating to ownership, physical factors, contamination, deficit funding, marketability, infrastructure provision and land use policy and can be developed for housing.

12. The position of the owners of the land is unequivocal as is the policy of Scottish Ministers. The owners are not willing sellers. It will not be available for the construction of housing in the foreseeable future and, consequently, it cannot be treated as contributing to the effective land supply.

Abernethy H9

13. H9 is a continued housing allocation (H40) from the Perth Area Local Plan 1995. Although that plan is of a considerable vintage there is no evidence to support a conclusion that the site is not effective. In particular, in contrast to the position at H8, the landowner is a willing seller. A development on this site can be accommodated within the settlement. However, the proposed development density of 16 houses to be built out on 0.6 hectares is at the limit of what is appropriate if the new build is to reflect the density of neighbouring development. In the event that a planning application is received, the other matters of concern raised by respondents, including access onto the A913 and the capacity of the primary school, can be dealt with by way of the development management process. The site-specific developer requirements should be modified to take into account the advice from the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA).

Abernethy H10

14. Abernethy is not a principal settlement. It has been established elsewhere in this report that there is sufficient land allocated to deliver the housing requirements of TAYplan within, or on the edge of, principal settlements. Accordingly, it would run contrary to the requirements of TAYplan if the boundaries of Abernethy were to be redrawn simply in order to make room for an additional housing allocation. Taken together, the allocations for H10 and H11 are for an additional 100 houses in a settlement which is not identified in Tier 1, or Tier 2, or Tier 3. The site currently provides an

attractive, well defined rural edge to the settlement in this vicinity which fits well within the existing landscape. Moreover, as the council's estimates confirm, Abernethy has accommodated considerable growth in population over the past 10 years only a small proportion of which can find employment locally. There is considerable commuting from Abernethy to Perth and the allocation of further land for residential development in this vicinity would conflict with the aim of the Plan to decrease rather than increase movements to work, to shop and to access other services.

Abernethy H11 and E4

15. The allocation of site E4 for employment use contributes to a balanced community providing local job opportunities to accompany housing and related facilities within the same settlement. The ownership position, even when related to an aspiration expressed by an existing business is not a sufficient justification to extend E4 into the land allocated for residential development at H11. As far as that proposed allocation is concerned is concerned, there is no overwhelming justification for a large additional allocation of housing land in Abernethy. However, this small settlement has sufficient in the way of a range of facilities capable of serving local needs to justify a small allocation. A way forward is to allocate the 1.5 hectare site at H11 for mixed use. Policy ED1B would then apply thereby promoting the integration of employment generating opportunities with a smaller number than the 50 identified in the Proposed Plan. A decision on the extent of the land required for employment uses, and the number of houses which can be accommodated on the site, as well as the merits of retaining established trees, can be determined by way of the development management process should a planning application come forward.

Abernethy New Sites

16. The land east of Southfield and the land at Thorn Bank both lie outside the established settlement boundary of Abernethy. There is no evidence to support a view that the release of either of these proposed additional allocations of housing land would genuinely contribute to the objectives of TAYplan or meet specific local needs or support regeneration of the local economy.

17. The land west of Midfield is located within the settlement boundary. The respondent's position that a small residential development would "*tidy-up what is currently an oddity in the settlement plan*" can be tested by way of the development management process.

Glenfarg H23

18. In response to a request for further information the council has confirmed that on 4 June 2013 the council received three planning applications for the staged development of 33 houses on H23. Some site investigation works were carried out in advance of the submission. The settlement is shown as a pipeline consultation zone in the Proposed Plan.

New Landward Site

19. An allocation of additional land for housing at Dron in the local development plan cannot be justified. The merits of any proposed development in this vicinity can be assessed by way of the development management process.

Reporter's recommendations:Aberargie

1. Modify the settlement boundary to follow that delineated in the adopted Perth Area Local Plan.

Forgandenny

2. Delete site H22 from the Plan.

Abernethy

3. At paragraph 5.4.1 delete, "*a population of 900*"; insert, "*with an estimated population of around 1470*".
4. Delete site H8 from the Plan.
5. Add to the site-specific requirements at H9 a fifth requirement as follows: "*Flood Risk Assessment and no development should take place on a functional flood plain or within an area of known flood risk.*"
6. Add to the site-specific requirements at H9 a sixth requirement as follows: "*A feasibility study to assess the potential for channel restoration by removing the culvert.*"
7. Delete H10 from the Plan.
8. Delete H11 and replace as a Mixed Use opportunity.

Glenfarg H23

9. Add to the site-specific requirements at H23 a fifth requirement as follows: "*Re-consult the HSE on the development of the site at the planning application stage to ensure that there are no conflicting issues.*"