

| Issue 44 | | Strathmore and the Glens Area - Settlements with Proposals | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Development plan reference: | 9.5 – Ardler, page 290-391 H66 – Ardler, page 290 H67 – Carsie, page 295 9.14 – Meigle, page 301-302 E34 - Forfar Road, Meigle, page 301 H68 - Ardler Road, Meigle, page 301 H69 - Forfar Road, Meigle, page 302 9.16 – Spittalfield, page 304-305 MU6 – Spittalfield, page 304 | Reporter: Timothy Brian | |
| | Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number): | | |
| Denise Rigby (00207) George McLeod (00209) Mr & Mrs P Murrie (00210) Jay Thomson (00257) Mr & Mrs T Melville (00279) Christopher Dingwall (00483) Peter Richardson (00570) Natasha Richardson (00571) Holly Richardson (00572) Jason Richardson (00573) Mr & Mrs Peter Drummond (00632) Roger Meredith (00652) Joyce Campbell (00659) | | Michael McLaren (00664) Daniel Rowan (00807) John Fotheringham (00808) Edmund Knapp (00829) Scottish Natural Heritage (05211) J Maxwell (08651) T Rawlings (08962) Bellway Homes Ltd (09022) Mr & Mrs David Miller (09289) Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505) Thomas Milne (09567) Graham Forsyth (09695) | |
| Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates: | Proposals for Ardler, Carsie, Meigle and Spittalfield | | |
| Planning authority's summary of the representation(s): | | | |
| <p><u>Ardler: H66</u> Christopher Dingwall (00483/2/001 & 00483/3/001): Requests that any development reflects historical precedent, such as street layout and naming, also seeks protection of Scots Pine tree which is in excess of 100 years old which has both scenic and historic value (suggest use of Tree Preservation Order), and incorporation into Developer Requirements for H66 .</p> <p>Graham Forsyth (09695/1/001 & 09695/1/002): Ardler has seen development over recent years which have increased the population considerably; it has virtually no village services or amenities, even fewer than Kettins, where no housing allocation is made. For consistency there should be no allocation in Ardler. The scale of development is out of keeping with the character of the village.</p> <p>Daniel Rowan (00807/1/001): Part of the site floods, site is not well defined; access road is very close to a junction. Site would reduce the visual amenity of the village. The scale of development is out of keeping with the character of the village.</p> | | | |

Ardler new sites

John Fotheringham (00808/1/001): Suggests an additional small site (S4_Doc_059) be added to the village to give better shape to the village and allow possible small scale development. The land is available, of appropriate small scale, well defined and developable.

Carsie: H67

George McLeod (00209/1/001); Mr & Mrs P Murrie (00210/1/001); Jay Thomson (00257/1/001); Denise Rigby (00207/1/001); Mr & Mrs T Melville (00279/1/001); Peter Richardson (00570/1/001); Natasha Richardson (00571/1/001); Holly Richardson (00572/1/001); Jason Richardson (00573/1/001); Roger Meredith (00652/1/001): Object to the loss of an area which is an attractive area used by all age groups, a safe place for children to play, somewhere people walk and exercise their dogs, and used for socialising within the local community. Wildlife would be disturbed and habitat lost. Concerns about loss of these features and overloading of other 'inadequate' play park. Concerns also expressed over impact on sewerage system and primary school and increased traffic. Better sites exist in Blairgowrie.

Meigle general

Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505/1/001): Paragraph 9.14.2 *'While we are pleased to see that "It is proposed that no more than 50 houses will be developed within the Plan period on the Forfar Road site", we would ask that the remainder of this sentence is omitted. We feel that the statement "although it is capable of accommodating much more development" is unhelpful and inappropriate in the context of a development plan whose duration is limited. Any future development should be the subject of the next LDP assuming that house building begins on site (ref H69) during the present Plan period.'*

Meigle E34: Forfar Road

Joyce Campbell (00659/6/001): Use of site for employment uses is illogical with residential use being on 2 sides, and a residential site proposed to the south. Objection is made to site specific developer requirements for E34 and it is requested they are removed from the Plan. SPP paragraph 48 (S4_Doc_098) endorses the re-use of previously developed land; it should be used for housing.

Meigle H68: Ardler Road

Bellway Homes Ltd (09022/4/001): There are developability issues on at least part of the site, there is no volume builder involved. Site should be rezoned as white land; Bellway homes site at Ardler road should be substituted as alternative. Representation document on behalf of Bellway Homes gives justifications.

Thomas Milne (09567/1/001): Village will lose its identity. Loss of agricultural land for crops, access issues.

Mr & Mrs Peter Drummond (00632/1/001): Concerns regarding traffic, water and sewerage problems, educational provision, maintenance of woodlands along boundaries, provision of community footpath.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/032): The Developer Requirements should reflect the outcomes of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (pages 103/104) (S4_Doc_139).

Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505/1/002): Access and parking issues would be partially resolved if Ardler Road widened and should be considered as a site specific

developer requirement.

Mr & Mrs David Miller (09289/10/001): Support for the Plan

Meigle H69: Forfar Road

Bellway Homes Ltd (09022/4/002): Site at Ardler Road (Bellway site) is more effective than H69, which is less well linked to the village, not in the hands of a house builder and has physical and infrastructure constraints Representation document on behalf of Bellway Homes gives justifications.

Thomas Milne (09567/1/002): The development will result in a loss of wildlife and agricultural land. The road access to the site is not suitable. The scale of development is out of keeping with the character of the village.

Edmund Knapp (00829/1/001): The scale of development is out of keeping with the character of the village. The development will result in a loss of wildlife and agricultural land. The infrastructure and community facilities will have to be able to cope with the amount of development proposed. The road access to the site is not suitable. Loss of privacy.

Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505/1/003): Comment on the Site Specific Developer Requirements *"The final bullet point could lead to misunderstanding as it results in some ambiguity in the proposed development on this site:*

" Access: allow for access to Phase 2 in southern part of site."*

This statement could be taken to indicate that development is expected to continue in the rest of the field, south of site ref H69. We understand that for the duration of the present Plan, this is NOT intended. For this reason we ask that this statement is omitted."

In addition they express concerns about the lack of a buffer zone between proposed development and existing properties. Similarly concerns are expressed regarding road safety issues accessing this site from the main A94 road, traffic calming measures are likely to be required.

Joyce Campbell (00659/7/001): The requirement for landscaping should be identified during the preparation of the masterplan. The eastern part of the area identified for indicative landscaping is in separate ownership and is used for motor car storage. Because of speed of traffic and other trees etc, there is no need for additional screening along this edge.

The requirement for a path along the railway also involves land in separate ownership. Core path MEGL/114 (S4_Doc_536) lies to the north of the site boundary but it does not lie within the former railway land, opportunities for connection to this core path should be made through the masterplan, SPP paragraph 48 (S4_Doc_098) endorses the re-use of previously developed land; it should be used for housing.

Michael McLaren (00664/1/001): Support for the Plan.

Meigle new sites

Bellway Homes Ltd (09022/4/003): Bellway Homes site at Ardler Road (S4_Doc_060) is considered to be effective and deliverable, and is considered to be more effective than the 2 sites identified on the Plan, it is considered capable of delivering 178-225 houses in a development of varying density with access taken off Ardler Road and a secondary access for pedestrians and cyclists onto Dundee Road. Representation document on

behalf of Bellway Homes gives justifications.

Spittalfield general

T Rawlings (08962/1/001): Support for the boundary of Spittalfield in the vicinity of the property known as Woodside.

Spittalfield MU6

J Maxwell (08651/2/001): Site is not considered effective.

Spittalfield – new site

J Maxwell (08651/2/002): Stonebroke Farm proposed as an alternative site, (S4_Doc_051) free from constraints, to the west of the village for a development of approximately 23 units with provision for mixed use through live/work which may be more appropriate to the area. Site is free from constraints; unaffected by flooding (Appendix 3 of Representation); not in or adjacent to any European natural heritage designations; (Appendix 4) is not of archaeological or historic importance (appendix 5), apart from a military road running north of the site; can be integrated with Core Paths (appendix 6); is uncontaminated (appendix 7); is close to existing services and facilities (appendix 8); and may be connected to Scottish Water infrastructure subject to waste water treatment capacity. An indicative layout is suggested (appendix 9).

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Ardler: H66

Christopher Dingwall (00483/2/001): Ensure development keeps to rectilinear development of the village and use as appropriate name or names drawn from the original village plan of 1832.

Christopher Dingwall (00483/3/001): Protection of Scots Pine tree which lies to the north of Main Street in Ardler (as part of H66 Developer Requirements or other mechanism)

Graham Forsyth (09695/1/001): Paragraph 9.5.2 amend to '*the character of the village is quite distinctive interspersed with many green spaces. A few small developments have taken place in the village in recent years and no further allocation is proposed at this time to allow consolidation of these*' (i.e. as per paragraph 9.11.2)

Graham Forsyth (09695/1/002); Daniel Rowan (00807/1/001): Delete the site.

Ardler: New sites

John Fotheringham (00808/1/001): Inclusion of additional area (S4_Doc_059) within the village boundary (part of pre-MIR site 093).

Carsie: H67

George McLeod (00209/1/001); Mr & Mrs P Murrie (00210/1/001); Jay Thomson (00257/1/001); Denise Rigby (00207/1/001); Mr & Mrs T Melville (00279/1/001); Peter Richardson (00570/1/001); Natasha Richardson (00571/1/001); Holly Richardson (00572/1/001); Jason Richardson (00573/1/001); Roger Meredith (00652/1/001): Delete the site.

Meigle: general

Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505/1/001): In paragraph 9.14.2 omit '*although it is capable of accommodating much more development*'.

Meigle E34: Forfar Road

Joyce Campbell (00659/6/001): Removal of site from Plan for employment use, and removal of developer requirements, leave site in village boundary as appropriate for residential development.

Meigle H68: Ardler Road

Bellway Homes Ltd (09022/4/001); Thomas Milne (09567/1/001); Mr & Mrs Peter Drummond (00632/1/001): Delete the site.

Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505/1/002): Amend Developer Requirements to allow for provision for widening of Ardler Road.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/032): Add the following criteria to the Developer Requirements section on Page 301:

- *'Construction Method Statement to be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.'*
- *'Where the development of the site is within 30m of a watercourse an otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation'.*

Meigle H69: Forfar Road

Bellway Homes Ltd (09022/4/002); Thomas Milne (09567/1/002); Edmund Knapp (00829/1/001): Delete the site.

Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505/1/003): Remove last Developer Requirement 'access: allow for access to phase 2 in southern part of the site'.

Require a buffer zone between existing properties and new development in H69.

Introduce traffic calming measures on Forfar Road as part of Developer Requirements.

Joyce Campbell (00659/7/001): Removal of Specific Developer Requirements relating to provision of landscaping planting to the east boundary of the site, and provision of path along former railway land. Include opportunities for connection to the Core Path MEGL/114 (S4_Doc_536).

Meigle: new sites

Bellway Homes Ltd (09022/4/003): Identify new site at Ardler Road north of Belmont Castle (S4_Doc_060) for residential use for 178-225 houses.

Spittalfield: MU6

J Maxwell (08651/2/001): Delete the site.

Spittalfield: new site

J Maxwell (08651/2/002): Include a mixed use site for approximately 23 units at Stonebrook Farm (S4_Doc_051).

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

Ardler H66

Christopher Dingwall (00483/2/001 & 00483/3/001); Graham Forsyth (09695/1/001 & 09695/1/002); Daniel Rowan (00807/1/001): The designation of the housing site H66 is considered to meet the spatial strategy of the TAYplan (S4_Doc_067) which, whilst

requiring development to be concentrated within Tiered settlements within the area, does not preclude allowing smaller scale developments within smaller settlements, and this site has been identified to give an element of choice within the Plan area.

It is acknowledged that Ardler has seen a housing development in relatively recent years; however this has now been integrated into the village.

The proposed site is considered an appropriate one for development which could be developed in such a way as to echo the historical linear street pattern of the village- the requirement for this and the need for a flood risk assessment are both specified within the Site Specific Developer Requirements.

The issue of street naming is not one for the Local Development Plan.

The desire to protect the Scots Pine tree on the periphery of the site is also acknowledged, and should the Reporter be so minded to include this in the Developer Requirements the Council would be comfortable with this as it would not have any implications for any other aspect of the Plan.

It is also acknowledged that Ardler does not have many of the amenities a small village might aspire to, such as a small shop, village hall or school. These facilities are, however, available in nearby Meigle, Blairgowrie and Coupar Angus. The lack of such facilities is not a reason to remove the allocated housing site from the Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Ardler new sites

John Fotheringham (00808/1/001): A small amendment is proposed to the village boundary (S4_Doc_059) to '*allow for small scale infill development*' the site identified lies to the rear of the houses along the Main street and is only one plot in width. It is difficult to see how this site could be developed to reflect the rectilinear shape of the village, which is such a strong characteristic of this planned settlement. The site is also on the same side of the road as the sewage treatment works, and so may not be best placed as a site for residential development. On balance, there may be reasons to extend the settlement boundary but not identify this as a proposal.

Should the Reporter be so minded as to include this modest area within the village boundary the Council would be comfortable with this change as it would have no impact on any other proposals or policies in the Plan.

Carsie: H67

George McLeod (00209/1/001); Mr & Mrs P Murrie (00210/1/001); Jay Thomson (00257/1/001); Denise Rigby (00207/1/001); Mr & Mrs T Melville (00279/1/001); Peter Richardson (00570/1/001); Natasha Richardson (00571/1/001); Holly Richardson (00572/1/001); Jason Richardson (00573/1/001); Roger Meredith (00652/1/001): The designation of the housing site H67 is considered to meet the spatial strategy of TAYplan (S4_Doc_065) which, whilst requiring development to be concentrated within Tiered settlements within the area, does not preclude allowing smaller scale developments within smaller settlements, and this site has been identified to give an element of choice within the Plan area.

The site, which is a brownfield site, was previously occupied by prefabricated housing that was demolished some years ago and the ground was grassed over to tidy it up. It is

wholly owned by the Council and it is intended that it be developed for affordable housing units. The site is effective in terms of its deliverability and whilst it is acknowledged it is currently well used by local residents for the uses so described, the footpath links to the surrounding countryside could be incorporated into the new development, which should accommodate some of the issues raised.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Meigle: general

Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505/1/001): The words '*Although it is capable of accommodating much more development*' in paragraph 9.14.2 are intended to make it clear that the site, may, at some time in the future, be extended, and that any development should not preclude the possibility that this may happen. It is not a foregone conclusion, merely a wish to make it clear that future options should not be prejudiced.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Meigle E34: Forfar Road

Joyce Campbell (00659/6/001): The site is currently utilised in part for storage of cars in association with a car sales business, however the owner has expressed a desire to dispose of the land. A number of comments were received at the MIR stage to the effect that Meigle should have employment land identified in tandem with the housing allocations, and this site is seen as an appropriate one for such a use.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Meigle H68: Ardler Road

Bellway Homes Ltd (09022/4/001); Thomas Milne (09567/1/001); Mr & Mrs Peter Drummond (00632/1/001): The designation of the housing site H68 is considered to meet the spatial strategy of TAYplan (S4_Doc_065) which, whilst requiring development to be concentrated within Tiered settlements within the area, does not preclude allowing smaller scale developments within smaller settlements, and this site has been identified to give an element of choice within the Plan area.

The site has been included in the Development Plan for some years, and has attracted interest in the past. It is acknowledged that the use of this site would involve the loss of agricultural land; however, there is no reason to believe that its development would result in the loss of the identity of the village.

Meigle has a good range of local facilities (shop and post office, school, church, etc) and as such the allocation of housing land in this settlement is in accordance with TAYplan strategy. This site lies close to the heart of the village and will contribute to its compact form, in sustainability terms it is better located than the site proposed as an alternative by Bellway Homes. Scottish Water has instigated an investment project for the upgrading of the Waste Water Treatment Works. An area is included within H69 for educational/playing field uses, all other comments are dealt with under the Site Specific Developer Requirements.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505/1/002): The requirement or otherwise for the widening of Ardler Road would be a detailed matter to be resolved at the stage of a

planning application.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/032): It is considered that amending the Developer Requirements to incorporate mitigation measures as set out in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (Including Appropriate Assessment) (pages103/104) (S4_Doc_139) would provide greater clarity and transparency for applicants in terms of how the provisions of the Plan's Policy NE1: International Nature Conservation Sites apply to this site.

If the Reporter is so minded the suggested additional text by the respondent, as detailed in the 'Modifications Sought' section, should be added to the Site Specific Developer Requirements.

Meigle H69: Forfar Road

Bellway Homes Ltd (09022/4/002); Thomas Milne (09567/1/002); Edmund Knapp (00829/1/001): The designation of the housing site H69 is considered to meet the Spatial Strategy of the TAYplan (S4_Doc_067) which, whilst requiring development to be concentrated within Tiered settlements within the area, does not preclude allowing smaller scale developments within smaller settlements, and this site has been identified to give an element of choice within the Plan area.

The site has been included in the Development Plan for some years, and has attracted interest in the past. It is acknowledged that the use of this site would involve the loss of agricultural land; however, there is no reason to believe that its development would result in the loss of the identity of the village.

Meigle has a good range of local facilities (shop and post office, school, church, etc) and as such the allocation of housing land in this settlement is in accordance with TAYplan strategy (S4_Doc_067). This site lies close to the heart of the village and will contribute to its compact form, in sustainability terms it is better located than the site proposed as an alternative by Bellway Homes. Scottish Water has instigated an investment project for the upgrading of the Waste Water Treatment Works. An area is included within the allocation for educational/playing field uses, all other comments are dealt with under the Site Specific Developer Requirements.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Meigle & Ardler Community Council (09505/1/003); Joyce Campbell (00659/7/001): It is acknowledged that the second phase referred to may have caused some confusion. It is important however that development opportunity for the future (and outwith the life span of this Plan) is not prejudiced by development proposals which are implemented as a result of this Plan. The issue of a future access to the south of the site is a matter which could be resolved through the masterplan process. It is anticipated that the site as identified would be developed in a phased manner, and the reference to phase 2 in the south of the site is intended to imply the site would be developed from the northern end first. The requirement for buffer zones and links to core paths is a matter for either the masterplan, or detailed planning application.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Meigle: new sites

Bellway Homes Ltd (09022/4/003): This site is less well related to the village centre than either of the two housing sites H68 and H69 identified in the Plan, and is less sustainable

in terms of access to village facilities. Although the site is an agricultural field, because of its enclosure it has a park land feeling. Part of the site includes a Scheduled Monument, and the site also shares boundaries with B listed Belmont Castle Stables, and A listed Belmont Castle; its development would be likely to affect the settings of these historical structures. Access to the site would be from Ardler Road which at this point is very narrow, with no public footpaths. The scale of development proposed during the Plan period is considered excessive, being potentially three times larger than the current proposals in the Plan. In particular, it may be difficult to accommodate the additional capacity that would be required at the local primary school. For all these reasons, and because better located sites are available, the site is not included in the Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Spittalfield: MU6

J Maxwell (08651/2/001): The designation of the mixed use site MU6 is considered to meet the spatial strategy of TAYplan (S4_Doc_067) which, whilst requiring development to be concentrated within Tiered settlements within the area, does not preclude allowing smaller scale developments within smaller settlements, and this site has been identified to give an element of choice within the Plan area.

The site was identified in the 2005 draft Eastern Area Local Plan (page 94) (S4_Doc_537) and the Council has had discussions with the land owner, and has no reason to believe that the site identified is not effective.

Reference is made to the planning application approved in 2005, but this is immediately to the east of the site, and does not preclude access being taken to the site. Reference is made to the fact that the site is brownfield land which may suffer from contamination. The Council consider the brownfield nature of this site to be a positive attribute, and its development would mean that other green field sites are avoided in the immediate future, contamination is unlikely to be a major issue as the site was previously used for parking buses, and if any contamination exists it should be dealt with in a straightforward manner. Any contamination issues can be dealt with at the planning application stage, and appropriate mitigation measures taken if necessary. From a landscape point of view, the site is well contained and offers a natural extension to the settlement.

Reference is also made to the military road running through the site which may result in archaeological investigations being required. These need not take a great length of time, nor prevent a site from being developed in a sensitive way.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Spittalfield: new site

J Maxwell (08651/2/002): The Representation suggests a site which is not visually contained, somewhat remote from the village centre, and would result in a more linear shape to the village; its development is not considered to be sustainable (S4_Doc_051).

The site lies immediately adjacent to the area identified on Scottish Environment Protection Agency 1:200 year indicative flood risk maps as being at risk, indeed, given the indicative nature of these maps it does appear that the southern-most part of the site may well be included in the Scottish Environment Protection Agency flood risk area. In the absence of a flood risk appraisal the Council is adopting the precautionary principle.

A site has been identified in Spittalfield for mixed residential and employment use, and there is no requirement for the additional identification of further housing land at this time.

As the site does not meet the preferred strategy of the Plan it has not been assessed through the SEA process.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Reporter's conclusions:

Ardler: H66

1. Ardler is a small settlement of around 70 houses, which lies between Meigle and Coupar Angus. It lacks shops and community facilities (apart from a small green and play area), and residents of Ardler require to travel to its larger neighbours to access schools and other local services. The village has lost its church, primary school and village hall, and the bus service is only intermittent. Any new development in the village would therefore be dependent on private car use, whereas Policy TA1B of the Proposed Plan states that the aim of all development should be to reduce travel demand by car

2. The Proposed Plan identifies an area of 2.54 hectares on the northern edge of the village as a site for 20 houses, including low cost housing. This is a substantial scale of development for such a small village, which has already had to absorb a 27 house estate at Franklin Street. Policy 1 of TAYplan accepts that local development plans may provide for some development in smaller settlements, but this provision applies where the development can be accommodated and supported by the settlement. As explained above, Ardler does not have the community services to support further development at present. Moreover site H66 has little enclosure, and it would be necessary to build on the prominent upper slopes of the field to avoid flooding. The allocation should therefore be deleted.

Ardler new sites

3. It would not be appropriate to extend the settlement boundary to include the small field at the north west end of Ardler. The land does not have a frontage to a public road, and it is unclear how a safe and convenient access could be formed or how the site could be developed in a manner in keeping with the established village form.

Carsie: H67

4. Carsie is a small community only around ½ km south of Blairgowrie, based around a housing estate on the west side of the A93 (Perth road). The settlement has no community facilities apart from a small play area at the west end of Whiteloch Avenue, although it has a bus service to Blairgowrie and Perth.

5. Site H67 is an attractive and well maintained area of grass and trees, owned by the council, which is used by local residents as an amenity open space for sitting, walking, dog walking, relaxing and playing games. As such it complements the equipped play area at the opposite end of Whiteloch Avenue. The representations, including a petition of objection signed by more than 70 local residents, underline the value of this informal open space to the local community.

6. Although the land has been previously developed, it is now an established amenity area, well used and appreciated by local residents. As explained elsewhere in this report the Proposed Plan provides sites for a generous amount of housing in the Strathmore and the Glens area, so there is no need to allocate site H67 to meet TAYplan housing targets. In any case TAYplan Policy 1 expects new housing to be focused on principal settlements such as Blairgowrie/Rattray, in preference to smaller settlements like Carsie. Site H67 should therefore be deleted, and the site should be designated as open space.

Meigle: general

7. Meigle is well provided with local services, having a primary school, church, village hall, post office and shop, play area and playing field. The village is capable of accommodating a measure of new development, subject to the upgrading of the local waste water treatment works and the provision of additional school capacity – both of which are catered for in the Proposed Plan. The proposal to identify land for housing development and employment uses in Meigle is consistent with Policy 1 of TAYplan, which allows for some development where this can be accommodated and supported by the settlement.

Meigle: E34 Forfar Road

8. Site E34 is a small brownfield site on the eastern edge of the settlement, currently used in connection with a car sales business. The site contains a commercial garage building and a stone cottage, both of which are in relatively poor condition. It is proposed to allocate the site for general employment use, to encourage local business and provide employment in tandem with housing growth.

9. In light of the scale of housing development proposed in the village (70 houses during the Plan period, with the prospect of more beyond), it is appropriate to make provision for employment in the village. This site on the margins of the settlement, with a history of commercial use, is well placed to fulfil that requirement. The masterplan for housing site H69 would have to take account of the general employment use on the adjoining site E34. The site-specific developer requirements for E34 would apply if the site is redeveloped as proposed.

Meigle: H68 Ardler Road

10. Site H68 is a site of 1.2 hectares which is allocated for 20 houses. Its development for housing would represent logical infill between Victory Park and the village centre. It is well located for convenient access to the primary school and village services. A flood risk assessment would determine how much of the site could be developed, but there is no reason to suppose that flooding would prevent the development coming forward within the Plan period. There is scope to improve the footpath network in the area, and to provide woodland cover on the west and north sides of the site.

11. Detailed access issues, including the need or otherwise to wider Ardler Road, would be addressed at the planning application stage. Meanwhile site H68 should remain in the Proposed Plan, but the site-specific developer requirements should be modified in line with the comments of Scottish Natural Heritage.

Meigle: H69 Forfar Road

12. Site H69 is a large open field on the east side of the village, which has existing

development to the north and west and the former railway line to the east. It is close to the village centre and adjacent to the primary school, so it is well placed to encourage walking and cycling. The site was identified for housing in the previous local plan for the area, and remains suitable for residential development. It is clear from paragraph 9.14.3 that the infrastructure constraints (i.e. waste water treatment and education capacity) which have prevented the site from being developed so far are now being addressed. Indeed site H69 would itself provide an area for educational use / playing fields.

13. H69 covers a substantial area of land (5.69 hectares) which could take many more houses than the 50 currently proposed. The allocation of 50 houses is described as 'Phase 1', and one of the site-specific developer requirements is to allow for access to Phase 2 in the southern part of the site. There is no need to delete the comment in paragraph 9.14.2 that H69 'is capable of accommodating much more development', since it is merely a statement of fact consistent with the detailed terms of the allocation on page 302 of the Plan. No modification is required to clarify the point.

14. The masterplan will illustrate the phasing of the development, which will start at the north end, and will determine the extent of landscape planting (and possibly buffer zones) on the site boundaries.

Meigle new site

15. The additional site at Ardler Road suggested by Bellway Homes (East) Ltd lies on the southern edge of the village, considerably further from the village centre than the allocated sites H68 and H69. The site of almost 12 hectares, which is expected to accommodate 178-225 houses, is substantially larger than is required in a village of 450 inhabitants. Moreover, Ardler Road is a narrow country lane with no footways at this point, and the potential for widening is limited by a stone wall which bounds the suggested development site. Any development on this field would be likely to affect the settings of the ancient monument and listed buildings at neighbouring Belmont Castle. This land should not be allocated as a housing site in the Proposed Plan therefore.

Spittalfield: MU6

16. Spittalfield is an attractive small settlement with services including a post office and general store. This site of 2.13 hectares on the eastern edge of the village was formerly occupied by a bus depot. The proposal to redevelop the land for employment and residential use (20 houses) is an appropriate re-use of a brownfield site, which would help to maintain village services. There is no evidence that the site is incapable of development, or that archaeological constraints or possible contamination could not be resolved. The proposal should therefore remain in the Proposed Plan.

Spittalfield: new site

17. In contrast to site MU6, any development of the greenfield site at Stonebroke Farm would extend the village to the west in a ribbon form uncharacteristic of the village. Spittalfield has a conservation area centred around a village green, and a linear development along the A984 would not reflect its established pattern. It is also possible that the site is at risk of flooding. Therefore the site should not be allocated for housing in the Proposed Plan.

Reporter's recommendations:Ardler: H66

1. Delete proposed housing site H66, realign the settlement boundary to exclude the site, and modify paragraph 9.5.2 accordingly. Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 9.1.11.

Carsie: H67

2. Delete proposed housing site H67, and redesignate the land as open space (Open Space Policy CF1). Make consequential modifications to the table under paragraph 9.1.11.

Meigle: H68

3. Add the following criteria to the site-specific developer requirements section on Page 301:

- *“Construction Method Statement to be provided for all aspects of the development to protect the watercourse. Methodology should provide measures to protect the watercourse from the impact of pollution and sediment so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.*
- *Where the development of the site is within 30 metres of a watercourse an otter survey should be undertaken and a species protection plan provided, if required so as to ensure no adverse effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation.”*