

## **Rumbling Bridge summary of comments received**

Thanks to the assistance of Local Members and the Community Council to raise public awareness, from a population of roughly 164 (census 2011) in Rumbling Bridge, we received a very good response. There were 92 public comments received of which 60 were from residents Rumbling Bridge representing over 36% of the population.

There were 26 individual comments objecting to the proposal, and 38 supportive comments, and there were 7 comments which did not express a clear preference. In addition there was a petition signed by 44 people which came from 35 separate addresses in the village, this objected to the recent pace of development in the village with concern that further development would destroy the character and density of Rumbling Bridge. It also states that there is already a foot path linking the gorge to the dollar footpath built by Thomson Homes. The petition has some dates on it which predate the consultation material being made available to view. This suggests that at least some of signatories had not seen the current proposal. Of the 44 signatories it is noted that 15 followed this up with their own objections (which pick on the same issues as the petition), whilst one person retracted their objection. The total number of responses against proposal was 26 plus a further 28 on a petition so 54 objections in total.

The principal reasons given for objecting were as follows: the pace of recent development; and impact on the character, amenity greenspaces and setting of the gorge and the village. Other commonly mentioned issues include a perceived failure to secure community benefits for other proposals (gorge car park on Thomson home's recently developed site directly opposite the current proposal on the other side of the A823), and traffic concerns. Please note this public carpark for the gorge is in the process of being delivered; however the access was changed as a non-material variation of the planning permission from being accessed directly off the main road to instead being served off the access for Braehead Chalets.

There were also a lot of supportive comments, 38 in total, of which 30 came from residents outwith Rumbling Bridge. This perhaps reflects the popularity of the proposal for another carpark for the gorge (likely to be of more benefit to people visiting the village). Of the supportive comments 2 are qualified and would retract their support if it is only delivering the benefits the Council can definitely insist upon.

In terms of reasons for supporting the proposal, the reasons given included: potential to improve the parking situation for the gorge; and that it is a good fit as it would help 'balance' the place with development on either side of the road, and it would make it feel more like a village; that this might help the case for extending the main gas line to the village; welcome of the proposed new play area, interpretation board and shelter; and that it could help local businesses. The landowner also submitted a comment to the consultation to clarify that they would deliver on discretionary benefits and commit to putting these in place ahead of any permitted development.

Other notable comments made which could become relevant if the proposal were supported in the Local Development Plan were: SNH's request for a proportionate Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment if the proposal is to proceed; a request that the access for this proposal does not jeopardise access to the proposed house site between Firgrove and Merryorchard; and desire to see a footway on this side of the road.

## **Crook of Devon and Drum summary of comments received**

Thanks to the assistance of Local Members and the Community Council to raise public awareness, from a population of roughly 669 (census 2011) in Crook of Devon and Drum, we received a very good response rate. There were 83 public comments received representing more than 11% of the population. However there was some concern about the consultation process due to: the consultation event being held on the school half term; and because one of the landowners is on the Community Council (as this was considered to add legitimacy to the proposal and make it harder for the public to speak out). Please note with regard to the make-up of the Community Council this is a matter for them. However it is understood that the landowner Angus Cheape declares an interest and absents himself from the formal Community Council debate when he has an interest.

There were 53 objections to the proposal, and 26 supportive comments (of which 8 are qualified and would retract their support if it is only delivering the benefits the Council can definitely insist upon). There were also 6 comments which did not express a clear preference.

SNH stated that the proposed site is large, and would constitute a major extension of this small settlement. However they consider that the site has potential to connect the ribbon development to the north east with the core of the settlement and embed the town in surrounding woodland. SNH recommend a sensitive design to integrate the new development, and consider this can be achieved by further LVIA investigation, an integrated masterplanning process and a wider blue/green network, including sustainable drainage. SEPA state alternative sites not located on peat soil would be preferred, however if it is not possible to avoid disturbance then development requirements to require the submission of an appropriate peat survey and management plan to minimise impact and implement suitable mitigation measures is required. SEPA also seek developer requirements for FRA, buffer strips and no culverting.

Reasons given for objecting to the proposal included: scale of the proposal; difficulty integrating that amount of new residents; that there are already sufficient infill opportunities; impact on village setting/separation between Drum and Crook of Devon; loss of village feel/identity/ character and potential to urbanise area; a suggestion that it would lead to pressure to develop the opposite side of the A977 leading to further impact on landscape and setting/amenity; traffic/safety concerns generally and more so if café farm shop estimated visitor numbers are realised; that the roundabout is not needed/that the other funds could be used to deliver it/that a roundabout would not reduce speeds or dissuade HGVs because Asda Transport manager confirmed it is mileage rather than other factors that chooses routes; that original reasons for considering proposal – roundabout (transport statement now shows this is not needed) and drainage (since Scottish Water have confirmed that drainage would be to Crook of Devon not Drum) do not exist now; potential impact on existing café/shops and doubts about the viability of the farm shop/cafe and of the business units (what market research has been done and concern that if other uses are not viable could this lead to more housing); it is not considered correct place for this level of growth with larger places favoured; concern about capacity of school and the waste water treatment works; that a smaller development /smaller development associated to the east end would be more appropriate; concern about flooding/ history of flooding/standing water issues; air quality/pollution concerns; concern that discretionary benefits would not be delivered; and that planning officers do not support the proposal. It was also suggested that not all of the Crook Moss is owned by the Cheape partnership.

Reasons given for supporting the proposal included: the provision of affordable housing; the provision of a roundabout; that it would slow traffic; that it is a good site and suitable compared to other sites in the village; that it would provide a gateway; its employment opportunities; and that it would improve safer routes to school. Some who offered support felt that development should be phased more slowly over a longer period than the Local Development Plan.

Other community benefits sought included: seeking refurbished/ expanded village hall; improved bus service; housing for the elderly; improving school road access and pedestrian provision here, and along A977 + B9097; generally more footpaths and road improvements; a village bypass/ a 20 mph throughout/ or on sections, speed camera, traffic calming measures; upgrade tennis court, provide village/sports hall, play equipment and seating in park, 4G sports pitch, skate park, and core path network maintenance fund; better broadband/4G; improved school parking; relocation of shop here with enhanced parking; more shops in the village centre; provision of adequate facilities on the traveller's site; and mains gas.

Other notable comments made which could become relevant if the proposal were supported in the Local Development Plan were that the proposal: should reduce the density proposed to better fit with existing character; should consider environmental impacts; protect the setting of the village hall; should reflect local need for affordable and modestly sized houses; should better address the street frontage (rather than back gardens); should better integrate the affordable housing; have good aesthetics (concern that new houses haven't fitted in with older houses); that the existing crossing position at brow of hill is better than what is proposed or that there are too many crossings; needs further traffic calming measures beyond what is currently proposed; needs the design the roundabout to allow for service access to existing house as the current access meets this roundabout; should provide for greater greenspace; and should place the pond in a more natural position.

Other suggestions made were: by a landowner for a new access into the village from north with provision of a new school drop off area (currently outwith settlement boundary).

The landowner's representative also made the following comments about their proposal: that a gap of undeveloped land would still remain at the junction and that a gateway feature at A977/B9097 junction would be provided; TAYplan provides support for some development in places like Crook of Devon/Drum; that it would provide employment opportunities through café farm shop (even if just a proportion of Balgove Larder) and there is willingness to set aside and transfer land for class 4 business use to the Council; Crook Moss would have public access improvements and be transferred to the community; the roundabout would slow traffic and the replacement pedestrian crossing would improve safety; that it would provide 25% (up to 13 units) affordable housing; development would be of high design quality and respect setting of village hall and buildings of merit opposite the site and provide detailed landscaping treatments (with details of this provided at planning application stage); that allocations can require a mix of uses, that the mix proposed is attractive, and that the community can be confident that LDP2 will provide a robust policy tool to resist deviations from the vision of the site; and they also point out that the landowner's helped enable the Millennium footpath at a cost to them, and that they want to improve the offer/amenities for residents, visitors, tourists and new residents.

## **Blairingone summary of comments received**

Thanks to the assistance of Local Members and the Community Council to raise public awareness, from a population of roughly 128 (census 2011) in Rumbling Bridge, we received a good response. We received 33 comments from the public, of which 7 were definitely from Blairingone, which represents more than 5% of the population. Given the good turnout of people from Blairingone at the exhibition it is likely that more comments came from the village, however there were comments submitted without names and addresses which we cannot trace. 27 positive comments were received on the proposal (although 6 of these are qualified and would retract their support if it is only delivering the benefits the Council can definitely insist upon). There were also 6 objections to the proposals, and 2 comments did not express a clear preference. Of the comments from residents of Blairingone, 6 were supportive, whilst the other submitted that their land should continue to be supported for development in the Local Development Plan.

SNH suggested that given the scale of the proposal there may be a wish to consider capacity and carry out a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. On the detail of the proposal SEPA requested the following developer requirements: require a Flood Risk Assessment; require feasibility of enhancing/restoring existing channel in southern area, and requirement a buffer for watercourse/s and no culverting.

The positive responses were supported by comments often mentioned a need for more residents to help support the school as well as the development helping to provide new community facilities such as the potential village hall and shop, and the benefits of traffic calming.

The community benefits which were most popular were those suggested by the consultation: the provision of a village hall, community shop, provision of village green/open spaces/play area/pitch, and traffic calming; as well as its support of the primary school. Other benefits sought included a bypass, a pub, adequate parking, and a bus service.

Where reasons for objecting were given these included: concern about the scale of the proposal and its impact on the character of the village; and concern about traffic impact. Whilst one respondent was concerned if the potential bypass would affect their house at Windy Ridge.