

Issue 38		Strathearn Area - Crieff	
Development plan reference:	8.1.6 – Strathearn Area Employment Strategy, page 239 8.1.12 – Strathearn Area Housing Strategy, page 240 8.3 – Crieff, page 249-253 E26 - Bridgend, Crieff, page 250 E27 - Broich Road, Crieff, page 250 H55 - Laggan Road, Crieff, page 251 H57 - Wester Tomaknock, Crieff, page 251 MU7 - Broich Road, Crieff, page 252 OP21 - Broich Road, Crieff, page 252	Reporter: Douglas Hope	
	Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Scottish Government (00092) Ray McMaster (00206) Moyra Turnbull (00297) Mr & Mrs T McNutt (00298) Charles Campbell-Crawford (00315) Isabel Campbell (00338) Oakbank (Crieff) Ltd (00350) Professor David Sloan (00351) Margaret Sloan (00352) Malcolm Hicks (00353) Gordon Campbell (00354) S D Millar (00355) G & S C Hookham (00379) L J Laird (00395) Simon Barnes (00396) L G Banks (00401) John McDonald (00408) Mr & Mrs C Nairn (00410) Stella Ferguson (00411) Ailsa Campbell (00459) Susan Stevens (00475) Blazon Developments Ltd (00478) Mr & Mrs P Callander (00495) E A Powell (00503) Mr & Mrs A J P Leaver (00515) Vicki Renwick (00517) Mr & Mrs A P Milroy (00561) Donald Smith (00565) Ian Barr (00575) Helen Barr (00576) Ruth Stone (00592) Graeme Robertson (00600) Mike & Pam Ross (00605) Isobel McCallum (00607) John Watson Scott (00608) Joan Dyer (00615/1)		Jamie Burns (00660) Ewan Burns (00661) David Burns (00662) Louise Burns (00663) Mr & Mrs S Mckay (00705) Ann Grodzicka (00706) Allan Downie (00713) Susan Carter (00715) Graham Carter (00716) Mr & Mrs K Russell (00791) Jonathan Poore (00792) Benjamin Foster (00815) Joshua Foster (00816) Morgan Foster (00817) Henry Foster (00818) Jane Foster (00819) Maureen Pennie (00820) Mr & Mrs Neil Watters (00833) Crieff Community Trust Steering Group (00859) Mr & Mrs Mark Cumming (00866) Fiona Struthers (00871) Lesley La Hay (00910) Dr Ken Arton (00927) Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928) Dr & Mrs J L Graham (00929) Sasha Brunton (00935) Alan Brunton (00936) Robert Whyte (00937) Robert Lauchan (00938) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194) Christian & David Stewart (07693/10) Drummond Estates (07693/13 & 07693/14) Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (09004)	

Residents of Ritchie Place & Rintoul Avenue (00615/2) Tom & Mandy Guthrie (00621) Karen Brown (00625) Gordon Taylor (00628) Philip Dyer (00635)	Ken Russell (09193) William Thompson Rimmer & Co (09285) Robert Simpson & Son (09313) Crieff Community Council (09327) John Champion (10287)
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Representations relating to sites in the Strathearn housing market area, sites in Crieff only.
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>Settlement Boundary North of Horseshoe Drive</u> Oakbank (Crieff) Ltd (00350/1/001): A change to the settlement boundary north of Horseshoe Drive (S4_Doc_378) has resulted in Site H17 from the adopted Strathearn Area Local Plan 2001 (S4_Doc_714) appearing to be partly in and partly out of the settlement. The site has been gradually developed over the past 10 years and to date 13 units are complete, two are under construction and planning consent has been received for a third. The respondent intends to build a further two houses and then extend Horseshoe Drive northwards to develop up to 9 more houses. To facilitate the completion of the site within the LDP an amendment to the settlement boundary is requested.</p> <p><u>New Community Facility</u> Ken Russell (09193/4/001): There is little if any opportunity to site new community developments in Crieff. The school and supermarket are already catered for. During the life of the LDP further improved/new community facilities will be needed. There are insufficient opportunities for new community developments in Crieff and more should be identified in the plan.</p> <p>Ken Russell (09193/5/001): [Referring to paragraph 8.3.2] should emphasise that better community facilities should include 'new' facilities. Ken Russell (09193/3/002): There is little if any opportunity to site a community development in Crieff although there is no shortage of land available. Requests that paragraph 8.1.6 be amended to permit mixed use development to include a community development. Refers to paragraph 7.2.2 (S4_Doc_715), which allows for mixed use development on opportunity sites where proposals include improved employment land.</p> <p><u>New Employment Site</u> Mr & Mrs S McKay (00705/1/002): Consideration should be given to two fields either side of the Muthill Road beyond the 30 mile limit heading towards Muthill. Both fields could easily accommodate a sizeable Industrial Estate if so required as the fields are flat making groundworks a bit easier. No specific site has been identified in the representation.</p> <p><u>Cumulative Impact of Proposed Development on Crieff's Transport Network</u> Scottish Government (00092/9/001): Transport Scotland is generally supportive of the spatial strategy for the Strathearn area. However, in relation to the housing allocations in Crieff, it will be required to demonstrate through an appropriate transport assessment, that the A85 trunk road through Crieff can accommodate the level of development proposed. Should mitigation measures be required, then they should be agreed with Transport Scotland.</p>	

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (CUSP) (00928/1/003): The A85 trunk road through Crieff is congested and dangerous. A relief route would reduce traffic flow, congestion and pollution; and improve safety. Independent traffic consultants should be appointed as per the recommendation made by CUSP in their Preliminary Recommendations Report forwarded to the Council in January 2011 - ref 4.4 (included in the representation).

Crieff Community Trust Steering Group (00859/1/002): Seeking a much greater emphasis in the Plan on the requirement for significant infrastructure improvements in relation to roads, traffic management, parking and public transportation network. The LDP is at odds with the views of residents and Scottish Government policy, which expects infrastructure to foster the right conditions for growth and community cohesion, including good transport and digital connectivity. There are significant problems with traffic flow in the town centre, with no information in the Proposed Plan about how this will be addressed and tackled in the future. Scottish Government, 2011 "Achieving a Sustainable Future" Annex A (S4_Doc_716).

Crieff Town Centre

Ray McMaster (00206/1/002): The proposed supermarket poses a threat to the vitality and viability of Crieff town centre.

Mr & Mrs A J P Leaver (00515/1/002): The proposal for a supermarket will be insufficient to improve Crieff town centre and will contribute to its destruction. Population has increased but the town has few services and the town centre is ailing.

Gordon Taylor (00628/1/001): Retail development outside the town centre will accelerate decay in the town centre therefore it should be a firm condition of the granting of planning permission for residential development that a concurrent town centre development should take place by that developer on a brownfield or similar decaying site. Several streets, particularly Dollerie Terrace and Broich area, are already strained and will not be able to cope with increased traffic volume. A bypass is needed for south Crieff to manage this traffic. Reference made to University of Dundee Town & Regional Planning Department, "Crieff town study report" (S4_Doc_717).

Crieff Community Trust Steering Group (00859/1/004): Seeks a commitment not to use land outside the town centre (High Street/King Street) for retail. Highlights local concerns that the focus for town centre development has shifted to Broich Road at the expense of the town centre (High Street and King Street). Highlights that town and high streets act as a focal point for social and economic indicators. Requests support for the economy, particularly other non-tourism sectors. Concerned that the Proposed Plan will not contribute towards a strong local economy, apart from specific mention of tourism and the Crieff Hydro, refers to Scottish Government, 2011 "Achieving a Sustainable Future" (Core_Doc_208).

Crieff Community Trust Steering Group (00859/1/005): A much greater emphasis should be placed on the regeneration and improvement of Crieff's historic town centre. The LDP is expected to contribute towards a strong local economy, a thriving town and high street, where communities have a positive appearance and are places where people want to live, work and invest. The LDP should address vacant and derelict land and property, should preserve heritage/built environment for productive use; and should contain details of how Crieff's Conservation Area will be enhanced and protected. Refers to Scottish Government, 2011 "Achieving a Sustainable Future" (Core_Doc_208).

Deallocation of Open Space at site south of West March, Turretbank Road

Blazon Developments Ltd (00478/1/001): Seeking removal of Open Space allocation at identified site south of West March, Turretbank Road, Crieff (S4_Doc_378). The site of some 0.507 Ha forms the main part of the private garden ground of West March, a property owned by Blazon Developments Ltd. and tenanted by Mrs.D.P. Wadhams, the former owner. Comprising a relatively flat area of land bounded by the river to the west and south and separated from the adjacent footpath by a small belt of scrub woodland, access to the site is via the private driveway of Turretbank and there is no public access to the property. The site is private ground and has never been used as open space; there is adequate public open space in the immediate local area; and the part of the site not at flood risk may be potentially developable, subject to planning consent. A letter from Blazon Investments as site owner and seven further letters referring to the site are included in the Representation.

Crieff Masterplan

John Champion (10287/1/001): A master plan is needed for Crieff because infrastructure improvements are needed before increases in housing and employment sites take place. Congestion and pollution requires to be alleviated. Limits on building heights are required to protect Crieff's character. The south Crieff hub needs to be linked to the town centre to create one centre and avoid creating competing islands of activity. The Style of Crieff is said to have been a locally-important feature.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/001); (00928/1/002): Crieff's infrastructure is already strained and would not be able to cope with significant additional development unless a comprehensive town master plan is prepared in respect of current and future infrastructure, development, growth and regeneration needs of the town. A stipulation should be made that any buildings arising from new development, whether for employment or residential usage, be limited in their height to no more than that of the Strathearn Community Campus.

Crieff Community Trust Steering Group (00859/1/003): A commitment to developing brownfield sites and disused buildings within the existing town boundary for employment and residential use is needed. The prioritisation of brownfield site development before the development of greenfield sites outwith the existing town boundary. Alternatively, developers should be required to make a contribution to the development of derelict and disused land as a condition of any future development of greenfield land. The LDP is at odds with the views of residents and Scottish Government policy, which expects communities to have a positive appearance and be of quality design with measures to address any vacant and derelict land and property. The LDP contains no information about how this will be addressed and tackled in the future. Refers to Scottish Government, 2011 "Achieving a Sustainable Future" (Core_Doc_208).

E26 Bridgend

Mr & Mrs K Russell (00791/2/001); Mr & Mrs Neil Watters (00833/1/001): Request deallocation of site because the proposal would represent overdevelopment and would have an adverse landscape impact. The site is especially sensitive to development and the representation suggests that alternative sites exist with less visual impact, although none are identified.

E A Powell (00503/1/001): Deallocation of site to the north of Alichmore Lane and south of Strowan Road because its steep topography makes it unsuitable for development, and concerns about traffic safety on Strowan Road.

Mr & Mrs S McKay (00705/1/001): No objection to existing employment site however concerns at how practical development would be at proposal E26 north of Alichmore Lane, which has a very steep embankment. Concerns are raised over drainage and access.

Ken Russell (09193/6/001 & 09193/7/001): The area already has mixed use development and there are few opportunities to site new community developments in Crieff. Improved or new community facilities are needed during the life of the LDP. Concerns that new employment sites have been identified in excess of the forecast need. There are mixed uses adjacent to the site (pottery, garden centre, fencing manufacturer, bus depot, shop, restaurant and child's play area) and therefore mixed uses should be allocated for site E26, to accord with paragraph 3.7.2 of the Proposed Plan, which states that '*recreation facilities contribute to cultural identity*'.

Drummond Estates (07693/13/001): Calculates that there is no need for employment land in this area because demand and take up in the area has been low. Removal of the part of site E26 (north) would still leave an over-provision of employment land in the Plan. In any case, concerns that employment use would not be appropriate at this location because it is adjacent to an existing housing site (S4_Doc_718); identification of the site as a housing site would assist square off the existing settlement and help meet the plan's housing requirement, improving competition and choice. Refers to comments in previous submissions pre-MIR (S4_Doc_720) and MIR comments (S4_Doc_719).

Drummond Estates (07693/14/001): Requests that there is no need for site E26 (south) to be restricted for employment use. Despite marketing, it has not been taken up and there is little demand for solely employment use. A range of uses including business, storage and tourist/retail uses should be promoted, which could help deliver employment land and would benefit the area and Crieff as a whole. Alternatively, a mixed use allocation is sought,

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/004): The site is near the junction of the South Comrie Road and the A822, and concerns are raised in respect of road safety.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/29/001): 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 through the middle of the development site. Site developer needs to be made aware of risk of flooding, and take this into account when considering development. Precautionary approach required in accordance with Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (Core_Doc_059) and National Planning Framework 2009 (Core_Doc_020).

E27 Broich Road

Ken Russell (09193/6/002): The area already has mixed use development, with a school and supermarket proposed in the area, and there are few opportunities to site new community developments in Crieff. Improved or new community facilities are needed during the life of the LDP. Concerns that new employment sites have been identified in excess of the forecast need.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/005): The site is not in Crieff's retail core and retail development would be inappropriate; the listed building was recently listed (2002) and should remain protected. The farm and outbuildings could be sympathetically restored for housing, holiday accommodation or 'micro' business purposes - possibly a mix of all three.

Crieff Community Council (09327/1/002 & 09327/1/004): Concerns that the area will be developed in a piecemeal way without any coherence or cohesion. Concerns that the Plan promotes retail use at the site. Any retail use would not comply with Policy RC1; would have an adverse effect on Crieff's High Street; would be contrary to Scottish Government Regeneration Strategy; would have an adverse impact on road safety at the nearby schools; and an adverse operational impact on the nearby fire station. More appropriate alternative vacant sites exist within the town centre such as at Penny Lane.

John Champion (10287/1/001): Farm house is a Category B listed building and should be retained for housing or office use.

H55 Laggan Road

Charles Campbell-Crawford (00315/1/001): Site is in agricultural use and should not be developed; Laggan Road forms part of the Laggan Valley and Lady Mary's Walk circular walks with views to the north over countryside, which should be preserved; safety concerns regarding access from Laggan Road and Laggan Lane.

Moyra Turnbull (00297/1/001): Concerns that Laggan Road would be unsuitable for the increased traffic volume; parked vehicles make passing hardly possible, particularly for the community bus; no need for the proposed development while houses remain unbuilt and unsold at an adjacent site.

Mr & Mrs T McNutt (00298/1/001): Concerns at loss of view from own property; loss of privacy; decrease in property value; increase in noise from new residents and vehicles; loss of agricultural and recreational land; adverse impact on deer habitat; inadequate and unsafe access along Laggan Road and in local area, particularly at Turretbank Road; objection to public funding of any necessary roads or traffic work to accommodate the proposal; adverse impact on pedestrians using Laggan Road; alternative better-located sites exist in Crieff, and Broich Road is particularly highlighted. Supplementary letter continues: proposal has inadequate justification; existing settlement boundary is appropriate and should be retained to allow access to the countryside and Lady Mary's Walk and Curroch's Walk; opposed to building on greenfield land; concern that the proposal would lead to further encroachment in the future to the north and west; proposed population increased cannot be accommodated unless social issues are also addressed; relatively stagnant property market; town's sole petrol filling station cannot realistically cope with the proposal.

L G Banks (00401/1/001): There are unfinished developments in the area; adverse impact of additional traffic on Laggan Road; poor access to Crieff town centre across single track roads in places; adverse impact on tourism in the area.

Stella Ferguson (00411/1/001): Concerns at access; traffic safety and adverse impact of development on peaceful countryside walk.

Isabel Campbell (00338/1/001): Avoid peripheral development; avoid destruction of agricultural land at the start of a beautiful walk; concerns raised in respect of poor access with traffic choke points and overspill parking from Macrosty Park; concerns also raised should a Compulsory Purchase Order be used to secure access.

Professor David Sloan (00351/1/001): Proposal will have an adverse impact on local beauty and landscape; concerns about viability of the proposal linked to Crieff's relatively static housing market; concerns about adverse impact on tourists using McCrosty Park and Lady Mary's Walk; inadequacy of existing car parks in the area meaning that Laggan

Road becomes used for linear overspill parking; adverse impact of construction traffic on road safety at Laggan Road and on tourism.

Margaret Sloan (00352/1/001): Adverse impact on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; adverse effect on tourism; reduced access (particularly disabled access) to Lady Mary's Walk during construction; conflict between parked cars and construction traffic on Laggan Road.

Gordon Campbell (00354/1/001): Need for additional housing has not been demonstrated and may not exist; access would be inadequate, dangerous and could prove intolerable; adverse environmental impact; potential adverse impact on tourism.

S D Millar (00355/1/001): Concerns at adverse impact of construction traffic along Laggan Lane during lengthy construction period.

G & S C Hookham (00379/1/001): Proposal would be detrimental to the environment and to eco systems, particularly higher levels of run-off from hard standing surfaces and structures; loss of high quality agricultural land in food production, which should be retained; adverse impact on town's utilities, particularly treatment of sewage and surface water; increased risk in local area to traffic and pedestrians caused by parked cars; site would be remote from town facilities, schools and shops creating demand for public transport and car journeys; adverse impact of increased traffic from the proposed site travelling through Crieff town centre.

Susan Stevens (00475/1/001): Concern at loss of arable land; adverse impact on route to Lady Mary's Walk; possible disruption or damage to mains water supply for Ardarroch House, Field House and Curroch Cottage during construction; the representation suggests that alternative sites exist although none are identified.

Mr & Mrs P Callander (00495/1/001): Adverse impact on the character of the rural environment; adjoining building site should be finished before any further development in the area takes place; adverse impact on walkers on way to Lady Mary's Walk; no obvious vehicular access from the road in to the site; local road network would be inadequate and at risk from flooding; adverse impact on the biodiversity of the local area, which is well used for recreation; the alternative access to Lady Mary's Walk elsewhere in the town is impractical; proposed high density is not in keeping with the surrounding area; concerns at service provision to the site, such as telephone, sewage and water; adverse impact on local community facilities including schools, doctor, hospital, supermarket, petrol filling station. East side of Crieff is suggested would be a better location for development.

Ruth Stone (00592/1/001): Further traffic congestion would have an adverse impact on a valuable amenity area; existing access at Milnab Street would be narrow in places and dangerous, particularly at the two bridges and the hill to the rear of the park; adverse impact on views to Laggan Hill and open countryside; suggest town centre regeneration should be prioritised

Mike & Pam Ross (00605/1/001): Vehicular access on local road network would be unreasonable for proposed traffic volume with potential problem areas identified; concerns about adverse impact on public safety for users of Lady Mary's Walk, Curroughs Walk, and Laggan Hill Walk.

John Watson Scott (00608/1/001): Concerns expressed over size of development; it would be outside current settlement boundary, and on greenfield land while existing

brownfield land in the town is undeveloped; concerns at sewerage capacity and road safety in the area.

Mr & Mrs A P Milroy (00561/1/001): Existing road network and car park would be inadequate and would not cope with increased traffic to MacRosty Park; photographs attached to illustrate hazards; inadequate access to the site for the potential increase in vehicle numbers; proposal would have an adverse impact on views west from Crieff to Laggan Wood, Turrleum Hill and Bairds Monument; proposed density is too high; proposed mix of housing types and styles including 25% affordable homes will have an adverse impact on property value in the area; concerns at distance from schools; adverse impact on access to Lady Mary's Walk for wheelchair and pram users and the infirm.

Tom & Mandy Guthrie (00621/1/001): Inadequate road access; increase in traffic; likelihood of traffic accidents increased; increased risk to public safety using Lady Mary's Walk, Laggan Hill Walk, and Curroughs Walk

Karen Brown (00625/1/001): The site makes an important contribution to the wider landscape setting. It is an important foreground to the wider setting of the River Earn valley, including views to west including Bairds Monument and beyond to the hills of Glen Artney. It is visible in the landscape from various walks: The Knock, Laggan Rd, Laggan Hill, Bairds Monument, Knock Mary and Torlum. Development would have significant adverse impact on this highly attractive landscape setting to the west of town.

Susan Carter (00715/2/001); Graham Carter (00716/1/001): Concerns at loss of agricultural land while alternative brown field land exists in and around Crieff; suggested that development would be better located at the south of the town; local road network would be inadequate; concerns at adverse impact of affordable housing on the surrounding area; no apparent need for housing at this location.

Dr Ken Arton (00927/1/001): Concerns that enough new housing has been built or planned in Crieff to meet the needs of the community; development could lead to an increase in parked cars in the local area, which would have an adverse impact on access to Laggan Road via Horseshoe Drive and Turretbank Road; adverse impact on the area's attraction to tourists on local walks and beauty spots such as Lady Mary's Walk.

Dr & Mrs J L Graham (00929/1/001): The road network in the area would be inadequate for the size of development; concerns at distance from schools; concerns that traffic congestion will increase accident risk; adverse visual and landscape impact of development on the countryside setting of Lady Mary's Walk and Laggan Woods.

Sasha Brunton (00935/1/001); Alan Brunton (00936/1/001): There is no proven need for the development; South Crieff would be a better location for development and both locations are not needed; concerns at access difficulties and increase in traffic congestion; loss of agricultural land; alternative brown field development sites exist elsewhere in the town.

Robert Whyte (00937/1/001): Concerns at adverse impact on access to Lady Mary's Walk; loss of green land; local road network could be inadequate for both construction and future residents' traffic; wider access to the site through the local road network would be inadequate, concerns raised about road safety. Alternative location suggested to south of Crieff in the Broich Road area.

Mr & Mrs Mark Cumming (00866/1/001): Concerns at adverse impact on natural environment and habitats; increase in noise, light and waste pollution; adverse impact on

residents and local walkers views; insufficient capacity in road network; retail facilities to support additional population; Adverse impact on quiet and tranquil area and Crieff's tourism industry by introducing development to the area.

Fiona Struthers (00871/1/001): Concerns that adverse impact on scenery and natural habitat would occur; local road network would be inadequate and development would lead to accidents; lack of amenities at this location, no need identified for the proposal and alternative development locations nearer the town centre are identified as Crown Hotel, Drummond Hotel.

Lesley La Hay (00910/1/002): Taking the town as a whole, Crieff has many green sites which should not be developed; concerned at visual impact of housing development; no need generally for additional housing in Crieff; infrastructure cannot accommodate development.

Malcolm Hicks (00353/1/001): Concerns raised over problems at junctions in the local road network would be exacerbated by additional traffic generated by the construction of, and subsequent occupation of an additional 50 houses.

Maureen Pennie (00820/1/001): Concerns raised over access; need for additional housing development; loss of agricultural land; waste water infrastructure capacity; removal of hedges and trees from the landscape; adverse impact on Lady Mary's Walk; adverse impact of construction noise, dust and road traffic on the area and tourism.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/006): Concerns at capacity and effectiveness of the area's waste water treatment system; and concerns that development would be unacceptable without road widening.

John McDonald (00408/1/001): Site should not be developed for housing because there is demand for allotments in the town and this site could secure their long-term provision.
Mr & Mrs T McNutt (00298/1/002): Site should be developed for allotment use and a play area.

Robert Simpson & Son (09313/7/001): Site is available, effective and there are no constraints to its development. It is anticipated that it can start delivering new housing development by 2014.

H57 Wester Tomaknock

L J Laird (00395/1/001); Simon Barnes (00396/1/001): Development is unnecessary while other more suitable sites remain undeveloped in Crieff, especially the south of the town; concerns at sewerage capacity; increased traffic congestion along Dollerie Terrace; adverse impact on biodiversity and habitat of birds including yellow hammers, woodpeckers, siskins and wrens.

Mr & Mrs A J P Leaver (00515/1/001): Concerns raised regarding inadequate road network, lack of paths, congestion on Dollerie Terrace; unspecified safety, environmental issues and over population of Crieff relative to services available.

Vicki Renwick (00517/1/001): Site is boggy; concern at adverse impact of increased traffic, particularly Madderty Road and Dollerie Terrace. More generally, Crieff has been overdeveloped and residents who live on the outskirts of the town do not wish to lose green space and feeling of living semi-rural.

Ian Barr (00575/1/001); Helen Barr (00576/1/001): The site collects water and is poorly drained and therefore development of this site would increase flood risk to nearby houses; concerns that the existing road network is inadequate and congested; alternative sites exist closer to services including site MU7; concerns about sewerage capacity; adverse impact on biodiversity and habitats of wild birds, ducks, oyster catchers, buzzards, herons, and frogs. Mrs Barr also raises concerns about the proposal's impact on the viability of the town centre.

Ruth Stone (00592/1/002): Concerns about adverse impact on existing housing and traffic congestion; site collects water and is poorly drained; alternative brownfield sites exist.

Donald Smith (00565/1/001): Concerns that site is wet and marshy. If built, this proposal would cause flooding of the burn, and place Ritchie Place at flood risk; traffic problems predicted at the top 180 metres of Dollerie Terrace.

Ann Grodzicka (00706/1/001): Concerns regarding potential increase in traffic congestion; spreading of Crieff into the countryside; adverse environmental impact; increased risk of flooding.

Robert Lauchan (00938/1/001): Site is unsuitable for development because it is permanently flooded or waterlogged because it lies at a lower level than the adjacent burn; concerns at length of walk to schools; adverse impact on road network and traffic safety, particularly at Dollerie Terrace.

Fiona Struthers (00871/1/002): Concern at adverse impact on natural environment.

Lesley La Hay (00910/1/002): Taking the town as a whole, Crieff has many green sites which should not be developed; concerned at visual impact of housing development; no need generally for additional housing in Crieff; infrastructure cannot accommodate development.

Jamie Burns (00660/1/001); Ewan Burns (00661/1/001); David Burns (00662/1/001); Louise Burns (00663/1/001): Concerns at capacity of road network; distance from services; alternative sites identified in the town centre; concerns at impact on biodiversity and habitats for kite, heron, deer, oyster catcher and bats; potential displacement of water from the burn and boggy land may increase flood risk; no demonstrated need for the proposal; concerns at sewerage capacity and lack of local employment opportunities.

Joan Dyer (00615/1/001): This proposal would not be needed while other developments remain uncompleted; alternative site at MU7 suggested; concerns at the use of greenbelt land while numerous brownfield sites remain undeveloped; increased flood risk; adverse impact on biodiversity and habitats for herons, ducks, oyster catchers, woodpecker, garden birds, frogs, buzzards and roe deer; adverse impact of increased traffic; and lack of amenities.

Jane Foster (00819/1/001); Benjamin Foster (00815/1/001); Joshua Foster (00816/1/001); Morgan Foster (00817/1/001); Henry Foster (00818/1/001): Concerns at capacity of road network; alternative sites exist MU7 and town centre suggested; poorly located for amenities and active travel opportunities; no demonstrated need for the proposal; concerns that development may displace water from the burn and boggy land and increase flood risk; concerns at adverse impact on biodiversity and habitats for heron, deer, wild birds, oyster catcher, buzzard; concerns at impact on sewer capacity

and water supply.

Residents of Ritchie Place & Rintoul Avenue (00615/2/001): Petition with concerns that the site is boggy and if drained may increase flood risk; adverse impact of increased traffic; few amenities; other brown field sites should be developed first; housing is too far from school; adverse impact on biodiversity including herons, frogs, ducks, oyster catchers, buzzards and roe deer; adverse impact on sewage capacity.

Mr & Mrs C Nairn (00410/1/001): Concerns at flood risk; adverse impact on biodiversity including Mallard duck, Grey heron, Roe deer, Buzzard, nesting Oyster Catchers, frogs; adverse impact on traffic and road network particularly at Dollerie Terrace and A85 junction; inadequate sewerage capacity.

Philip Dyer (00635/1/001): Concerns at drainage and flood risk; road safety; alternative town centre sites identified that should be developed first to support the town's viability; concerns about distance from schools and poor facilities in the area; sewerage capacity; adverse impact on biodiversity and habitats for grey heron, duck, oyster catcher, buzzard, roe deer, bats, owls and woodpecker.

Graeme Robertson (00600/1/001); John Champion (10287/1/001): Concerns at increase in traffic levels on existing road network, which would be exacerbated by development of site H57.

Isobel McCallum (00607/1/001): Identifies a blind spot at South Crieff Road in the area of site H57.

Allan Downie (00713/1/001): Comments that the existing access at Dollerie Terrace is of inadequate width; the alternative route via Highlandman's Loan is also unsuitable unless improved.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/007): Concerns raised about road safety; drainage and sewerage capacity; flood risk.

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (09004/20/001 & 09004/21/001): The boundary of site H57 as proposed does not account for site specific characteristics (constraints and opportunities) nor does it accurately reflect the land in control of TWUK Ltd nor the third party owners to the east. The site area could be expanded and the capacity of the site increased without compromising the Proposed Plan's strategy. Supporting information submitted; appropriate levels of landscaping and open space could be provided; proposals have taken account of topography, infrastructure requirements, water courses and path networks in the area. Adequate landscape capacity would exist for a larger, higher density development.

Christian & David Stewart (07693/10/001): Site H57 as proposed is in a sensitive landscape setting. An alternative area is proposed that the writer considers will have a reduced impact on the wider landscape, will maintain Tomaknock's status as a building group in the open countryside, and will be a sustainable and complementary extension to Crieff. Pre-MIR representations were submitted in June 2009 (S4_Doc_722); MIR representations were submitted in January 2011 (S4_Doc_721).

MU7 Broich Road

Ailsa Campbell (00459/1/001): Concern at potential impact on the town centre, recommends existing town centre sites should be developed before green field land;

concern that development is drawing vitality out of the centre and to the southern edge of the town, contrary to Scottish Government regeneration strategy.

Lesley La Hay (00910/1/001 & 00910/1/002): Concerns that development would take away land that is currently peaceful and tranquil and is used for walking. Taking the town as a whole, Crieff has many green sites which should not be developed; concerned at visual impact of housing development; no need generally for additional housing in Crieff; infrastructure cannot accommodate development.

Crieff Community Council (09327/1/005 & 09327/1/001): Site should be deleted because it is a greenfield site and is not needed, alternative sites exist in elsewhere in the town such as at Inchbrakie, E26, the Crioich and other brown field sites not identified; concern that residential development on this site would not protect and enhance environmental and landscape quality (see Proposed LDP paragraph 3.5.2 (S4_Doc_501)) and would contravene government policy and legislation on the natural environment (see paragraph 3.9.3 (S4_Doc_723)). There are concerns that the area will be developed in a piecemeal way without any coherence or cohesion.

John Watson Scott (00608/1/002): Support for site MU7 as a better development option than site H55 because it is closer to amenities such as schools, proposed supermarket and town centre.

Louise Burns (00663/1/002); Jamie Burns (00660/1/002); Ewan Burns (00661/1/002); David Burns (00662/1/002): Support for site MU7, however wish to increase capacity by 60 units. This is to facilitate the separate request to delete site H57, which is dealt with elsewhere within this form.

Broich Road Farm (09285/3/001): Support the proposed masterplanning of the site however the masterplan should determine the extent of land to the east of the site which will be required to protect the Scheduled Monument and its setting

Isobel McCallum (00607/1/002): Concerns at increased traffic volume at the junction of South Crieff Road and Highlandman Loan

Jonathan Poore (00792/1/001): A heritable right of access from Broich Steading to Broich Road is claimed and should therefore be excluded from the site plan. Concerns that three access points to Broich Road will increase traffic; and that new access points will require tree felling, which will adversely impact on bat habitat.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/008): Concerns about the size of the proposed development, and that it won't provide a sense of place unless Plan is changed to ensure a mix of building styles is developed and that quality of build is maintained; concerns about the narrow B8062, which will require widening because it is already of inadequate width.

John Champion (10287/1/001): Development should be of good quality with a variety of styles and suitably wide access roads.

Robert Simpson & Son (09313/8/001): An amendment is requested to site MU7 to reflect the boundary set out in the MIR (S4_Doc_229). While it is understood that the Proposed Plan site boundary was drawn with input from Historic Scotland and Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust, other areas are suggested for inclusion in the masterplanned area without necessarily being developed to ensure that the protection and setting of the scheduled monument is maintained.

Op21 Broich Road

Crieff Community Council (09327/1/003 & 09327/1/006): There are concerns that the area will be developed in a piece meal way without coherence or cohesion. The infrastructure requirements in respect of sites MU7, E27 and Op21 should be considered together. A coherent and cohesive Development Brief should be prepared for site Op21 taking the neighbouring sites' infrastructure requirements into consideration.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**Settlement Boundary**

Oakbank (Crieff) Ltd (00350/1/001): Amend settlement boundary north of Horseshoe Drive (S4_Doc_378) to match site H17 of the Strathearn Area Local Plan 2001 (S4_Doc_714).

New Community Facility

Ken Russell (09193/4/001): Amend paragraph 8.1.12 of the Plan to include provision of new opportunity sites and/or new mixed use developments in Crieff for further improved/new community facilities. Site E26 is referred to in the representation.

Ken Russell (09193/5/001): Insert the words '*new and*' to paragraph 8.3.2 to read '*...The provision of new and better community and commercial facilities in the town...*'

Ken Russell (09193/3/002): Amend paragraph 8.1.6 to reallocate Crieff's employment sites as opportunity sites where mixed use development will be supported.

New Employment Site

Mr & Mrs S McKay (00705/1/002): Amend Plan to allocate fields either side of the Muthill road beyond the 30 mile limit heading towards Muthill for employment use.

Cumulative Impact of Proposed Development on Crieff's Transport Network

Scottish Government (00092/9/001): Amend Plan to require an appropriate transport assessment to demonstrate whether the A85 trunk road through Crieff can accommodate the level of development (particularly housing) proposed. Should mitigation measures be required, then they should be agreed with Transport Scotland.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/003): Amend Plan to remove through-traffic from Crieff town centre by providing a relief route from Gilmerton, along the Highlandman Road, the B8062, Broich Road, and A822.

Crieff Community Trust Steering Group (00859/1/002): Amend Plan to require significant roads, traffic management, parking and public transport improvements

Crieff Town Centre

Mr & Mrs A J P Leaver (00515/1/002): Although not explicitly requested, it is inferred that the respondent wishes the Plan amended to include proposals to improve Crieff town centre or to require that Supplementary Guidance be prepared to this effect.

Gordon Taylor (00628/1/001): Amend Plan to require development of brownfield and decaying sites in Crieff town centre; and to improve roads infrastructure in the town.

Crieff Community Trust Steering Group: (00859/1/004): Amend Plan to prevent retail use outwith Crieff town centre (High Street/King Street).

Crieff Community Trust Steering Group (00859/1/005): Amend Plan to put a greater emphasis on the regeneration and improvement of Crieff's historic town centre; and include details of how Crieff's Conservation Area will be enhanced and protected.

Deallocation of Open Space at site south of West March, Turretbank Road

Blazon Developments Ltd (00478/1/001): Removal of Open Space allocation at identified site south of West March, Turretbank Road, Crieff.(S4_Doc_378)

Crieff Masterplan

John Champion (10287/1/001): The Plan should also be amended to require a master plan for the whole of Crieff that will require improvements to the town's infrastructure before any new development takes place; will emphasise the need for investment and the redevelopment of brownfield sites in Crieff town centre; will limit building heights to no higher than the Strathearn Community Campus; will provide a new Crieff relief road and will improve capacity at Dollerie Terrace; will ensure the retention and reuse of the listed buildings at Site E27 as part of a housing development; will require the south Crieff hub to be linked to the town centre; and will provide an opportunity to recreate the Style of Crieff feature at site MU7.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership: (00928/1/001 & 00928/1/002): No large scale development to proceed in Crieff in advance of a Crieff-wide masterplan. Amend Plan to limit the height of any new buildings to no more than the height of the Strathearn Community Campus.

Crieff Community Trust Steering Group: (00859/1/003): Amend Proposed Plan to require the development of Crieff's brownfield sites and disused buildings for employment and housing uses before any development of greenfield sites. Alternatively, developers should be required to make a contribution to the development of any derelict and disused land as a condition of any future development of greenfield land.

E26 Bridgend

Mr & Mrs K Russell (00791/2/001); Mr & Mrs Neil Watters (00833/1/001): Amend Plan to remove site.

E A Powell (00503/1/001); Mr & Mrs S McKay (00705/1/001): Amend Plan to remove part of site north of Alichmore Lane.

Ken Russell (09193/6/001 & 09193/7/001): Amend Plan from employment to mixed uses.

Drummond Estates (07693/13/001 & 07693/14/001): Amend Plan in respect of site E26 (north) from employment to housing, and in respect of site E26 (south) from employment to opportunity site suitable for a mix of employment and tourist/retail uses.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/004): Amend Plan to include a site specific developer requirement to assess any increase in traffic on local road network and core path network due to the proposal.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/29/001): Amend Plan to include a site specific developer requirement for a flood risk assessment; and to avoid development on the functional flood plain or in an area of known flood risk.

E27 Broich Road

Ken Russell (09193/6/002): Amend Plan from employment to mixed uses

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/005): Amend Plan to prevent retail use; avoid destruction of listed building; and include housing, holiday accommodation or micro business and potential uses for the listed buildings.

Crieff Community Council (09327/1/004 & 09327/1/002): Amend Plan to ensure necessary infrastructure is in place before development takes place; and to prevent retail use.

John Champion (10287/1/001): Amend Plan to reuse the farm house as a dwelling or alternatively for office use.

H55 Laggan Road

Charles Campbell-Crawford (00315/1/001); Moyra Turnbull (00297/1/001); Mr & Mrs T McNutt (00298/1/001); L G Banks (00401/1/001); Stella Ferguson (00411/1/001); Isabel Campbell (00338/1/001); Professor David Sloan (00351/1/001); Margaret Sloan (00352/1/001); Gordon Campbell (00354/1/001); S D Millar (00355/1/001); G & S C Hookham (00379/1/001); Susan Stevens (00475/1/001); Mr & Mrs P Callander (00495/1/001); Ruth Stone (00592/1/001); Mike & Pam Ross (00605/1/001); John Watson Scott (00608/1/001); Mr & Mrs A P Milroy (00561/1/001); Tom & Mandy Guthrie (00621/1/001); Karen Brown (00625/1/001); Susan Carter (00715/2/001); Graham Carter (00716/1/001); Dr Ken Arton (00927/1/001); Dr & Mrs J L Graham (00929/1/001); Sasha Brunton (00935/1/001); Alan Brunton (00936/1/001); Robert Whyte (00937/1/001); Mr & Mrs Mark Cumming (00866/1/001); Fiona Struthers (00871/1/001): Amend Plan to remove site H55

Lesley La Hay (00910/1/002): Amend Plan to remove proposals for housing development on previously undeveloped (green) sites in Crieff.

Malcolm Hicks (00353/1/001): Amend Plan to include a site specific developer requirement for road safety improvements to the local network, specifically Laggan Road, Turret Bridge, Lade Bridge, and the junction of Milnab Road and Sauchie Road.

Maureen Pennie (00820/1/001): Amend Plan to give further consideration to the need for additional houses in the area; loss of prime agricultural land; site specific developer requirements for capacity improvement at waste water treatment works; access to Lady Mary's Walk; and adverse impact on local road network.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/006): Amend Plan to include a site specific developer requirement for capacity improvement at waste water treatment works; and wider access road.

John McDonald (00408/1/001); Mr & Mrs T McNutt (00298/1/002): Amend Plan to remove site H55 and allocate for allotment use.

Robert Simpson & Son (09313/7/001): No change to the Plan.

H57 Wester Tomaknock

L J Laird (00395/1/001); Simon Barnes (00396/1/001); Mr & Mrs A J P Leaver (00515/1/001); Vicki Renwick (00517/1/001); Ian Barr (00575/1/001); Helen Barr (00576/1/001); Ruth Stone (00592/1/002); Donald Smith (00565/1/001); Ann Grodzicka (00706/1/001); Robert Lauchan (00938/1/001); Fiona Struthers (00871/1/002): Amend Plan to remove site H57.

Lesley La Hay (00910/1/002): Amend Plan to remove proposals for housing development on previously undeveloped (green) sites in Crieff.

Jamie Burns (00660/1/001); Ewan Burns (00661/1/001); David Burns (00662/1/001); Louise Burns (00663/1/001); Joan Dyer (00615/1/001); Jane Foster (00819/1/001); Benjamin Foster (00815/1/001); Joshua Foster (00816/1/001); Morgan Foster (00817/1/001); Henry Foster (00818/1/001): Amend Plan to remove site H57, reallocate 60 units to site MU7.

Residents of Ritchie Place & Rintoul Avenue (00615/2/001): No specific changes, however requests amend Plan to address concerns expressed regarding flood risk; traffic; few amenities; settlement boundary; distance from school; access; disturbance to wildlife in the area; and sewerage capacity.

Mr & Mrs C Nairn (00410/1/001): No specific changes, however requests amend Plan to take account of flood risk, biodiversity and habitats; traffic issues and sewerage capacity.

Philip Dyer (00635/1/001): No specific changes however requests amend Plan to take account of concerns in respect of site H57.

Graeme Robertson (00600/1/001); John Champion (10287/1/001); Isobel McCallum (00607/1/001); Allan Downie (00713/1/001): No specific changes however requests amend Plan to take account of concerns raised about traffic safety. Mr Downie requests amend Plan to prevent access to H57 via Dollerie Terrace.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/007): Amend Plan to address concerns regarding road safety and flood risk and drainage.

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (09004/20/001 & 09004/21/001): Amend proposal H57: change site capacity from 60 units to 100-120 units; change site size from 5.6Ha to 10.2Ha; change site specific developer requirements from '*Significant landscaping requirements including a woodland strip will reduce its developable area to 4Ha or approximately 60 units*' to '*Appropriate landscaping requirements including a woodland strip will reduce its developable area to 6.4Ha or approximately 100-120 units*'.

Christian & David Stewart (07693/10/001): Amend Plan with alternative to site H57 proposed.

MU7 Broich Road

Ailsa Campbell (00459/1/001); Lesley La Hay (00910/1/001 & 00910/1/002): Amend Plan to remove site MU7.

Crieff Community Council (09327/1/005 & 09327/1/001): Amend Plan to remove site MU7. Alternatively, should the site not be removed from the Plan, request that the plan be amended to ensure necessary infrastructure is in place before development of site MU7.

John Watson Scott (00608/1/002): Support for site MU7, instead of site H55.

Louise Burns (00663/1/002); Jamie Burns (00660/1/002); Ewan Burns (00661/1/002); David Burns (00662/1/002): Amend Plan to increase capacity by 60 units (reallocation from site H57 to site MU7).

Broich Road Farm (09285/3/001): Amend Plan to specify that the masterplan should determine the extent of land to the east of the site that will be required to protect the Scheduled Monument and its setting.

Isobel McCallum (00607/1/002): Amend Plan to include site specific developer requirement for improvements to the South Crieff Road/Highlandman Loan junction.

Jonathan Poore (00792/1/001): Amend Plan to exclude access drive between Broich Road and Broich Steading from site MU7; and to include site specific developer requirements for alternative access points to the east and west of the drive avoiding adverse impact on bat habitat at Crow Wood.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/008); John Champion (10287/1/001): Amend Plan to include site specific developer requirements that ensure a mix of building styles and quality of build is maintained; and suitably wide access roads (including B8062) are provided.

Robert Simpson & Son (09313/8/001): Amend Plan to reflect suggested revised boundaries for site MU7.

Op21 Broich Road

Crieff Community Council (09327/1/003 & 09327/1/006): Amend Plan to ensure necessary infrastructure is in place before development of site Op21. Amend Plan to require a development brief for Op21 that considers infrastructure requirements for the whole development area.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

Settlement Boundary

Oakbank (Crieff) Ltd (00350/1/001): This is drafting error of a minor nature which, if corrected, could resolve this issue. The issue raised is noted and accepted. Map 3 of the Strathearn Area Local Plan (Core_Doc_007) identified the housing site with an open space allocation at the north of the site. The Plan proposed a new settlement boundary that only included the part of the larger site that is completed.

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the proposed modification is adopted, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications on other aspects of the Plan.

New Community Facility

Ken Russell (09193/4/001): The Plan already provides for new and improved community and commercial facilities. In the case of Crieff, these will be provided in three sites, MU7, H57 and H55 that collectively have the potential to provide housing land incorporating new and improved community facilities (see paragraph 8.1.12). Furthermore, the general residential Policy RD1 (S4_Doc_405) allows for community facilities where they are compatible with residential amenity. In addition, there are several underutilised buildings in central Crieff that could be suitable for community facilities. No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Ken Russell (09193/5/001): The proposed addition of the words '*new and*' are not necessary since the Plan implicitly allows for new community facilities in the sites mentioned in the paragraph above.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mr Ken Russell (09193/3/002): The reason given for requesting this change is so that a community development can be sited in Crieff. It is unclear what description and extent of new facilities are sought and whether it would be appropriate to reallocate valuable employment land for such uses. The Plan already provides for new community facilities in the sites mentioned in the paragraph above.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

New Employment Site

Mr & Mrs S McKay (00705/1/002): The issue of whether there is enough employment land in Crieff is considered to be covered by Policy ED1 (S4_Doc_483) and sites E26, E27 & MU7 elsewhere in the LDP. No location plan is supplied. The Council does not wish the Plan amended to include the sites suggested because it is clear that both of the sites would impinge on the Garden and Designed Landscape at Drummond Castle, and one of the sites would be at risk of flooding from the nearby River Earn.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Cumulative Impact of Proposed Development on Crieff's Transport Network

Scottish Government (00092/9/001); Crieff Community Trust Steering Group (00859/1/002): The issues raised are considered to be covered where appropriate in the infrastructure considerations section for each LDP Proposal and in particular sites H57 and MU7 already have a requirement for a Transport Assessment, backed up by Policy TA1 (S4_Doc_387). Transport Assessments generally look at any wider impact on the road network and this would be covered more appropriately in any required Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the proposed modification is adopted, the Council would be comfortable with this modification as it would not have any implications for any other aspect of the Plan.

Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/003): The identification of a relief route is not considered a proportionate response to the problems identified, namely congestion in central Crieff. Furthermore, the A85 is a trunk road and this project was not identified in Transport Scotland's Strategic Transport Projects Review (Core_Doc_050). Should a study of the cumulative impact of proposed development on Crieff's transport network identify a relief route is necessary then this would be considered for inclusion in a future LDP.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Crieff Town Centre

Mr & Mrs A J P Leaver (00515/1/002); Gordon Taylor (00628/1/001); Crieff Community Trust Steering Group (00859/1/004 & 00859/1/005): The issues raised are considered to be covered in the Plan's retail section and at paragraph 8.3.2 where it deals with Crieff town centre. Transport improvements are also covered in the Plan's infrastructure considerations section for each proposal. The Council is working with local community groups to improve the town centre. The Plan does support reuse of brownfield land however it requires a willing developer. In the current economic climate development of brownfield land presents severe challenges in terms of viability. The issue of concurrent development proposed by Mr Gordon Taylor (00628/1/001) is not considered to be legally

enforceable.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Deallocation of Open Space at site south of West March, Turretbank Road

Blazon Developments Ltd (00478/1/001): The open space allocation is considered appropriate. It is not intended to signify public access to the site. The site and trees contained in the site are considered valuable to the landscape setting of the area.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Crieff Masterplan

John Champion (10287/1/001); Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership: (00928/1/001 & 00928/1/002); Crieff Community Trust Steering Group: (00859/1/003): The issues raised are considered to be covered where appropriate in the Crieff spatial strategy considerations section and in the infrastructure considerations section for each LDP Proposal. The suggestion to place a height restriction on buildings in an area of varying topography is considered inappropriate.

Turning to the prioritisation of brownfield sites, whilst there are brownfield opportunities available, some of which are being promoted through this LDP, for the most part these too have issues and constraints. In particular it is generally recognised that brownfield sites often come with abnormal development costs, i.e. demolition, cleaning up of contamination etc. These additional burdens may affect the viability of sites, particularly in the current economic climate.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

E26 Bridgend

Mr & Mrs K Russell (00791/2/001); Mr & Mrs Neil Watters (00833/1/001); E A Powell (00503/1/001); Mr & Mrs S McKay (00705/1/001); Ken Russell (09193/6/001); (09193/7/001); Drummond Estates (07693/13/001 & 07693/14/001); Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/004): The issue of whether there is enough employment land in Crieff is considered to be covered by Policy ED1 (S4_Doc_483) and sites E26, E27 and MU7 here and elsewhere in the Plan. It is important that a supply of employment land remains available in the area and the suggested alternative uses such as housing and mixed use tourist/retail uses are not considered appropriate, particularly tourist and retail uses that would be better located nearer the town centre. There is already a site specific developer requirement in respect of roads and access improvement. The issue of topography may limit the use of part of the site but the remainder should be developable. It is recognised that not all the land identified is likely to be developed and this is partly why an oversupply of employment land is identified. A suitably safe road access can be provided to this site through the existing employment land and this is reflected in the site specific developer requirements. In respect of compatibility between employment and residential uses, it is considered that there are many employment uses (particularly Class 4 uses) that are compatible with residential uses. An adequate supply of long term housing land is identified at other sites closer to community facilities. This site lies between existing employment land and an intensive chicken rearing unit in agricultural use.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/29/001): The issue raised is noted. Part

of the site, particularly the neighbouring employment land and possibly that part of E26 nearer the River Earn, may not be suitable for development because it is at risk of flooding. Further investigation or an amendment to the site specific developer requirement may be appropriate.

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the proposed modification is adopted, the Council would be comfortable with this modification because it would not have any implications on site E26 or other aspects of the Plan.

E27 Broich Road

Ken Russell (09193/6/002); Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/005); Crieff Community Council (09327/1/004 & 09327/1/002); John Champion (10287/1/001): The issue of whether there is enough employment land in Crieff is considered to be covered by Policy ED1 (S4_Doc_483) and sites E26, E27 and MU7 here and elsewhere in the Plan. It is important that a supply of employment land remains available in the area and the suggested alternative uses such as housing and holiday accommodation would prevent employment use at the site. Retail and/or residential uses are not proposed. Development that may affect the listed farmhouse building at the site or its setting would be assessed as part of any application for planning permission and/or listed building consent. In addition, the developer requirement to implement an approved development brief will ensure the site is developed in a masterplanned way with appropriate consideration of listed buildings.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

H55 Laggan Road

Charles Campbell-Crawford (00315/1/001); Moyra Turnbull (00297/1/001); Mr & Mrs T McNutt (00298/1/001); L G Banks (00401/1/001); Stella Ferguson (00411/1/001); Isabel Campbell (00338/1/001); Professor David Sloan (00351/1/001); Margaret Sloan (00352/1/001); Gordon Campbell (00354/1/001); S D Millar (00355/1/001); G & S C Hookham (00379/1/001); Susan Stevens (00475/1/001); Mr & Mrs P Callander (00495/1/001); Ruth Stone (00592/1/001); Mike & Pam Ross (00605/1/001); John Watson Scott (00608/1/001); Mr & Mrs A P Milroy (00561/1/001); Tom & Mandy Guthrie (00621/1/001); Karen Brown (00625/1/001); Susan Carter (00715/2/001); Graham Carter (00716/1/001); Dr Ken Arton (00927/1/001); Dr & Mrs J L Graham (00929/1/001); Sasha Brunton (00935/1/001); Alan Brunton (00936/1/001); Robert Whyte (00937/1/001); Mr & Mrs Mark Cumming (00866/1/001); Fiona Struthers (00871/1/001); Lesley La Hay (00910/1/002); Malcolm Hicks (00353/1/001); Maureen Pennie (00820/1/001); Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/006); John McDonald (00408/1/001); Mr & Mrs T McNutt (00298/1/002): While the MIR acknowledged that there may be some development on brownfield land in Crieff, it noted at paragraph 5.5.10 (S4_Doc_230) that *'the majority of development is likely to be on greenfield land'*. The reason for this is related to the poor viability of brownfield land in Crieff, which is an issue to be addressed separately, and additionally to offer a choice of sites.

The MIR sought views on development options on a larger area than is proposed at H55. The potential for adverse impacts on views and landscape has been considered by SNH and its comments have been taken into account in proposing the size of the site and scale of development at H55. The site's capacity for development has also been limited by the capacity of the surrounding road network of minor roads. It is acknowledged that while there may be some adverse impact on habitats these can be mitigated. It is not considered that there is a lack of community facilities in Crieff. A new community campus has been developed with a new primary school proposed; and there are modern health

care facilities in the town. There is capacity in Crieff's community facilities to cope with increased pressure and the Plan requires drainage to connect to Public Waste Water Treatment Works. The site would connect to the core path network.

An alternative use for the site as allotments and a play area is proposed however the site is near open space at MacRosty Park and the Council is already working with a local allotment association to identify a suitable allotment site. There is no landowner support for allotment and play area use.

The alternative development site suggested at Broich Road is a much longer-term development option and it is considered important that another site such as H55 be available for development in the shorter term.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

H57 Wester Tomaknock

L J Laird (00395/1/001); Simon Barnes (00396/1/001); Mr & Mrs A J P Leaver (00515/1/001); Vicki Renwick (00517/1/001); Ian Barr (00575/1/001); Helen Barr (00576/1/001); Ruth Stone (00592/1/002); Donald Smith (00565/1/001); Ann Grodzicka (00706/1/001); Robert Lauchan (00938/1/001); Fiona Struthers (00871/1/002); Lesley La Hay (00910/1/002); Jamie Burns (00660/1/001); Ewan Burns (00661/1/001); David Burns (00662/1/001); Louise Burns (00663/1/001); Joan Dyer (00615/1/001); Jane Foster (00819/1/001); Benjamin Foster (00815/1/001); Joshua Foster (00816/1/001); Morgan Foster (00817/1/001); Henry Foster (00818/1/001); Residents of Ritchie Place & Rintoul Avenue (00615/2/001); Mr & Mrs C Nairn (00410/1/001); Philip Dyer (00635/1/001); Graeme Robertson (00600/1/001); John Champion (10287/1/001); Isobel McCallum (00607/1/001); Allan Downie (00713/1/001); Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/007); Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (09004/20/001 & 09004/21/001); Christian & David Stewart (07693/10/001): As mentioned above, while the MIR acknowledged that there may be some development on brownfield land in Crieff, it noted at paragraph 5.5.10 (S4_Doc_230) that *'the majority of development is likely to be on greenfield land'*. The reason for this is related to the poor viability of brownfield land in Crieff, which is an issue to be addressed separately.

The MIR sought views on development options on a larger area than is proposed at H57. The potential for adverse impacts on views, habitats and landscape has been considered by SNH and its comments have been taken into account in proposing the reduced size of the site and scale of development at H57. A flood risk assessment and transport assessment are also required as part of the site specific developer requirements and these will address flooding concerns and access issues along Dollerie Terrace. Furthermore a masterplan will be required to ensure that any built form and layout respond appropriately to the landscape. There is a watercourse in the vicinity of the site that may preclude development on a small proportion of the site however this is reflected in the total number of units proposed at the site, which at 60 is relatively low. It is acknowledged that while there may be some adverse impact on habitats, these can be mitigated.

It is not considered that there is a lack of community facilities in Crieff. A new community campus has been developed relatively nearby with a new primary school proposed; and there are modern health care facilities in the town. There is capacity in Crieff's community facilities to cope with increased pressure and the Plan requires drainage to connect to Public Waste Water Treatment Works. Concerning the comments in respect of the town centre, it is considered that additional housing would support the viability of the town

centre, in tandem with the identification of employment land elsewhere in the town. It is acknowledged that this proposal extends the boundary of Crieff however expansion beyond this would raise concerns in respect of adverse impact on the landscape and visual containment of the settlement.

Three representations propose an extension to the site's boundary to the north and south of the identified site. Whilst it is noted that the site boundaries do not reflect the total landholdings of the various landowners, this is not considered to be a justification to extend the boundary where other agencies suggest this would be inappropriate. As has been noted above, larger scale allocations were considered at MIR stage however these attracted significant opposition due to landscape impact, impact on Dollerie Terrace and particularly its junction with the A85 trunk road. In the case of the extension to the south, there is potential for flooding from the burn on the east boundary.

It is considered that H57 would offer choice in the housing market in Crieff.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

MU7 Broich Road

Ailsa Campbell (00459/1/001); Lesley La Hay (00910/1/001 & 00910/1/002); Crieff Community Council (09327/1/005 & 09327/1/001): As mentioned above, while the MIR acknowledged that there may be some development on brownfield land in Crieff, it noted at paragraph 5.5.10 (S4_Doc_230) that *'the majority of development is likely to be on greenfield land'*. The reason for this is related to the poor viability of brownfield land in Crieff, which is an issue to be addressed separately.

The MIR sought views on development options on a larger area than is proposed at MU7. The potential for adverse impacts on environmental quality, habitats and landscape has been considered by SNH and its comments have been taken into account in proposing the size of the site and scale of development at MU7. A masterplan approach will avoid piecemeal development and ensure that any necessary infrastructure is given consideration in advance of development taking place. The Broich Road area to the south of Crieff already includes the Community Campus and a supermarket and primary school are proposed together with employment land. It is therefore considered that this area is an appropriate long term location for a large scale mixed use development site. It is acknowledged that there are issues with capacity at the junction at the western end of Broich Road and suitable mitigation measures will be a matter for the Transport Assessment that forms part of the developer requirements.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Louise Burns (00663/1/002); Jamie Burns (00660/1/002); Ewan Burns (00661/1/002); David Burns (00662/1/002): Although not explicitly stated, it is inferred that the respondents' sole reason for increasing the density at MU7 is so that H57 can be removed from the Plan. There appears no wish to independently increase density at MU7. As noted above in discussions on H57, the Council would prefer to retain H57 to offer choice and would not suggest an increase to the density at MU7 at this point in time. It is recognised that the masterplan process may identify opportunities for this site to accommodate a higher level of density however if this was the case it would be for a future review of the LDP to identify such a longer term opportunity.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Broich Road Farm (09285/3/001): The area around the Scheduled Monument that should be reserved for landscaping or left undeveloped has been identified in conjunction with Historic Scotland.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Isobel McCallum (00607/1/002); Jonathan Poore (00792/1/001); Crieff & Upper Strathearn Partnership (00928/1/008); John Champion (10287/1/001): These suggested changes to the Plan would be best considered as part of the masterplanning of the site, including whether works should be necessary to the road network to make the development acceptable, and whether the Broich Steading access should be excluded from the site. The Transport Assessment generally looks at any wider impact on the road network including Highlandman Loan, and this would be covered more appropriately in any required Transport Assessment as part of the masterplanning of the site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Robert Simpson & Son (09313/8/001): The options for development at this site were set out in the MIR however it was specified at paragraph 5.1.9 (S4_Doc_724) that '*at this stage site boundaries have not been precisely identified*' and the text and maps in the MIR were intended to draw comments from developers, landowners, key agencies and other consultees as to what should and should not be included in the Proposed LDP. Following consideration of all comments in respect of the site's boundary, and with particular input from Historic Scotland and Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust, a proposed site boundary was published that meets their approval. It is considered that further expansion to the south east of the site may limit the continued operation of the North Forr waste management site by the introduction of potentially incompatible mixed uses in the vicinity of this important facility.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Op21 Broich Road

Crieff Community Council (09327/1/003 & 09327/1/006): The issues raised are considered to be covered where appropriate in the Crieff spatial strategy considerations section and in the infrastructure considerations section for each LDP Proposal. The masterplanning for MU7 will require to take account of the wider area including E27, Op21 and the supermarket site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Reporter's conclusions:

Settlement boundary north of Horseshoe Drive

1. The settlement boundary shown on the Crieff Settlement Map does not accurately reflect the boundary of the site under development at Horseshoe Drive. This is a drafting error and the settlement boundary should be re-instated as shown on Map 3: Crieff in the adopted Strathearn Area Local Plan.

New community facility

2. In relation to the concerns expressed regarding the provision of community facilities in Crieff (rep. nos. 09193/3/001, 09193/4/001 & 09193/5/001), the Proposed Plan makes

provision for better community and commercial facilities, which includes new facilities, in the Broich Road development to the south of the town. Paragraph 8.1.12 of the Proposed Plan refers to this provision and paragraph 8.3.2 restates the position. There is no need for any further clarification. In addition, Policy RD1 supports improvements to community facilities within established residential areas.

New employment site

3. In relation to the suggestion that the fields either side of Muthill Road beyond the 30mph limit should be considered for employment use, any development in this area would impinge on the Drummond Castle Garden and Designed Landscape. Furthermore, sufficient employment land is available in the existing employment sites and in proposed sites E26, E27 and MU7.

Cumulative impact of proposed developments on transport network

4. In relation to the request for much greater emphasis on the requirement for infrastructure improvements in relation to roads, traffic management, parking and public transport, the planning authority points out that Policy TA1 requires the preparation of Transport Assessments and the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures for individual development proposals, where appropriate. Transport Assessments are developer requirements for proposed sites H57 and MU7.

5. In relation to the concerns expressed regarding the cumulative impact of proposed developments, particularly housing development, on the A85 through Crieff, the planning authority agrees that the Transport Assessments required for individual developments should establish the impact of those developments on the A85 and that any mitigation measures required should be agreed with Transport Scotland. It is considered that an appropriate reference to this requirement should be made in the spatial strategy considerations in paragraph 8.3.2.

6. In relation to the request that independent traffic consultants should be appointed to examine traffic issues on the A85 through Crieff and the possibility of a partial relief route around the town centre, the planning authority points out that this project is not identified in Transport Scotland's Strategic Transport Projects Review. Should the impact of proposed developments at Broich or elsewhere identify a relief route as necessary, through the preparation of Transport Assessments, this would be a matter for the planning authority to consider in determining the scale of housing development that is acceptable. Any proposal for a relief route would be a matter for a review of the local development plan.

Crieff town centre

7. In relation to the concerns expressed regarding the impact of retail development outwith the town centre and the request that more emphasis be put on the regeneration and improvement of Crieff's historic town centre, the planning authority points out that paragraph 8.3.2 draws attention to the need to retain town centre uses to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the town centre. Policy RC1 encourages a range of uses in town centres, providing they contribute to the character, vitality and viability of the retail area. The Proposed Plan supports the re-use of brownfield land. The impact of traffic from proposed developments on the town centre is a matter for assessment through the preparation of Transport Assessments for major developments. As indicated in paragraph 5 above, it is considered that the requirement to assess the impact of

proposed developments on the A85, and identify any mitigation measures required, should be emphasised in paragraph 8.3.2 of the Proposed Plan. Such assessments should also encompass other relevant town centre roads.

Crieff Masterplan

8. The issues raised under this heading are covered in general terms by the spatial strategy considerations in paragraph 8.3.2 of the Proposed Plan. Infrastructure considerations are covered in paragraph 8.3.3, and infrastructure improvements, where necessary, are required under the site-specific developer requirements specified for each proposed development. Furthermore, Policy PM1 of the Proposed Plan requires all development to contribute, positively, to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment. Policy PM1B specifies more specific criteria in relation to design and materials. Policy TA1 requires the preparation of Transport Assessments and the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures for individual development proposals, where appropriate. It is considered that, together, the considerations and requirements outlined above are sufficient to guide the development of Crieff over the next decade.

Open space at West March, Turretbank Road

9. The contested area comprises scrub woodland fenced off from the immediate garden ground of the property 'West March'. Nevertheless, it forms part of the curtilage of 'West March' and is in private use. The area is separated from the adjacent public park and playing fields by a fence and hedge and its value as recreational open space is extremely limited. However, the wooded area is considered valuable to the landscape setting of the area. In relation to Issue 11: Community facilities, Sport and Recreation, it is concluded that the scope of policy CF1A should be extended to protect open space which has amenity value as well as those areas of recreational value. Ownership of the land is not a determining issue but it is the value of the land to the community either as a recreational or an amenity resource that is important. Accordingly, it is concluded, in this case, that incorporation into the open space designation to which policy CF1A applies is appropriate.

E26 Bridgend

10. Site E26 comprises two areas of ground situated north and south of Alichmore Lane. That part of site E26 south of Alichmore Lane would be accessed through the existing employment land. It is allocated for general business, industrial and distribution uses in the adopted Strathearn Area Local Plan. Site-specific developer requirements include road and access improvements and a landscaping framework, including a woodland buffer to the southern boundary and the mitigation of the potential impact on the Drummond Castle Garden and Designed Landscape. The council does not object to the addition of "Flood risk assessment" to the list of site-specific developer requirements. In relation to the request that the range of uses be broadened to include business, storage and tourist/retail uses reflecting existing uses on the existing estate, the planning authority considers that tourist and retail uses would be better located nearer the town centre. It is considered that, on balance, the 'General employment use', which provides the opportunity for a range of light industrial, business, office and storage/distribution uses, is appropriate, notwithstanding the wider range of uses in the existing estate.

11. That part of site E26 north of Alichmore Lane is of a different character and is overlooked by residential property to the west. The northern part slopes steeply to Strowan Road. A site previously identified for housing development in the adopted

Strathearn Area Local Plan (site H54) lies between the site and existing housing to the east. Any development on this site would be much more prominent and access and road safety issues have been identified. Accordingly, it is considered that this site is not appropriate for identification as employment land. Other sites in Crieff, sites E27 and MU7, have been identified to meet the employment land requirements of the Proposed Plan. In relation to the request to re-allocate the site for housing, there is no need for additional housing land in Crieff and it is considered, therefore, that the employment designation should be removed from the northern part of E26 and the settlement boundary returned to that in the adopted Strathearn Area Local Plan.

E27 Broich Road

12. Site E27 comprises the farmhouse, a wide-range of steading buildings and a small field forming part of Duchlage Farm. It adjoins the site for a new supermarket to the west and is adjacent to a site to the east identified for the provision of a new primary school (Op21). In relation to the need for the site, the Proposed Plan identifies a requirement for some 20 hectares of employment land in Strathearn during the 14 year period 2010-2024. Sites in Auchterarder, Crieff and Aberuthven have been identified to meet the need in Strathearn. The Main Issues Report (MIR) indicated that, given the significant housing expansion proposed for Crieff, there was a need for approximately 5 hectares of additional employment land to maintain an adequate supply and offer choice. Site E26, as modified, would provide land for the continued expansion of the Bridgend Industrial Area and site MU7 includes the provision of a minimum of 5 hectares of employment land as part of the comprehensive development of the Broich Road area.

13. Site E27, sandwiched between the proposed supermarket and the site for a new primary school, would offer a choice of location for small-scale businesses that are compatible with the neighbouring retail, residential and education uses, and the description of the site rightly points out that any business use must be compatible with neighbouring uses. The designation would not allow further retail or commercial uses. Any development on the site would be required to conform to the development brief approved by the council in 2006 that covers the whole area between Market Park and the new Secondary School. Policy HE2 of the Proposed Plan would ensure that the interests of the Category B listed farmhouse are taken into account in any development proposal.

MU7 Broich Road

14. In relation to the principal of this comprehensive development, the Proposed Plan identifies a requirement for 1,820 houses in the Strathearn Housing Market Area during the period 2010-2024, in order to accommodate the population increase projected by TAYplan. In accordance with the TAYplan hierarchical settlement approach, the Proposed Plan seeks to concentrate the majority of the housing development in Auchterarder and Crieff, the principal settlements in Strathearn. Auchterarder has a significant supply of effective housing land and the vast majority of housing development during the Plan period will be concentrated in Auchterarder. Taking account of expected windfall sites, land for only some 265 additional housing units is required to meet the 2010-2024 housing requirement and the majority of the additional housing land allocations are located in Crieff. Site MU7 will make a significant contribution to the housing requirement, phased over the lifetime of the Proposed Plan.

15. This site was thoroughly examined through the MIR process, which points out that it is unlikely that significant numbers of houses can be accommodated on brownfield land within Crieff. It is considered that the Broich Road area, which is the location of the

Community Campus, supermarket and primary school, is the appropriate long-term location for the expansion of Crieff. A Masterplan is proposed to guide the future development of this area and site-specific developer requirements include the need for a Transport Assessment; the provision of a mix of housing types and sizes; the retention of the existing woodland framework, hedge lines and woodland corridors; the protection of the Scheduled Ancient Monument; the protection of habitats and the enhancement of biodiversity. It is considered that these developer requirements address the various concerns of respondents, including the design and layout of the development, the requirement for specific access improvements and the impact on the wider road network, and the avoidance of any adverse impact on bats.

16. As regards the capacity of the site and its extent, an area of ground between site MU7 and North Bridge Street, located to the south-west of the Arnbro Caravan Site, is not included in the site, although it lies within the settlement boundary. This area of land was included within MIR site B and there would seem to be no logical reason for not including this area within site MU7 to ensure that any proposed development on this area of land is fully integrated with the masterplanning of the whole Broich Road area. The estimated capacity of site B in the MIR was 330 dwellings but whether or not an enlarged site MU7 could provide a higher number of housing units within the Plan period than the 300 units proposed in the Plan would be a matter for the masterplan to determine.

17. Site MU7 also excludes land to the south and east of Broich Road Farm. An area of land to the west of Broich Road Farm is designated as open space, ostensibly to protect the nationally important scheduled monument at Broich. However, this designation covers only the northern half of the Scheduled Area and it would be logical to include the whole of the Scheduled Area in site MU7, as shown in the MIR and in the Broich Road Development Proposals and Site Analysis. The designation of the whole of the Scheduled Area as open space would enable it to be fully incorporated into the framework of the master plan for the Broich Road development.

18. The area to the east of Broich Road Farm was considered as an alternative employment site in the MIR (site E). This area is omitted from the Proposed Plan, following the consideration of comments from Historic Scotland and Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust, and the employment land proposed on it has been subsumed into a reduced site MU7. An archaeological study shows that there are five known sites within the boundaries of the whole developable area, which includes the field to the east of Broich Road Farm (see Rep. No. 09313/8 supporting document). The developer is aware of the implications of the presence of these sites and it is considered that the whole of the developable area has potential for development subject to the carrying out of an agreed programme of archaeological investigation and the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures. Any development on the land to the east of Broich Road Farm would also be required to take account of the proximity of the North Forr waste management facility. Nevertheless, the inclusion of this area of land in the masterplanning of the Broich Road area would allow greater flexibility in the provision of housing, employment and community facilities, open space and a landscape framework.

19. It is concluded, therefore, that site MU7 should encompass the whole area as shown on the plan following paragraph 3.10 of the supporting document accompanying rep. no. 09313/8 to allow a comprehensive and co-ordinated master plan approach to the development of this southern expansion area of Crieff.

Op21 Broich Road

20. The issues raised in relation to site Op21, the site for a proposed primary school, should be addressed through the implementation of the development brief approved by the council in 2006 that covers the whole area between Market Park and the new Secondary School, which includes site E27 and Op21. The master plan for site MU7 will be required to take account of the requirements of other developments in the vicinity, including infrastructure requirements.

H55 Laggan Road

21. There is overwhelming opposition to this site from residents of the surrounding area on a number of grounds. In particular, many respondents question the adequacy of the local road system connecting the site to the centre of Crieff; Laggan Road, Turretbank Road and Milnab Street, including the pinch points at the bridges over the Turret and the Lade, to accommodate the increased flow of traffic likely to be generated by an additional 50 houses. Many voice concerns about the potential impact on road and pedestrian safety along this steep, narrow and twisting route. Reference is made to the severe parking problems on Laggan Road following the up-grading of McRosty Park, which further reduces the capacity of this road to provide access to a further 50 houses. Respondents question whether Laggan Road is capable of being widened at its western end to accommodate an access to any housing development on the site. Concerns are also expressed regarding the loss of prime agricultural land, and the adverse impact of a housing development on habitats and the surrounding landscape and on the attractiveness of the circular Laggan Valley / Lady Mary's Walk, a Crieff tourist attraction, which is well used by walkers, runners and cyclists.

22. The planning authority acknowledges that the site is served by a network of minor roads with limited capacity and the maximum capacity of the site has been set at 50 houses. However, the Proposed Plan does not include a requirement for a Transport Assessment as part of any development proposal. The Transport Statement submitted on behalf of the landowner, based on a development proposal for 30-60 housing units, does not include any assessment of the traffic impact of the proposed development on the surrounding road system but suggests that this would form part of a submission in support of any future planning application.

23. In relation to the concerns expressed regarding the adverse impact of a housing development on the surrounding landscape, the planning authority recognises that the site is located in a prominent position on the edge of Crieff and the area designated in the Proposed Plan has been reduced to roughly half the size of that considered in the MIR. The northern boundary of the site is drawn about half way up the slope of the field.

24. There is no doubt that site H55 constitutes a significant incursion into open countryside in an area of high landscape value. However, similar considerations apply to much of the periphery of Crieff and development on greenfield land is inevitable if the housing requirement for the Strathearn HMA set out in TAYplan is to be met. Although there is land for housing at Broich Road (MU7) with a capacity for some 300 houses, more than the additional housing requirement for the Strathearn HMA, another site such as H55 would provide choice in the housing market. Site H57 at Wester Tomaknock would also serve the purpose of providing choice and the designation of this site is considered below.

25. In conclusion, therefore, it is considered that any concerns regarding the impact of a housing development on site H55 on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties, wildlife and natural habitats, and the landscape, including the attractiveness of the Laggan Valley/Lady Mary's Walk could be addressed through the imposition of site-specific developer requirements. All development must also comply with policy PM1 of the Proposed Plan, which requires development to contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment. Policy PM1B sets out a number of criteria that must be met to ensure that any development complements its surroundings.

26. However, the adequacy of the existing road system to accommodate the additional housing development proposed on site H55 has not been substantiated. It is considered that an assessment of the potential impact of the traffic likely to be generated by the development on adjoining roads is essential to any assessment of the adequacy of the existing road system to accommodate the additional housing development proposed for site H55. The submission of a transport assessment could be a site-specific developer requirement but it is considered that, in view of the legitimate road safety concerns raised, it would be premature to designate site H55 for housing development until the adequacy of the tortuous local road system to accommodate the development has been determined.

H57 Wester Tomaknock

27. There is opposition to this site from residents of the neighbouring residential areas, and others, on a number of grounds. The MIR sought views on the development of a much larger area, largely focussed on land south of Dollerie Terrace/Madderty Road with an estimated capacity of some 450 houses (site D). Site H57 is restricted to the northern side of Madderty Road and to the area south of Wester Tomaknock farm and steading and has a capacity of 60 houses. There is no doubt that site H57 constitutes a significant incursion into open countryside in an area of high landscape value. However, similar considerations apply to much of the periphery of Crieff and development on greenfield land is inevitable if the housing requirement for the Strathearn HMA set out in TAYplan is to be met.

28. The Proposed Plan identifies a requirement for 1,820 houses in the Strathearn HMA during the period 2010-2024, in order to accommodate the population increase projected by TAYplan. In accordance with the TAYplan hierarchical settlement approach, the Proposed Plan seeks to concentrate the majority of the housing development in Auchterarder and Crieff, the principal settlements in the Strathearn HMA. Auchterarder has a significant supply of effective housing land and the vast majority of housing development during the Plan period will be concentrated in Auchterarder. Taking account of expected windfall sites, land for only some 265 additional housing units is required to meet the 2010-2024 housing requirement and the majority of the additional housing land allocations are located in Crieff. Although there is land for housing at Broich Road (MU7) with a capacity for some 300 houses, another site such as H57 would provide choice in the housing market.

29. The report prepared by the prospective developer, which accompanies rep. no. 09004/20/01, assesses the impact of a larger site that extends beyond the northern boundary of site H57, which is somewhat arbitrarily drawn across the land associated with West Tomaknock Farm. The enlarged site would measure 10.2 hectares in total with a developable area of 6.4 hectares, which could accommodate 100-120 houses. The enlarged site is well contained within established field boundaries, and would provide more opportunity for planting and landscaping to integrate the site into the landscape.

The potential for adverse impacts on the landscape, habitats and views has been assessed. The enhancement of biodiversity and the protection of habitats is a site-specific developer requirement. The proposed development framework illustrates how the site might be developed taking account of the topography of the site and the requirements for a landscape and open space framework and the provision of a sustainable urban drainage system. Foul drainage would be required to be connected to the public drainage system. A flood risk assessment would be required to address any flooding concerns from the small watercourses that abut and cross the site.

30. In relation to the issues raised about the increased risk to road and pedestrian safety on Dollerie Terrace and the capacity of Dollerie Terrace and the junction with the A85 to accommodate additional traffic, the site-specific developer requirements include the need for a Transport Assessment, which would be required to address these issues and identify appropriate mitigation measures, including off-site measures should they be required. Such an assessment would also assist in determining the specific number of houses that could be developed on the site.

31. It is considered, therefore, that there are merits to enlarging the size of site H57 as proposed by the prospective developer. The development framework illustrates how a housing development on the enlarged site could be laid out and designed to provide a mix of house types and tenures within a landscape framework of planting and open space. There are no infrastructure constraints that would suggest the site is ineffective and could not contribute to the 2010-2024 housing requirement. It would provide choice in the housing market in Crieff and the Strathearn HMA generally.

32. The extended site H57 would incorporate a small area of land not included in MIR Site D that has not been considered in the SEA or the HRA of the Proposed Plan. However, the proposed inclusion of this small area within site H57 does not raise any issues that have not already been raised either by consultees or the public and there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed modification would introduce any new environmental concerns.

33. In relation to the request to include land to the south of Madderty Road within site H57, the burn and tree belt along the eastern boundary of the Inchbrakie Drive development forms a defensible boundary to the settlement. Further development to the east of this boundary would be particularly prominent in views from Madderty Road and would constitute an inappropriate intrusion into the countryside. Furthermore, there is potential for flooding from the burn on the eastern boundary.

Reporter's recommendations:

Settlement boundary north of Horseshoe Drive

1. Amend settlement boundary north of Horseshoe Drive as shown on document Schedule 4 document 378.

Cumulative impact of proposed developments on transport network

2. Insert the following words in an appropriate part of paragraph 8.3.2 of the Proposed Plan: 'In relation to the housing allocations, it will be required to demonstrate through an appropriate transport assessment that the A85 trunk road through Crieff can accommodate the level of development proposed. Should mitigation measures be required, they must be agreed with Transport Scotland'.

E26 Bridgend

3. Delete employment designation E26 from that area of land situated north of Alichmore Lane and return settlement boundary to that shown in adopted Strathearn Area Local Plan 2001 (see Core_Doc_007). Make appropriate amendments to description of site E26 on page 250 of Proposed Plan. Make appropriate changes to table in paragraph 8.1.8.

MU7 Broich Road

4. Amend boundaries of MU7 on Crieff Settlement Map to reflect those shown on plan in supporting document attached to representation ref. no. 09313/8. Extend open space designation to include field to south.

H55 Laggan Road

5. Remove this site from Proposed Plan and make appropriate changes to the Crieff Settlement Plan and consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 8.1.14.

H57 Wester Tomaknock

6. Modify the boundaries of H57 on the Crieff Settlement Map to include the area of land shown in Figure 1 of the supporting document accompanying rep. no. 09004/20/01. Make appropriate adjustments to the size and description on page 251. Change the size of the site to 10.2 ha and capacity to 100-120 maximum. Modify the second sentence of the description to read: "*Appropriate landscaping requirements, including a woodland strip, will reduce its developable area to 6.4 ha*". Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 8.1.14.