

Issue 29b		Highland Perthshire Area – West Settlements with Proposals	
Development plan reference:		6.13 – Fearnan, page 179-180 H41 - Fearnan North, page 179 6.17 – Kenmore, page 186-187 H42 - East of Kenmore Primary School, page 186 6.18 – Kinloch Rannoch, page 188-189 E15 - Kinloch Rannoch North, page 188 H43 - Innerhaddon Farm, Kinloch Rannoch, page 188	Reporter: Douglas Hope
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):			
Kenmore & District Community Council (00035) George Wilson (00274) Fraser MacLean (00299) Patricia MacLean (00307) Alistair Halden (00308) Fearnan Village Association (00309) Alex Glynn (00310) Mairi Taylor (00311) Samantha Glynn (00312) D Glynn (00313) Ian Marshall (00314) J Wright (00347) Taymouth Estates Ltd (00369/6) FT Property Investments Ltd (00369/7) C McGregor (00380) Jeanette Hickman (00381) Mary Robb (00383) Patsy Penny (00384) Guy Hickman (00386) Peter McKenzie (00387) G M Carter (00388) Sheila Dunn (00412) Julia Lane (00492)		Graham Liney (00493) Jason Oliver (00494) Alan Paterson (00498) Alison Paterson (00499) Carole Sneddon (00500) Reigh Sneddon (00501) Mr & Mrs Brian Colclough (00518) John Baugh (00519) Elizabeth Baugh (00520) Scottish Natural Heritage (05211) Patricia Timto (00523) Christopher Rowley (00873) Culdess Ecovillage (00945) Fiona Ballantyne (00953) Neil Ballantyne (00954) Strutt and Parker (08651) Mains of Taymouth (09152) Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450) A & J Stephen Ltd (09727) Peter Ely & Christine Sofflet (09958) Susan Gardener (09983) L Lane (10158) Dunalastair Estate (10315)	
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:		Landward settlements in the west of the Highland Housing Market Area with development proposals.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):			
Fearnan Employment Site Alex Glynn (00310/1/002); Mairi Taylor (00311/1/002); Samantha Glynn (00312/1/002); D Glynn (00313/1/002); Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450/1/002); Graham Liney (00493/1/003); Fraser MacLean (00299/1/002); Patricia MacLean (00307/1/002); Sheila Dunn (00412/1/003); Susan Gardener (09983/1/002); Alistair Halden (00308/1/002); Fearnan Village Association (00309/1/002); J Wright (00347/1/002); Jeanette Hickman (00381/1/002); Mary Robb (00383/1/003); Patsy Penny (00384/1/003);			

Guy Hickman (00386/1/003); Peter McKenzie (00387/1/003); Alan Paterson (00498/1/003); Alison Paterson (00499/1/003); Jason Oliver (00494/1/003); Elizabeth Baugh (00520/1/002); Fiona Ballantyne (00953/1/002); Neil Ballantyne (00954/1/002); L Lane (10158/1/002); Julia Lane (00492/1/003): Designation for employment raises concerns regarding noise and activities inappropriate to village. Should be identified for housing or agricultural use eliminating these concerns.

John Baugh (00519/1/002): Been out of use for some time for small business venture however would create traffic issues on Quarry Road if brought back in to use.

Christopher Rowley (00873/1/002): Any new development should be put on hold unless a way can be found to avoid putting further traffic on the Quarry Road.

Fearnan H41

Alex Glynn (00310/1/001); Mairi Taylor (00311/1/001); Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450/1/001); Graham Liney (00493/1/001); Fraser MacLean (00299/1/001); Patricia MacLean (00307/1/001); Sheila Dunn (00412/1/001); Susan Gardener (09983/1/001); Alistair Halden (00308/1/001); Fearnan Village Association (00309/1/001); J Wright (00347/1/001); Jeanette Hickman (00381/1/001); Mary Robb (00383/1/001); Patsy Penny (00384/1/001); Guy Hickman (00386/1/001); Peter McKenzie (00387/1/001); Alan Paterson (00498/1/001); Alison Paterson (00499/1/001); Jason Oliver (00494/1/001); Fiona Ballantyne (00953/1/001); Neil Ballantyne (00954/1/001); L Lane (10158/1/001); Julia Lane (00492/1/001): Redraw the settlement boundary to exclude site H41 and retain current shape of the village. The site is inappropriate as it would use agricultural land expanding the village at the northern end and could open up the land for ribbon development in adjacent fields.

Samantha Glynn (00312/1/001); D Glynn (00313/1/001): Site H41 is inappropriate as it would use agricultural land expanding the village to the north and lead to ribbon development. No infrastructure support for the 20 units such as sewers and drainage. Flooding on site and road. Limited public transport reliance on private car to access doctors, dentists, shops, amenities etc. Would increase carbon dioxide emissions. Access on to single track road would be dangerous and often impassable in winter. A third of properties are already second homes.

Ian Marshall (00314/1/001): Replace H41 with Tomdarrach site (S4_Doc_023) which is currently unsightly vehicle scrap yard. Contentious issue in the village for some time.

C McGregor (00380/1/001): Object to site H41. Would alter settlement boundary and impact on the landscape.

G M Carter (00388/1/001): Considers Tomdarrach (S4_Doc_023) more appropriate site than H41 as would address current residential amenity issues at Tomdarrach.

A & J Stephen Limited (09727/2/001): Remove H41 from the plan as consider site to the west of Fearnan a logical expansion of the village.

Christopher Rowley (00873/1/003): This parcel of land should not be developed as it will increase the use of Quarry Road.

John Baugh (00519/1/001): Support for the Plan. Does not support Tomdarrach site as proposed by Fearnan Village Association on traffic grounds and possible contamination of site as currently used for storage of old vehicles.

Elizabeth Baugh (00520/1/001): Support for the Plan. H41 more suitable for shape of the village and easier to link into necessary services. Does not support use of Tomdarrach as proposed by Fearnan Village Association due to traffic issues.

Patricia Timto (00523/1/002): H41 is most suitable site for development. Opposed to Tomdarrach site as proposed by Fearnan Village Association due to Quarry Road is single lane with no passing places. No development off Quarry Road without costly road reconstruction.

Carole Sneddon (00500/1/001); Reigh Sneddon (00501/1/001): Support for the Plan. H41 is suitable site given location and access. Does not support use of Tomdarrach given traffic, noise and nuisance associated with housing or industry.

Fearnan New sites

Culdess Ecovillage (00945/1/003): Object to H41 which should be part of a larger eco-village scheme. Off grid eco-houses proposed to the west of H41. The representation has submitted further information setting out consultation that has taken place on the eco-village proposal and a masterplan.

Mairi Taylor (00311/1/003); Samantha Glynn (00312/1/003); D Glynn (00313/1/003); Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450/1/003); Graham Liney (00493/1/002); Fraser MacLean (00299/1/003); Patricia MacLean (00307/1/003); Sheila Dunn (00412/1/002); Susan Gardener (09983/1/003); Alistair Halden (00308/1/003); Fearnan Village Association (00309/1/003); J Wright (00347/1/003); Jeanette Hickman (00381/1/003); Mary Robb (00383/1/002); Patsy Penny (00384/1/002); Alex Glynn (00310/1/003); Guy Hickman (00386/1/002); Peter McKenzie (00387/1/002); Jason Oliver (00494/1/002); Fiona Ballantyne (00953/1/003); Neil Ballantyne (00954/1/003); L Lane (10158/1/003); Julia Lane (00492/1/002); C McGregor (00380/1/002): Replace H41 with Tomdarrach site, Quarry Road (S4_Doc_023) for housing development. Currently unofficial vehicle scrap yard which is unsightly and not in keeping with the character of the village. Brownfield site. Would allow for housing development to meet requirements for future development whilst minimising visual impact.

G M Carter (00388/1/002): Considers Tomdarrach (S4_Doc_023) more appropriate site than H41 as would address current residential amenity issues at Tomdarrach. Issues regarding poor management of site at present would consider housing development more appropriate use.

Alan Paterson (00498/1/002); Alison Paterson (00499/1/002): Currently unofficial vehicle scrap yard (S4_Doc_023) which is unsightly and not in keeping with the character of the village. Brownfield site. Would allow for housing development to meet requirements for future development whilst minimising visual impact. Concern regarding whether the vehicle scrap yard would locate elsewhere and whether any powers to prevent this from happening. Increased traffic on Quarry Road would need to be considered.

A & J Stephen Limited (09727/2/002): Promoting a site on the west side of Fearnan (0.6hectares) (S4_Doc_023). Considers it to be the most logical residential opportunity for the extension of the village. Could provide mainstream (75% low density country homes) and affordable housing (25%) totalling approximately 35 units.

Kenmore

Mains of Taymouth (09152/1/001): Planning permission has been granted for a residential and leisure development 05/00878/FUL (S4_Doc_781) including an extension

of the existing golf course at Mains of Taymouth, which should be shown in the Plan. Particularly the site for housing at the western end of the site and the site for a quarry and landfill at the eastern end of the site.

Kenmore & District Community Council (00035/1/001): Important that land around the sports field (S4_Doc_024) is earmarked for recreation and amenities. To protect visual amenity the Conservation Area should be extended to Crannog on the south side and to Dalerb on north side.

Kenmore H42

Taymouth Estates Limited (00369/6/002): Agrees with general principle of H42 allocation within LDP. Seeks changes to wording of the Plan in terms of the expectation of site H42. Seeks an extension to H42 allocation such that a better urban form could be delivered and will ensure that there is sufficient flexibility in land supply and delivery.

Kenmore & District Community Council (00035/1/002): Concern about Kenmore surviving as a sustainable community. Current development within the village has reduced availability of housing for local people. The Community Council's view is that this site should be 100% affordable housing and in terms of structure and design be compatible with the school and the rest of Taymouth Drive.

Peter Ely (09958/1/001): Support if affordable housing to be suitable for families and targeted towards local needs. The structure and design be compatible with the school and Taymouth Drive. Would like to see a development like that recently built in Grandtully (S4_Doc_780) which is considered appropriate.

Kenmore New Sites

FT Property Investments LTD (00369/7/001): Taymouth Castle development creates an element of demand for residential development in the wider Breadalbane area that could be met within Kenmore if sufficient land is allocated.

Properties in and around Kenmore have been lost to the general housing market as individuals acquire properties as a second home/holiday home. Now a recognised lack of affordable housing within the area.

Additional housing opportunities are needed over and above those existing proposed allocations within the Proposed Plan. Development for a parcel of land to the west of the Primary School (S4_Doc_024) for staff accommodation under existing Planning Permission 03/02250/PPLB (S4_Doc_779).

FT Property Investments LTD (00369/7/002): Taymouth Castle development creates an element of demand for residential development in the wider Breadalbane area that could be met within Kenmore if sufficient land is allocated. Properties in and around Kenmore have been lost to the general housing market as individuals acquire properties as a second home/holiday home. Now a recognised lack of affordable housing within the area. Additional housing opportunities are needed over and above those existing proposed allocations within the Proposed Plan. Need to address the issue of imbalance within the settlement through allocation of new family housing including affordable housing (for sale or rent) as well as mainstream housing. Additional housing can make a significant positive impact on local communities through enabling existing families to stay in the area as well as new families and delivery of additional facilities and services. A further housing site at Kenmore South (S4_Doc_024) should be allocated within the Local Development Plan.

Kinloch Rannoch

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/24/005): Development that affects a National Scenic Area should only be permitted where it will not adversely affect the integrity of the area or the qualities for which it has been designated (unless outweighed by benefits of national importance) SPP 2010 (Core_Doc_048). This should be reflected under paragraph 6.18.2.

Kinloch Rannoch E15

George Wilson (00274/1/001): A more appropriate site should be chosen such as the existing employment site. Concern about traffic issues and loss of good quality agricultural site. Kinloch Rannoch has restricted good quality agricultural land and the proposed location is on one of the prime sites with such quality land. Reducing it is considered a waste when other sites of poorer quality land exist.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/24/017): Development that affects a National Scenic Area should only be permitted where it will not adversely affect the integrity of the area or the qualities for which it has been designated (unless outweighed by benefits of national importance) SPP 2010 (Core_Doc_048). This should be reflected in the Site Specific Developer Requirements.

Kinloch Rannoch H43

Strutt & Parker (08651/1/001): Owners are no longer willing to make the site available during this Local Development Plan period.

Mr & Mrs Brian Colclough (00518/1/001): Would request that the site is moved further east as it affect residential amenity of adjacent property and reduce daylight.

Dunalastair Estate (10315/1/001): If this is to be an infill development its boundary should align with existing settlement boundary. Land develops slowly in the area so more than one allocation would not rely on one landowner or one development. Significant opposition to H43 at Main Issues Report stage.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/24/018): Development that affects a National Scenic Area should only be permitted where it will not adversely affect the integrity of the area or the qualities for which it has been designated (unless outweighed by benefits of national importance) SPP 2010 (Core_Doc_048). This should be reflected in the Site Specific Developer Requirements.

Kinloch Rannoch New Site

Dunalastair Estate (10315/1/002): The settlement boundary should be extended in the western part of the village. The principal reason for not selecting site in western part of the village is due to apparent 1:200 year flood risk (S4_Doc_773). The Scottish Environment Protection Agency indicative flood risk map does not take account of flood prevention measures such as the dam directly south of the area proposed. Would consider it to be more sensible to have more than one allocation to meet housing requirements within the village. The landowner has indicated willingness to undertake flood risk assessment.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:Fearnan Employment Site

Alex Glynn (00310/1/002); Mairi Taylor (00311/1/002); Samantha Glynn (00312/1/002); D Glynn (00313/1/002); Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450/1/002); Graham

Liney (00493/1/003); Fraser MacLean (00299/1/002); Patricia MacLean (00307/1/002); Sheila Dunn (00412/1/003); Susan Gardener (09983/1/002); Alistair Halden (00308/1/002); Fearnan Village Association (00309/1/002); J Wright (00347/1/002); Jeanette Hickman (00381/1/002); Mary Robb (00383/1/003); Patsy Penny (00384/1/003); Guy Hickman (00386/1/003); Peter McKenzie (00387/1/003); Alan Paterson (00498/1/003); Alison Paterson (00499/1/003); Jason Oliver (00494/1/003); Elizabeth Baugh (00520/1/002); Fiona Ballantyne (00953/1/002); Neil Ballantyne (00954/1/002); L Lane (10158/1/002); Julia Lane (00492/1/003): Remove employment designation on Quarry Road and re-classify site for housing or agricultural uses.

John Baugh (00519/1/002); Mr Christopher Rowley (00873/1/002): Require that new development should not increase traffic on Quarry Road.

H41: Fearnan North

Alex Glynn (00310/1/001); Mairi Taylor (00311/1/001); Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450/1/001); Graham Liney (00493/1/001); Fraser MacLean (00299/1/001); Patricia MacLean (00307/1/001); Sheila Dunn (00412/1/001); Susan Gardener (09983/1/001); Alistair Halden (00308/1/001); Fearnan Village Association (00309/1/001); J Wright (00347/1/001); Jeanette Hickman (00381/1/001); Mary Robb (00383/1/001); Patsy Penny (00384/1/001); Guy Hickman (00386/1/001); Peter McKenzie (00387/1/001); Alan Paterson (00498/1/001); Alison Paterson (00499/1/001); Jason Oliver (00494/1/001); Fiona Ballantyne (00953/1/001); Neil Ballantyne (00954/1/001); L Lane (10158/1/001); Julia Lane (00492/1/001); Samantha Glynn (00312/1/001); D Glynn (00313/1/001); Ian Marshall (00314/1/001); C McGregor (00380/1/001); G M Carter (00380/1/001); A & J Stephen Limited (09727/2/001); Christopher Rowley (00873/1/003): Remove site from the Plan.

Fearnan New Sites

Culdees Ecovillage (00945/1/003); Designate new site for an eco-village to the north and west of Fearnan including land identified under H41.

Mairi Taylor (00311/1/003); Samantha Glynn (00312/1/003); D Glynn (00313/1/003); Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450/1/003); Graham Liney (00493/1/002); Fraser MacLean (00299/1/003); Patricia MacLean (00307/1/003); Sheila Dunn (00412/1/002); Susan Gardener (09983/1/003); Alistair Halden (00308/1/003); Fearnan Village Association (00309/1/003); J Wright (00347/1/003); Jeanette Hickman (00381/1/003); Mary Robb (00383/1/002); Patsy Penny (00384/1/002); Alex Glynn (00310/1/003); Guy Hickman (00386/1/002); Peter McKenzie (00387/1/002); Jason Oliver (00494/1/002); Fiona Ballantyne (00953/1/003); Neil Ballantyne (00954/1/003); L Lane (10158/1/003); Julia Lane (00492/1/002); C McGregor (00380/1/002); G M Carter (00388/1/002); Alan Patterson (00498/1/002); Alison Paterson (00499/1/002): Designate Tomdarroch site on Quarry Road for housing development.

A & J Stephen Ltd (09727/2/002): Designate new site to the west of Fearnan for residential use.

Kenmore

Mains of Taymouth (09152/1/001): Amend the Plan to show a site for residential and leisure development at Mains of Taymouth.

Kenmore and District Community Council (00035/1/001): Identify a site for sports and amenities and extend the Conservation Area boundary.

Kenmore H42

Taymouth Estates Limited (00369/6/002): Modify the description of development for H42. Amend the site boundary. Modify reference H42 on Page 186 to read:

Ref	Location	Size	Number
H42	East of Primary School	1.6ha	30 houses, 25% affordable, remainder low cost and/or mid market housing

Site Specific Developer Requirements:

- Flood Risk Assessment
- Road access improvements to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority
- Built form and layout should respond appropriately to the landscape and strengthen the character of Kenmore as a distinctive place.
- Enhancement of biodiversity and protection of habitats
- Design to incorporate existing trees

Kenmore 7 District Community Council (00035/1/002); Peter Ely (09958/1/001): Modify reference H42 on Page 186 to require 100% affordable housing.

Modify Site Specific Developer Requirements to include: '*Structure and design to be compatible with the school and the rest of Taymouth Drive.*'

Kenmore New Sites

FT Property Investments LTD (00369/7/001): Identify site for staff accommodation. Proposed entry within the LDP should read:

Ref	Location	Size	Number
	West of Primary School	0.6ha	10 houses

Site Specific Developer Requirements:

- Site to be developed in line with the approved layout/designs as set out in Planning permission 03/02250/PPLB unless otherwise agreed by PKC.

FT Property Investments LTD (00369/7/002): Identify site for residential and associated development at Kenmore South. Proposed entry within LDP should read:

Ref	Location	Size	Number
	Kenmore South	0.2ha	24 houses

Site Specific Developer Requirements:

- A minimum of 25% affordable housing is provided on the site
- At least 50% of the site is developed for lower/mid-market family housing for sale (and permanent residence)
- A masterplan will be required that confirms the range of enhanced local facilities that will be delivered (to include as a minimum visitor parking and relocated public toilets).
- Access to parking for the Sports Ground are included as part of the proposals.
- Additional visitor facilities (including picnic spaces, retail, public toilets) are included as part of the proposals.
- Options for enhancement of Kenmore Square are included in the overall scheme.

Kinloch Rannoch

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/24/005): Insert under 6.18.2 spatial strategy considerations:

"Kinloch Rannoch is located at the east end of Loch Rannoch within the Loch Rannoch and Glen Lyon National Scenic Area"

Kinloch Rannoch E15

George Wilson (00274/1/001): Remove site from the Plan.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/24/017): Amend Developer Requirements to include: *'Built form and layout should respond appropriately to the landscape and strengthen the character of Kinloch Rannoch as a distinctive place'*.

Kinloch Rannoch H43

Strutt & Parker (08651/1/001): Remove site from the Plan.

Mr & Mrs Brian Colclough (00518/1/001): Move or enlarge site further east.

Dunalastair Estate (10315/1/001): Reduce area of H43.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/24/018): Amend Developer Requirements to include: *'Built form and layout should respond appropriately to the landscape and strengthen the character of Kinloch Rannoch as a distinctive place'*.

Kinloch Rannoch New Site

Dunalastair Estate (10315/1/002): Expand settlement boundary in the western part of the village, north of the river (see map submitted with representation).

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:Fearnan Employment Site

Alex Glynn (00310/1/002); Mairi Taylor (00311/1/002); Samantha Glynn (00312/1/002); D Glynn (00313/1/002); Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450/1/002); Graham Liney (00493/1/003); Fraser MacLean (00299/1/002); Patricia MacLean (00307/1/002); Sheila Dunn (00412/1/003); Susan Gardener (09983/1/002); Alistair Halden (00308/1/002); Fearnan Village Association (00309/1/002); J Wright (00347/1/002); Jeanette Hickman (00381/1/002); Mary Robb (00383/1/003); Patsy Penny (00384/1/003); Guy Hickman (00386/1/003); Peter McKenzie (00387/1/003); Alan Paterson (00498/1/003); Alison Paterson (00499/1/003); Jason Oliver (00494/1/003); Elizabeth Baugh (00520/1/002); Fiona Ballantyne (00953/1/002); Neil Ballantyne (00954/1/002); L Lane (10158/1/002); Julia Lane (00492/1/003); John Baugh (00519/1/002); Christopher Rowley (00873/1/002): Whilst there have been no other uses on the site since the closure of the site it is the intention that this designation will encourage other employment uses on to the site. Policy ED1: Employment and Mixed Use areas (S4_Doc_483), part a) sets out criteria for future development which indicates that the use must be compatible with the surrounding land uses and therefore issues of noise and type of development would be considered for any future proposals. It is however acknowledged that with the narrow single track access to this part of the village and the extensive woodland coverage that this site is of limited value as employment land and the site may be considered as non effective.

Should the Reporter be so minded the Council would not object to removal the employment land designation but, would suggest that the site remains in the settlement boundary, thus allowing the consideration of any future planning application to be considered against Policy RD1: Residential Areas (S4_Doc_405).

Fearnan H41

Alex Glynn (00310/1/001); Mairi Taylor (00311/1/001); Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450/1/001); Graham Liney (00493/1/001); Fraser MacLean (00299/1/001);

Patricia MacLean (00307/1/001); Sheila Dunn (00412/1/001); Susan Gardener (09983/1/001); Alistair Halden (00308/1/001); Fearnan Village Association (00309/1/001); J Wright (00347/1/001); Jeanette Hickman (00381/1/001); Mary Robb (00383/1/001); Patsy Penny (00384/1/001); Guy Hickman (00386/1/001); Peter McKenzie (00387/1/001); Alan Paterson (00498/1/001); Alison Paterson (00499/1/001); Jason Oliver (00494/1/001); Fiona Ballantyne (00953/1/001); Neil Ballantyne (00954/1/001); L Lane (10158/1/001); Julia Lane (00492/1/001); Samantha Glynn (00312/1/001); D Glynn (00313/1/001); Ian Marshall (00314/1/001); C McGregor (00380/1/001); G M Carter (00380/1/001); A & J Stephen Ltd (09727/2/001); Christopher Rowley (00873/1/003): The Council considers the site to be the most appropriate location for expansion of the village. The topography of the village is steep with the land rising to the north from Loch Tay, and plateauing at the top of the village to the north. Given the location of the site it cannot be seen from Loch Tay and therefore would not create a visual intrusion on the National Scenic Area. The site does have an open aspect from the north but this could be mitigated through creation of an appropriate landscape framework. This site is not constrained by flooding although it is acknowledged a flood risk assessment would be required as a small part of the site may be affected. The landowners have submitted a proposal for an eco village on a larger and alternative site which is dealt with below. It is, however, unclear whether this site would be released for development. Accordingly there is little evidence this site will be effective. The need for a new housing site in Fearnan has been reduced with the recent planning approval for 18 'residential' units at Tigh Na Loan (S4_Doc_774).

Should the Reporter be so minded the Council would not object to removal of this site from the Plan and the amendment to the settlement boundary to exclude this area, as this would have no implications for other aspects of the Plan.

Fearnan New sites

Culdess Ecovillage (00945/1/003): Further to the Representation made from the owner regarding the eco-village, more details on the masterplan and consultation carried out carried out by the representee have been received; and the Council would refer the Reporter to the appropriate supporting documents for consideration. There remains, however, insufficient information available to assess the impact of this proposal in such a sensitive area. Such types of development are unique and probably outwith the scope of the Local Development Plan to consider, and, as such, are best assessed as planning applications, supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment, against the wider development plan strategy.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mairi Taylor (00311/1/003); Samantha Glynn (00312/1/003); D Glynn (00313/1/003); Glenlyon & Loch Tay Community Council (09450/1/003); Graham Liney (00493/1/002); Fraser MacLean (00299/1/003); Patricia MacLean (00307/1/003); Sheila Dunn (00412/1/002); Susan Gardener (09983/1/003); Alistair Halden (00308/1/003); Fearnan Village Association (00309/1/003); J Wright (00347/1/003); Jeanette Hickman (00381/1/003); Mary Robb (00383/1/002); Patsy Penny (00384/1/002); Alex Glynn (00310/1/003); Guy Hickman (00386/1/002); Peter McKenzie (00387/1/002); Jason Oliver (00494/1/002); Fiona Ballantyne (00953/1/003); Neil Ballantyne (00954/1/003); L Lane (10158/1/003); Julia Lane (00492/1/002); C McGregor (00380/1/002); G M Carter (00388/1/002); Alan Patterson (00498/1/002); Alison Paterson (00499/1/002): The site which has been proposed is within private ownership and whilst the community has raised issues with the untidy nature of the property the owner has not brought the site forward for development. In addition although this is a large area of land, the nature of

the single track access road is likely to severely curtail the development capacity of the site. For these reasons this site is not considered to be effective and it would be inappropriate to identify it as a housing proposal. Should the land be the subject of a planning application the relevant Local Development Plan policies will apply PM1: Placemaking (S4_Doc_396) and RD1: Residential Areas (S4_Doc_405) to ensure a suitable development which makes a positive contribution to the surrounding built and natural environment.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

A & J Stephen Limited (09727/2/002): The site would be a significant extension to the western edge of the village. The visual impact of the site would raise concerns in terms of the River Tay National Scenic Area/Special Area of Conservation and the surrounding area which would be contrary to the relevant Local Development Plan policies including PM1: Placemaking (S4_Doc_396) and the Natural Environment Policy NE1: Environment and Conservation Policies (S4_Doc_389).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Should the Reporter be of a mind to recommend in favour of this Representation, given this sites proximity to Loch Tay (River Tay Special Area of Conservation) and the potential for likely significant effects on the qualifying interests of the Natura 2000 site as a result of development, a Habitats Regulation Appraisal, and possibly an Appropriate Assessment, would firstly require to be undertaken for it.

Kenmore

Mains of Taymouth (09152/1/001): It is unclear exactly what is sought by the objector but it is assumed they wish the entire landholding identified within the tourism designation. The Plan as it stands identifies the core area of the tourist business, predominantly caravan site, holiday accommodation and ancillary facilities, within the tourism designation. It is not considered necessary to identify the golf course and agricultural land within the same ownership in this designation. Perthshire has many golf courses in rural areas which are not identified specifically in the Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Kenmore & District Community Council (00035/1/001): The sports field and adjacent recreational facilities are currently outwith the settlement boundary and the resultant policy framework would generally protect them from development. It is accepted that an alternative approach would be to encompass the recreation area with the settlement boundary and identify this area as open space covered by Policy CF1: Open Space Retention and Provision (S4_Doc_414).

If the Reporter is so minded the Council would not be opposed to the settlement boundary being amended and the recreational land being identified as open space under Policy CF1: Open Space Retention and Provision (S4_Doc_024), as this would not have implications for any other aspects of the Plan.

Kenmore H42

Taymouth Estates Limited 00369/6/002: The expectation referred to in the representation on the site at H42 as highlighted in the Spatial Strategy for Kenmore (6.17.2) is in response to the increased pressure for staff accommodation with the tourism development of Taymouth Castle and Mains of Taymouth. The 11-year waiting list

demonstrates the high demand in Kenmore for provision of local needs housing. It was considered that H42 provided an opportunity to develop not only affordable housing but help contribute to local housing needs as well as staff accommodation to benefit the Taymouth Castle development. The objectors sought an amendment to the type of housing from *'25% affordable, remainder low cost housing of staff accommodation'* into indicate *'25% affordable, remainder low cost and/or mid market rent'*.

If the Reporter is so minded, the Council would not be opposed to the addition of *'mid market rent'*, as this is a recognised tenure of affordable housing and would be acceptable within the site, but would suggest that *'staff accommodation'* is also appropriate.

The respondent has also sought an enlargement of the site and an increase in housing numbers from 20 to 30. The Council considers that the provision of a site for 20 houses in addition to the approved for staff accommodation site in planning application 03/02250/PPLB (S4_Doc_779) is sufficient development for a small settlement like Kenmore during the life of this Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Kenmore & District Community Council (00035/1/002); Peter Ely (09958/1/001): The Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance sets out a requirement that 25% of a development should be for the provision of affordable housing, the preference being for on-site provision. In addition to the 25% affordable housing the requirement for site H42 is for the rest of the units to be for low cost housing or staff accommodation for the Taymouth Castle development. In practice the majority of affordable houses are let through the common housing register (Council and local housing associations) and go to local residents. The rules, however, prevent discrimination. This issue is related to housing policy rather than planning policy.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Kenmore New Sites

FT Property Investments LTD (00369/7/001): The site referred to in the representation has been approved for staff accommodation under planning application 03/02250/PPLB (S4_Doc_779). The principle of this development is established and it does not require to be reflected through the Plan. If the development is undertaken the settlement boundary can be looked at through the next review of the Plan.

Should the Reporter be so minded to accept the issue raised in this Representation the Council would suggest an amendment to the settlement boundary to include this development (S4_Doc_024).

FT Property Investments LTD (00369/7/002): The SEA process for the Plan (S4_Doc_775) and the statutory consultee responses on the MIR identified potential constraints associated with the development of MIR Site G at Kenmore (S4_Doc_776); these were in relation to:

- The sites location within the Taymouth Castle Garden and Designed Landscape, and
- Flood risk

It is accepted that with good design the potential for development of the site to change the character of the garden and designed landscape, and affect the setting of the Grade A listed castle, could be minimised.

Through the MIR stage the Scottish Environment Protection Agency objected to the site and through discussion provided photographic evidence of flooding on this site (S4_Doc_797). SPP paragraph 197 (S4_Doc_312) indicates '*Development which would have a significant probability of being affected by flooding or would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere should not be permitted*'. Paragraph 203 (S4_Doc_326) indicates '*functional flood plains store and convey flood water during times of flood. These functions are important in the wider flood management system. For planning purposes the functional flood plain will generally have a greater than 0.5% (1:200) probability of flooding in any year*'. In addition to the photographic evidence the Scottish Environment Protection Agency Indicative Flood Maps identify this site as being potential at risk of flooding. Whilst the respondent has submitted further information in support of the site (S4_Doc_777) this was not received until late November providing insufficient time to fully analyse it and remove the doubt with regard to the site's suitability for development. Through further discussions with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency they have confirmed that no specific discussions have been ongoing regarding this site and it is still considered at risk from flooding (S4_Doc_778).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Should the Reporter be of a mind to recommend in favour of this Representation, given the proximity of the site to Loch Tay (River Tay Special Area of Conservation) and the potential for likely significant effects on the qualifying interests of the Natura 2000 site as a result of development, a Habitats Regulation Appraisal, and possibly an Appropriate Assessment, would need to be undertaken for it.

Kinloch Rannoch

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/24/005): Policy NE1B: National Designations (S4_Doc_389) is considered adequate to ensure that development does not adversely affect the National Scenic Area. In addition any development that comes forward within Kinloch Rannoch would be subject to Policy PM1: Placemaking (S4_Doc_396) and RD1: Residential Development (S4_Doc_405) which seeks to ensure that development responds appropriately to the surrounding built and natural environment. The additional wording is not therefore considered necessary.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Kinloch Rannoch E15

George Wilson (00274/1/001): In order to retain and encourage employment opportunities within Highland Perthshire sites that have an existing or previous use as employment have been retained for that purpose. The designation of this site seeks to encourage further employment opportunities and an expansion of an existing employment land within the area. Policy ED1: Employment and Mixed Use areas (S4_Doc_483), part a) sets out a criteria for future development which indicates that the use must be compatible with the surrounding landuses and therefore issues of noise and type of development would be considered for any future proposals.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/24/017): Policy NE1B: National Designations (S4_Doc_389) is considered adequate to ensure that development does not adversely affect the National Scenic Area. In addition any development that comes forward within Kinloch Rannoch would be subject to Policy PM1: Placemaking (S4_Doc_396) and RD1: Residential Development (S4_Doc_405) which seeks to ensure that development

responds appropriately to the surrounding built and natural environment. The additional wording is not therefore considered necessary.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Kinloch Rannoch H43

Strutt & Parker (08651/1/001); Mr & Mrs Brian Colclough (00518/1/001); Dunalastair Estate (10315/1/001); Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/24/018): The owner of site H43 has now indicated that they wish to withdraw the site for the development of housing. The Council acknowledges this position. However the site is still considered suitable for development but as this would create a constraint that would make the site ineffective the Council would have no issue if the site was removed from the Plan.

Should the Reporter be so minded the Council would not object to the deletion of site from the Plan but would suggest the retention of the settlement boundary without change. The Council would have no objection to this amendment which has no implications for other aspects of the Plan.

Kinloch Rannoch New Site

Dunalastair Estate (10315/1/002): The proposed site is within a 1:200 year flood plain. Paragraph 197 of the SPP (S4_Doc_312) indicates that *'development which would have a significant probability of being affected by flooding or increase the probability of flooding elsewhere should not be permitted'*. In addition TAYplan Policy 2a(i) (S4_Doc_066) indicates that there is a *'presumption against development in areas vulnerable to coastal erosion, flood risk and rising sea levels'*. Policy EP2: New Development and Flooding (S4_Doc_407) reflects the policy approach of the SPP and TAYplan. The allocation of this site for development would be contrary to the relevant national, strategic and local flooding policies.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Reporter's conclusions:

Fearnan employment site

1. This site comprises a former quarry that has been out of use for some time and its designation as an employment site has aroused a considerable number of objections in relation to noise and disturbance, and to traffic generation on a narrow road. The council recognises these concerns and is content with the removal of the employment land designation. It is agreed that the site should be retained within the settlement boundary in order to control any potential future development of the site.

Fearnan site H41

2. The designation of this site for housing has also aroused a considerable number of objections. The site lies on a plateau at the northern end of the village with an open aspect to the north and west. A housing development on this site would bear little relation to the existing character and form of the settlement. Furthermore, according to the council, it is not clear whether this site is available for development.

3. In accordance with the TAYplan hierarchical settlement approach, the Proposed Plan concentrates the majority of the new housing development in the Principal Settlements of Highland Perthshire. Fearnan is a fairly remote rural settlement, located 10 miles south-

west of Aberfeldy, with few employment opportunities and the development of an additional 20 houses in this location would not be consistent with the Proposed Plan's vision for sustainable economic growth. It is considered that there is insufficient justification for the development of this housing site and for its designation for housing.

Fearnan - Culdross Ecovillage

4. This large proposal, located on an exposed site above Loch Tay, a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and close to a National Scenic Area (NSA), would have a considerable visual impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As stated by the council, there is insufficient information available, at this stage, to assess the impact of the proposal in such a sensitive area. It would be totally premature to consider including such a proposal in this Plan.

Fearnan - Tomdarroch site

5. A number of respondents have suggested that this site be designated for housing development as an alternative to site H41. It is currently a vehicle scrap yard. However, according to the council, the site is currently unavailable for housing development and there are also issues with regard to the generation of further traffic on Quarry Road, a single track access road. Accordingly, it would not be appropriate to designate this site for housing in the Proposed Plan. The site lies within the settlement boundary and there is potential for future housing development on the site subject to compliance with policies PM1 and RD1 to ensure any development makes a positive contribution to the surrounding built and natural environment.

Fearnan – new site

6. The site proposed on the western edge of Fearnan would have a considerable visual impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the potential for significant effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation (SAC). In accordance with the TAYplan hierarchical settlement approach, the Proposed Plan concentrates the majority of the new housing development in the Principal Settlements of Highland Perthshire. Fearnan is a fairly remote rural settlement, located 10 miles south-west of Aberfeldy, with few employment opportunities and the development of an additional 35 houses in this location would not be consistent with the Proposed Plan's vision for sustainable economic growth. It is considered that there is insufficient justification for the development of this housing site and for its designation for housing.

Kenmore – Settlement boundary at Mains of Taymouth

7. The settlement boundary at Mains of Taymouth includes the core area of the tourist enterprise at this location; the holiday accommodation, caravan site and ancillary facilities. It excludes the golf course and agricultural land to the east. It is considered that the boundary as drawn is appropriate in this case.

Kenmore – Sports field

8. The sports field and adjacent recreational facilities have been excluded from the settlement boundary. The sports field forms an integral part of the settlement and it is considered that these facilities would be better protected if identified as open space to which policy CF1 applies and included within the settlement boundary.

Kenmore Conservation Area

9. In relation to the request for an extension to the Kenmore Conservation Area on the south side of Loch Tay to the Crannog and on the north side to Dalerb, a re-appraisal of the conservation area was carried out in 2011 and an amended boundary approved. Whilst the areas to the south and north of Loch Tay are considered to be part of the setting of the village, the conservation area is restricted to the areas of traditional townscape and built heritage. It is considered that this is an appropriate approach to conservation area designation. The protection and management of trees, tree groups and woodlands of high visual amenity outwith conservation areas is an aim of policy NE2A.

Kenmore site H42

10. This site is identified as suitable for the provision of 20 houses; 25% affordable and the remainder low cost housing or staff accommodation. The landowner requests that the site be extended to provide 30 houses and enable a better urban form to be delivered. It is also requested that the description be modified to remove the requirement for staff accommodation and allow low cost and / or mid-market housing. Other respondents consider that all the houses provided should be affordable housing and, in terms of layout and design, should reflect Taymouth Drive.

11. As indicated in paragraph 6.17.2 of the Proposed Plan, there is considerable pressure both for staff accommodation in conjunction with the tourism developments at Mains of Taymouth and Taymouth Castle and for local needs housing, demonstrated by the 11 year waiting list for accommodation in Kenmore. The council would not be opposed to the addition of mid-market rented housing to the description of the site, since this is a recognised tenure of affordable housing, but considers that the possibility of staff accommodation should be retained. However, the council considers that there is no justification for an increase in the housing numbers from 20 to 30.

12. The provision of 25% affordable housing is consistent with the council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance. In terms of the remaining 75% of housing provision, it is considered that allowing more flexibility in the housing provided, with a mix of house sizes targeted at the mid to lower owner-occupier market is more likely to deliver a viable development option. Nevertheless, retaining the possibility of providing further staff accommodation would benefit the Taymouth Castle development, although planning permission exists for staff accommodation on land to the west of the primary school under planning permission 03/02250/PPLB.

13. In relation to the size of the site, the Proposed Plan indicates that the designation of site H42 within the Taymouth Castle Garden and Designed Landscape is appropriate subject to a high quality design and layout. The council has not voiced any landscape concerns in relation to the suggested enlargement of the site. It is considered that enlarging the site would provide potential benefits in terms of delivering a quality development in accordance with Policy PM1 (the site would be doubled in size but the number of dwellings only increased by 50%). There is an increasing pressure for visitor accommodation in the area and a consequent need for accommodation for staff and local needs. An enlarged site H42 would contribute to meeting this need.

Kenmore – New site (West of Primary School)

14. This site was approved for staff accommodation under planning application

03/02250/PPLB (S4_Doc_779). According to the respondent, the site extends southwards beyond the settlement boundary shown on the Kenmore Settlement Map; the settlement boundary reflecting the extent of the land owned by Taymouth Castle Estate in 2011. This boundary runs between the 5 house units approved on the northern part and the 6 house units approved on the southern part, which is now within separate land ownership to Taymouth Castle Estate. The respondent requests that the whole site be designated for housing with a capacity for 10 houses to provide staff accommodation for middle and senior management within the Hotel Resort.

15. The council agrees that the settlement boundary should be amended to include the whole of the site and it is considered that this is an appropriate approach to take. Planning permission has been granted for a housing development on this site and its designation for housing is unnecessary. Should the developer wish to depart from the approved layout / designs in planning permission ref. no. 03/02250/PPLB, this would be a matter for further consideration by the council on the submission of a planning application.

Kenmore – New site (Kenmore South)

16. This site is also located within the Taymouth Castle Garden and Designed Landscape. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) process and the consultee responses on the Main Issues Report (MIR) site (site G) identified potential constraints associated with the designed landscape and with flood risk. The council considers that with good design, the potential for development on the site to change the character of the garden and designed landscape and to affect the setting of the Category A listed building could be minimised. However, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) Indicative Flood Maps identify the site as being potentially at risk of flooding and, although the respondent has submitted further information in relation to flooding to support development of the site, this issue remains unresolved.

17. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) states that “*Developers and planning authorities should take a precautionary approach in taking decisions when flood risk is an issue*”. Accordingly, it would be premature to consider the inclusion of this site in the Proposed Plan. Furthermore, it is considered that the development of a further 24 houses in Kenmore, in addition to the 30 houses proposed for site H42 and the 10 or so houses that can be accommodated on the site west of the primary school, would not be consistent with the Proposed Plan’s vision for sustainable economic growth.

Kinloch Rannoch

18. Scottish Natural Heritage draws attention to the fact that Kinloch Rannoch is located within the Loch Rannoch and Glen Lyon NSA, in which development should only be permitted where it will not adversely affect the integrity of the area. It is considered that it would be appropriate to make reference to Kinloch Rannoch’s location in the NSA in the description of the settlement.

Kinloch Rannoch – E15

19. The existing site is occupied by a repair garage and caravan storage. It would appear to be under-used and no justification has been put forward for expanding the site into the adjoining field. As the respondent points out, employment land is available at the other site within the village where Rannoch Smokery is located and it is considered that this would be a better location for additional employment land, should it be required.

Kinloch Rannoch – H43

20. The owner of the land has indicated that this site is no longer available for housing development during the Plan period. The council considers that the site should be retained within the settlement boundary. Retention within the settlement boundary would suggest that the whole site is appropriate for small-scale housing development, subject to compliance with policy RD1. It is considered that a housing development stretching beyond the rear of Muirlodge Place would not be well-related to the form of the existing settlement. A more appropriate settlement boundary would be aligned with the rear of the properties in Muirlodge Place, which would include approximately half of the site.

Kinloch Rannoch – Expansion of settlement boundary in western part of village

21. In relation to the suggested expansion of the settlement boundary in the western part of the village, this area is within the 1:200 year flood plain (see Schedule 4 document 773). The inclusion of the two areas identified in the representation within the settlement boundary would suggest that small-scale housing development was appropriate in these areas. This would be contrary to the statutory and policy framework for flood risk management and climate change embodied in the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2006, Government policy in SPP and strategic policy in TAYplan.

Reporter's recommendations:Fearnan employment site

1. Delete reference to the quarry site from paragraph 6.13.2. Remove the employment land designation from Settlement Plan

Fearnan site H41

2. Delete reference to housing site H41 and make appropriate changes to paragraph 6.13.2. Remove designation H41 from the Settlement Plan and make appropriate changes to settlement boundary.

Kenmore – Sports field

3. Modify the settlement boundary on the Settlement Plan to include the sports field and adjacent recreational facilities (see Schedule 4 document 024). Designate as open space to which policy CF1 applies.

Kenmore site H42

4. Modify the description of site H42 to read: "*Size: 1.6ha; Number: 30 houses, 25% affordable, remainder low cost and/or mid-market housing or staff accommodation.*" Modify the boundary of the site as shown on the Settlement Map to include the whole area shown on page 13 of Representation No. 00369/6/002.

Kenmore – New site (West of Primary School)

5. Modify the settlement boundary on the Settlement Plan to include the whole of the housing site approved under planning permission ref. no. 03/02250/PPLB (see Schedule 4 document 024).

Kinloch Rannoch

6. Modify the first sentence of paragraph 6.18.1 to read: “*Kinloch Rannoch is located at the east end of Loch Rannoch within the Loch Rannoch and Glen Lyon National Scenic Area*”.

Kinloch Rannoch – E15

7. Delete reference to employment site E15 and remove the designation from the Settlement Plan. Make appropriate changes to the table in paragraph 6.1.6 on page 151.

Kinloch Rannoch – H43

8. Delete reference to housing site H43 and make appropriate changes to paragraph 6.18.2. Remove designation H43 from the Settlement Plan and make appropriate changes to the settlement boundary to align with the rear of the properties in Muirlodge Place.