

Issue 27	Perth City Proposals	
Development plan reference:	Perth Area Strategy – pages 249 - 281	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<div> <div> <p>Louise Crawford (0026)</p> <p>Colin Murray (0037)</p> <p>Ryan Porteous (0038)</p> <p>Mr John Meiklem (0043)</p> <p>Stephen and Victoria Watkins (0108)</p> <p>Rossco Properties (0120)</p> <p>Mrs Sally Doig (0125)</p> <p>King James VI Golf Club (0131)</p> <p>The Fenton 2016 and the Simon Fenton Discretionary Trusts (0145)</p> <p>Frances Hobbs (0152)</p> <p>Neil Myles (0153)</p> <p>John Brian Milarvie (0171)</p> <p>Mr and Mrs MackIntosh (0179)</p> <p>Gary Wright (0181)</p> <p>Robert Reid 1999 Discretionary Trust (0192)</p> <p>T&E Young (0213)</p> <p>Peter and Vanessa Shand (0226)</p> <p>Mr JD McKerracher (0245)</p> <p>Scone Community Council (0265)</p> <p>Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust (0272)</p> <p>John W Rodgers (0304)</p> <p>Matthew Lonergan (0319)</p> <p>Scottish National Heritage (SNH) (0353)</p> <p>Rivertree Residential (0356)</p> <p>Mr and Mrs Short (0382)</p> <p>Mr and Mrs Stewart Reith (0389)</p> <p>St John's Kirk of Perth (0426)</p> <p>D King Properties (Scotland) Ltd (0461)</p> <p>Jeffrey Rowlinson (0485)</p> <p>David F Lewington (0486)</p> </div> <div> <p>Hansteen Land Ltd (0494)</p> <p>Network Rail (0509)</p> <p>The John Dewar Lamberkine Trust (0532/05)</p> <p>The John Dewar Lamberkine Trust and Craigrossie Properties (No. 1) (0588)</p> <p>Mr Murray Flett (0595)</p> <p>Lisa Cardno (0599)</p> <p>Scone Estate (0614)</p> <p>Go Americano Ltd (0618)</p> <p>Tim Kendrick and Jane Spiers (0641)</p> <p>James Thow (0668)</p> <p>Jennifer Thow (0669)</p> <p>Martin RW Rhodes (0675)</p> <p>Perth & Kinross Council Tenants' Organisation (0701)</p> <p>Bus 'Y' Bites (0704)</p> <p>Hazel MacKinnon (0705)</p> <p>Iona MacGregor (0707)</p> <p>Gerard Connolly (0712)</p> <p>Mr Eric Ogilvy (0713)</p> <p>Stewart McCowan (0714)</p> <p>Angela McCowan (0715)</p> <p>Gladys Ogilvy (0716)</p> <p>Mr Graham Ogilvie (0717)</p> <p>Mrs Tracy Ogilvie (0718)</p> <p>Mrs Shona Cowie (0719)</p> <p>Paul Cowie (0720)</p> <p>David Roy (0730)</p> <p>Greer Crighton (0731)</p> <p>Brian Hood (0732)</p> <p>Gaynor Hood (0733)</p> <p>Philip Crighton (0734)</p> <p>Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) (0742)</p> </div> </div>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Perth Area Strategy	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		

Archaeology

Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/011): Mention that site allocations, H1, E36, OP2, OP4, and OP9 may have archaeological potential and suggests that the site specific requirements for these allocations should be updated to reflect the likelihood of this requiring investigation.

H1 Scott Street/Charles Street

SEPA (0742/01/107 + 0742/02/023): Seeks removal of this allocation for the following reasons:

Site H1 is allocated for housing in an area being protected by the Perth Flood Protection Scheme (FPS).

This same issue also comes up in relation to allocations H319 Ruthvenfield, and MU73 Almond Valley so a common summary of SEPA's position is given under the sub heading 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood protection schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4.

H3 Gannochy Road

Frances Hobbs (0152/01/008), Neil Myles (0153/01/008), John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/008), Peter and Vanessa Shand (0226/01/008), Mr JD McKerracher (0245/01/009), Scone Community Council (0265/01/009), John W Rodgers (0304/01/009), Mr and Mrs Short (0382/01/005), Mr and Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/004), Jeffrey Rowlinson (0485/01/005), David F Lewington (0486/01/005), Lisa Cardno (0599/01/009), James Thow (0668/01/008), Jennifer Thow (0669/01/008), Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/003), Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/009), Gerard Connolly (0712/01/009), Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/009), Stewart McCowan (0714/01/009), Angela McCowan (0715/01/009), Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/009), Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/009), Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/009), Shona Cowie (0719/01/009), Paul Cowie (0720/01/009), David Roy (0730/01/009), Greer Crichton (0731/01/009), Brian Hood (0732/01/009), Gaynor Hood (0733/01/009), Philip Crichton (0734/01/009): Support the comments regarding Bridgend air pollution and many of the respondents trust that this will be developed into a full policy.

H71 Newton Farm

Robert Reid 1999 Discretionary Trust (0192/01/001): as sole landowner generally welcomes the housing allocation but considers there should be opportunity to incorporate a small element of retail and allocate for mixed uses. Proposes a new food store (2,000 to 2,500 m²) located next to new Crieff Road junction providing a buffer to new housing referring to the following reasons in support:

- that the Perth and Kinross Retail Study and City and Town Centre Review 2014 (CD215) identified capacity for further food store space in the city
- that it would reflect the mixed use nature of the area and would be compatible with surrounding uses
- its location opposite the Crieff Retail centre defined in the Proposed Plan and adjacent to new roundabout
- that it would be within walking distance of large residential catchment and well served by public transport

- that there is active operator interest
- that previous pre application advice did not discount retail but was dependent upon receipt of satisfactory reports covering retail impact, the sequential test and transportation and such studies can be brought forward
- that the Council has not explained why a small convenience store is unacceptable, and that alternative locations are suggested but not identified

SEPA (0742/01/110): seek a change that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) be included as a site specific developer requirement.

A potential flood risk has been identified at this site. As such, SEPA consider that part of the site may not be suitable for development and a flood risk assessment will be required to inform the siting, layout, design and capacity of development on site in a way that avoids an increase in flood risk on and off site and ensures dry pedestrian access and egress at times of flood. Any culverted watercourses in or adjacent to the site are also required to be assessed.

SEPA consider that the inclusion of a developer requirement with regards a FRA will ensure that developers are fully informed of the flood risk issues affecting the site at the earliest opportunity thereby preventing delay and frustration later in the planning process. SEPA consider it will also ensure that flooding issues are taken into account prior to submitting a planning application and potential developers recognise that the developable area of the site may be constrained by flood risk.

SEPA seek a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment as they consider that this accords with the planning authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (CD036), SPP (CD004), Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD030), and the Scottish Government's online planning advice on flood risk (CD043) which states that development plans should ensure that any assessment of the effectiveness of sites, especially housing sites, takes flood risk into account. It will also contribute positively to the local authority's duties under Section 44 of Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025, p24-25). As identified in the SEA, this area/part of this area is at flood risk.

H319 Ruthvenfield

The Fenton 2016 and the Simon Fenton Discretionary Trusts (0145/01/001): who own the majority of this allocation support the H319 allocation. They consider the split with housing land to the west of the Cross Tay Link Road and employment land to the east is common sense and they look forward to working with the other landowners and the Council to ensure an effective and quality development.

Mr and Mrs Mackintosh (0179/01/001): who own land within this allocation support the H319 allocation. They consider the split with housing land to the west of the Cross Tay Link Road and employment land to the east as common sense and they look forward to working with the other landowners and the Council to ensure an effective and quality development.

Stephen and Victoria Watkins (0108/01/001), Ryan Porteous (0038/01/001), Gary Wright (0181/01/001), Murray Flett (0595/01/001): All these respondents object to the allocation and mention some or all of the following reasons:

- disputes need for more housing/ better opportunities elsewhere in Perth.
- considers there is limited capacity in the road network (particularly Castle Brae)/

- safety issues/ unsuitable proposed access points
- the mains gas line within the site
- scale and impact on rural character
- impact on property price
- impact of the construction phase
- impact of this alongside other developments on well-being and environment
- flood risk (flooding here twice in last 4 years, SEPA flood warning alert 23/1/18, much of site being within SEPA medium risk flood risk, and impact from Bertha Park development on levels)
- pollution, noise and light impact on amenity
- this change in allocation (from employment allocation to housing) is coming about because of the unforeseen higher level of the new Cross Tay Link Road (CTLR)
- that the CTLR would provide a good boundary and sufficient buffer
- that previous onsite planning applications history should be ignored as they predate new development at Bertha Park and the CTLR construction
- impact on woodland because:
 - there was an application for outline permission for housing development on part of this site refused by the Council and by the Reporter (CD219) (08/00253/OUT)
 - the Reporter agreed with the Council that this site has a vital role in maintaining a strong woodland framework
 - an area was considered to be incorrectly designated within E38 employment use in the LDP 2014 (CD014, p319) as it is separated from the rest of the allocation agricultural land by a tree belt
 - it is part of the woodland estate of Ruthvenfield House
 - in the Perth Area Local Plan 1995 (CD138) it was identified as an area where existing tree cover should be enhanced and maintained
 - the LDP seeks to protect woodland

SEPA (0742/02/023 + 0742/1/97): Please refer to the common SEPA position as set out in under the sub heading 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood defence schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4.

SNH (0353/04/001): Following the completion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) SNH have updated their holding representation to now recommend amendments to the Proposed Plan in line with the outcomes of the HRA and Appropriate Assessment. The Site Specific Developer Requirements should reflect the outcome of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (Table 8.1, page 143-144) (CD056).

E1 The Triangle

Go Americano Ltd (0618/01/001): Seeks the use classification of E1 to be extended to include ancillary uses including food and drink to reflect the planning permission in place for a coffee shop/takeaway (16/01124/FLL) granted at Local Review Body April 2017. The remainder of the Triangle site has permissions in place or is seeking them for car sales uses. The permission for a Starbucks coffee shop and drive through is considered to be complementary, have an indirect economic benefit of increasing footfall to surrounding businesses, and to retain tourist traffic expenditure. The Local Review Body unanimously supported this application and the decision notice states "It was considered that the proposal would provide economic benefits and could be viewed as a high amenity employment use. The information submitted has demonstrated that the proposed use would generate employment and encourage other developments close to the site."

SEPA (0742/01/030): With regards site E1, the guidance identifies that least vulnerable uses, which include shops as defined by SEPA flood risk and land use vulnerability guidance (CD012), are acceptable where the standard of protection is equal or greater than 1 in 200 year (0.5% Annual Estimated Probability). The information provided clarifies that the Perth FPS affords this standard of protection and SEPA have no objection to the proposed car sales development at this site. Furthermore SEPA support the fact that the developer requirement identifies that areas behind the FPS should incorporate appropriate mitigation measures as this accords with the Risk Framework in paragraph 263 of SPP (CD004, p58-59).

Ensuring that the vulnerability of the land use is appropriate for the location and degree of flood risk is also an adaptation measure that will help make future development resilient to a changing climate. This accords with the high level sustainability principle in SPP (para 29) (CD004, p9) that states policies and decisions should support climate change adaptation, including taking account of flood risk. Local authorities also have a duty under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025) to contribute to the delivery of the Climate Change Adaptation Programme (May 2014) (RD052). This programme identifies the integration of climate change adaptation into planning processes and decisions as a strategic principle.

SEPA have noted however that the marketing material available for E1 indicates a hotel on the site, a land use which is categorised as highly vulnerable in SEPA's Flood Risk and Land Use Vulnerability Guidance (CD012) and which is only acceptable where the standard of protection is 1 in 200 year plus climate change. Given that the information provided clarifies that the Perth FPS does not offer this standard of protection we would therefore likely object in principle should an application be submitted for a highly vulnerable land use at this site.

E2 Broxden

The John Dewar Lamberkine Trust (0532/05/004): Supports the delivery of employment uses on allocation E2 and the associated site-specific developer requirements but, in light of the changing employment profile and commercial property market considers the allocation should provide for a broader range of uses not restricted to solely class 4. The reasons for supporting this change are given as follows:

- following active site marketing and developer/operator negotiations, the site is suited to a broader range of employment related uses than class 4, as consented by planning permission 12/01692/IPM (CD223);
- market evidence and the changing, mixed employment use of the broader Broxden Commercial area, continue to promote broad employment uses not restricted to single categories;
- this position accords with the approach towards encouraging employment land uses are detailed in policy 7 (Employment & Mixed use) (CD052, p26).
- this is aligned to the LDP's employment policies and the wider City plan, to support Perth & Kinross Council's transition to a low carbon economy.

E3 Arran Road

Louise Crawford (0026/01/001): screening provided for new Wilson's construction yard is considered inadequate as Rowan trees do not keep their leaves all year round. Ample screening is requested before more development due to the impact on views.

SEPA (0742/01/031): With regards site E3, the guidance identifies that least vulnerable uses, which include employment uses such as shops, offices, industry, storage and distribution as defined by our flood risk and land use vulnerability guidance, are acceptable where the standard of protection is equal or greater than 1 in 200 year. (0.5% Annual Estimated Probability). The information provided clarifies that the Perth FPS affords this standard of protection and therefore SEPA have no objection to the proposed core employment use development at this site. Furthermore SEPA support the fact that the developer requirement identifies that areas behind the FPS should incorporate appropriate mitigation measures as this accords with the Risk Framework in paragraph 263 of SPP(CD004, p58-59).

Ensuring that the vulnerability of the land use is appropriate for the location and degree of flood risk is also an adaptation measure that will help make future development resilient to a changing climate. This accords with the high level sustainability principle in SPP (para 29) (CD004, p9) that states policies and decisions should support climate change adaptation, including taking account of flood risk. Local authorities also have a duty under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025) to contribute to the delivery of the Climate Change Adaptation Programme (May 2014) (RD052). This programme identifies the integration of climate change adaptation into planning processes and decisions as a strategic principle.

E38 Ruthvenfield Road

Rossco Properties (0120/02/001): owns the 17 acres frontage land of E38, whilst the rear land lacks any main road frontage. It is considered that there should be greater flexibility on uses beyond class 4,5 and 6 to include limited retail, class 3/takeaway, hotel, and motor sales uses because:

- There are already within Inveralmond and Broxden sui generis uses such as motor sales and service, modest class 3 restaurants and hotels (some of these the council has promoted itself)
- The Council has accepted trade park uses at Inveralmond (permissions: 07/02336/FUL (RD043) and 07/01353/FUL(RD041) and subsequent development and lettings to parties such as screwfix and toolstation and this type of use could be replicated on the frontage of E38
- There are already food sales within Inveralmond including takeaway (Greggs) and at the commercial centre.

SEPA (0742/01/041): With regards site E38, the guidance identifies that least vulnerable uses, which include employment uses such as shops, offices, industry, storage and distribution as defined by our flood risk and land use vulnerability guidance, are acceptable where the standard of protection is equal or greater than 1 in 200 year (0.5% Annual Estimated Probability). The information provided clarifies that the Perth FPS affords this standard of protection and therefore SEPA have no objection to the proposed core employment use development at this site. Furthermore SEPA support the fact that the developer requirement identifies that areas behind the FPS should incorporate appropriate mitigation measures as this accords with the Risk Framework in paragraph 263 of SPP (CD004, 58-59).

Ensuring that the vulnerability of the land use is appropriate for the location and degree of flood risk is also an adaptation measure that will help make future development resilient to a changing climate. This accords with the high level sustainability principle in SPP

(para 29) (CD004, p9) that states policies and decisions should support climate change adaptation, including taking account of flood risk. Local authorities also have a duty under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025) to contribute to the delivery of the Climate Change Adaptation Programme (May 2014) (RD052). This programme identifies the integration of climate change adaptation into planning processes and decisions as a strategic principle.

E165 Cherrybank

D King Properties (Scotland) Ltd (0461/02/001): Seeks amendment to a mixed uses designation including scope for housing, hotel, care home, and non-residential institutions and refers to the following reasons:

- The Cherrybank site is part of a mixed use site in the current LDP and it is considered that demand for core employment uses can be more appropriately provided through E340 at Broxden reflecting the extensive employment land release approved as part of (15/00809/AMM) (RD046) which provided 6 hectares of commercial floor space as part of MU1 (12/01692/IPM) (CD222).
- Core employment uses are not considered appropriate on this site. Mixed uses at Cherrybank would be more compatible with surrounding uses including residential development north of Necessity Brae 08/00122/OUT (RD048), 11/00933/FLM (RD045 & 14/00269/AMM (CD228) and would ensure development can be delivered, and reflect the current LDP mixed use allocation.
- This site is a self-contained site with its own access and landscaping

Hansteen Land Ltd (0494/01/001): Seeks amendment to a mixed uses or residential allocation or alternatively to include as white land and the following reasons are given:

- The site has had planning permission (05/01600/OUT) (RD047) for some time and although the adjacent site has come forward for residential development this area has lain vacant despite marketing for the approved uses hotel, office, and care home.
- There is no evidence to support core employment uses here, see evidence from Smart & Co (RD049).
- As a vacant brownfield site they feel it should be afforded an opportunity for mixed uses housing and hotel and care home.
- It would be an effective housing site.
- There is sufficient land for business purposes and it would waste this potential resource to contribute to the housing land supply.

SEPA (0742/01/102): A potential flood risk has been identified at this site. As such, part of the site may not be suitable for development and a flood risk assessment will be required to inform the siting, layout, design and capacity of development on site in a way that avoids an increase in flood risk on and off site and ensures dry pedestrian access and egress at times of flood. Any culverted watercourses in or adjacent to the site are also required to be assessed.

The inclusion of a developer requirement with regards a FRA will ensure that developers are fully informed of the flood risk issues affecting the site at the earliest opportunity thereby preventing delay and frustration later in the planning process. It will also ensure that flooding issues are taken into account prior to submitting a planning application and potential developers recognise that the developable area of the site may be constrained by flood risk.

SEPA seek a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment as this accords with your authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (CD036), SPP (CD004), Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD030), and the Scottish Government's online planning advice on flood risk (CD043) which states that development plans should ensure that any assessment of the effectiveness of sites, especially housing sites, takes flood risk into account. It will also contribute positively to the local authority's duties under Section 44 of Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD0025, p24-25). As identified in the SEA, this area/part of this area is at flood risk (CD0075, p7-8). The SEA should be used to inform the LDP and it is noted that the SEA identified a mitigation measure and a developer requirement should reflect that.

E340 Broxden

The John Dewar Lamberkine Trust and Craigrossie Properties (No. 1) (0588/01/001): Comments submitted on behalf of The John Dewar Lamberkine Trust and Craigrossie Properties (No.1) seek E340 to be rezoned from the consented class 4 employment land to residential use, for a capacity of circa 50 mixed tenure residential homes. Reasons given for requesting this change are as follows:

- The 2 hectares site forms part of a wider mixed development granted planning permission in principle in 2013 (Planning Permission 12/01692/IPM approved layout) (CD223) subject of construction. That consent provides for 8 hectares of commercial land, including allocations E340 & E2. A further 6 hectares of commercial land (E2) is available and being marketed.
- E2 is better suited for employment use, reflecting the commercial characteristics of Broxden to the trunk road network, services and adjoining offices space.
- Market sentiment sourced through active marketing establishes that Perth is suffering from an oversupply of office accommodation at circa 70,000 sq (CoStar) (CD213).
- The allocation of strategic employment land will result in a significant pipeline of sites aligned to the market and economic strategy including 20 ha at MU70 Perth West.
- Site E340 subject of independent and active site marketing has not yielded developer or tenant interest. This reflects the challenging topography and its' separation from the Broxden Commercial Area.
- Proximity of E340 to the consented housing land gives it a distinct residential characteristic.
- It could provide an important short-term housing site whilst larger strategic developments materialise through the planning and technical stages.
- The wider Broxden area encompassed by allocations E340 and E2 is the subject of the consideration of hydrogen refuelling and associated onsite energy generation in addition to the expansion of Broxden service station assisting Perth & Kinross Council's low carbon transition strategy. These uses will strengthen the eastern boundary of the Broxden commercial area, further separating proposed allocation E340 from the surrounding commercial uses.
- The land is a logical and modest extension to the adjoining residential land currently under construction.

SEPA (0742/01/103) SEPA seek a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment as this accords with the authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (CD036), SPP (CD004), Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD030), and the Scottish Government's online planning advice on flood risk which states that development plans should ensure that any assessment of the effectiveness of sites, especially housing

sites, takes flood risk into account. It will also contribute positively to the local authority's duties under Section 44 of Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025, p24-25).

A potential flood risk has been identified at this site. As such, part of the site may not be suitable for development and a flood risk assessment will be required to inform the siting, layout, design and capacity of development on site in a way that avoids an increase in flood risk on and off site and ensures dry pedestrian access and egress at times of flood. Any culverted watercourses in or adjacent to the site are also required to be assessed.

The inclusion of a developer requirement with regards a FRA will ensure that developers are fully informed of the flood risk issues affecting the site at the earliest opportunity thereby preventing delay and frustration later in the planning process. It will also ensure that flooding issues are taken into account prior to submitting a planning application and potential developers recognise that the developable area of the site may be constrained by flood risk.

MU171 Perth Quarry

SNH (0353/01/026): Considers that this quarry is in a prominent location that forms part of the wooded landscape setting of Perth and has potential to generate adverse visual and landscape effects on the landscape setting of Perth and the Landscape Character Area of the Lowland Hills. Blurring the boundary between settlement and wooded enclosure in this visually prominent location is considered likely to result in a loss of distinctiveness and adverse impacts on the landscape setting of Perth. This could be visible in key views including the surrounding hilltops, the town and Friarton bridge.

SNH note that a LVIA (RD043) has been carried out but consider that this does not identify key landscape issues and key views and does not present a clear analysis in relation to the sites position at the edge of the settlement part of the town's landscape setting. SNH recommend a revised appraisal and detail an appropriate methodology for this.

SNH recommend development is subject to requirements for mitigation/avoidance of landscape and visual impact, and restoration of woodland in the southern part of the site. The confinement of developable area to the north of the site is welcome in principle but the nature of the 'Proposed Landscape Area or physical landscape works' in the southern section on the map is not clear. Prior to development, most of the southern half of this quarry site was an Ancient Woodland Inventory site (LEPO). Fragments of this remain around the perimeter and the developer requirement will help restore habitat connectivity between the west and northern woodland outwith the site and help integrate it into the wider landscape. There is a need to ensure that potential landscape and visual impacts can be mitigated and ensure development proposal or removal of woodland and trees does not result in a visible scar or intrusion of this wooded ridge and degrade Perth's distinct setting.

MU331 Perth Railway Station and PH2O

Colin Murray (0037/01/003 + 0037/02/001): Welcomes proposals for improvement as long as children's play area and car parking facilities are retained.

T&E Young (0213/01/001), Iona MacGregor (0707/01/001): Are concerned about the proposal for some or all of the following reasons:

- the extent of this allocation and inclusion of woodland to the rear of houses along Glover Street
- wildlife/habitat/residential amenity impact, including the potential loss of these trees which buffer air/noise pollution
- impact on historic environment (Glover St is an archaeological site)
- the new lift and walkway at the station has already detracted from visual amenity

Network Rail (0509/01/006): Refers to comments made elsewhere to the developer contributions policy and their sought amendment to include wider infrastructure within its scope (please refer to schedule 4 Policy 5 Infrastructure Contributions). These infrastructure improvements (rail/bus interchange) are referred to in this allocation and also in the non-statutory Perth City Plan (CD217). They state they are already working closely with Perth & Kinross Council regarding the masterplan which will consider joint access and parking in the context of infrastructure projects in and around and affecting Perth Station and will consider the constraints and opportunities presented by the A-listed status of the Station.

MU336 Murray Royal Hospital

Frances Hobbs (0152/01/008) Neil Myles (0153/01/008) John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/008) Peter and Vanessa Shand (0226/01/008), Mr JD McKerracher (0245/01/009), Scone Community Council (0265/01/009) John W Rodgers (0304/01/009), Mr and Mrs Short (0382/01/005), Mr and Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/004), Jeffrey Rowlinson (0485/01/005) David F Lewington (0486/01/005), Lisa Cardno (0599/01/009), James Thow (0668/01/008) Jennifer Thow (0669/01/008), Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/008), Hazel MacKinnon (07051/01/009), Gerard Connolly (0712/01/009), Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/009), Stewart McCowan (0714/01/009), Angela McCowan (0715/01/009), Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/009) Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/009), Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/009), Shona Cowie (0719/01/009), Paul Cowie (0720/01/009), David Roy (0730/01/009), Greer Crighton (0731/01/009), Brian Hood (0732/01/009), Gaynor Hood (0733/01/009), Philip Crighton (0734/01/009): Support the comments regarding Bridgend air pollution and many of the respondents trust that this will be developed into a full policy.

Rivertree Residential (0356/01/001): The requirement that only the listed buildings will be allowed to be occupied prior to the opening of the CTRL should be deleted. Elsewhere there is requirement for a Transport Assessment and this statement prejudices this assessment and is potentially prejudicial to the overall site strategy. A planning permission in principle application (18/00094/IPM) (CD232) is currently being considered for development up to 70 homes. This will be aligned with alteration and refurbishment of the main hospital which will be submitted as a planning application in due course (CD235) (18/00408/FLM). Disputes the possible capacity issues mentioned in the SEA (CD075, p355 - 370) as their Transport Assessment (CD233) concludes that the development proposals, across the site, will have no significant impact on the operation of the surrounding transport network.

Tim Kendrick and Jane Spiers (0641/01/001) Agree with priority conversion of the listed buildings but not that the new build should be delayed until the completion of the Cross Tay Link Road. Considers that removal of damaged listed buildings (semi derelict Gilgal ward) should be prioritised and that a new build estimate should be given which is significantly lower than the 70 properties proposed in the in principle planning application.

Matthew Lonergan (0319/01/001): Objects to allocation due to traffic impact on the road

junction between West Bridge, Gowrie Street, Main Street and Lochie Brae before suitable works have been carried out at this junction and at Lochie Brae.

MU337 Hillside Hospital

King James VI Golf Club (0131/01/003 + 0131/02/001): King James 6 golf club is supportive of the allocation but would like to explore the possibility of public parking either temporary or long term at this site.

SEPA (0742/01/117): Seek a change that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) be included as a site specific developer requirement.

A potential flood risk has been identified at this site. As such, part of the site may not be suitable for development and a flood risk assessment will be required to inform the siting, layout, design and capacity of development on site in a way that avoids an increase in flood risk on and off site and ensures dry pedestrian access and egress at times of flood. Any culverted watercourses in or adjacent to the site are also required to be assessed. The inclusion of a developer requirement with regards a FRA will ensure that developers are fully informed of the flood risk issues affecting the site at the earliest opportunity thereby preventing delay and frustration later in the planning process. It will also ensure that flooding issues are taken into account prior to submitting a planning application and potential developers recognise that the developable area of the site may be constrained by flood risk.

SEPA seek a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment as this accords with your authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (CD036), SPP (CD004), Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD030), and the Scottish Government's online planning advice on flood risk (CD043) which states that development plans should ensure that any assessment of the effectiveness of sites, especially housing sites, takes flood risk into account. It will also contribute positively to the local authority's duties under Section 44 of Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025, p24-25). As identified in the SEA, this area/part of this area is at flood risk. The SEA should be used to inform the LDP and it is noted that the SEA identified a mitigation measure and a developer requirement should reflect that.

OP2 Thimblerow

Colin Murray (0037/02/004): Concerned about potential loss of parking.

SEPA (0742/01/069): SEPA support the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment as this accords with the Local Authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (CD036), SPP(CD004), Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD030), and the Scottish Government's online planning advice on flood risk (CD043) which states that development plans should ensure that any assessment of the effectiveness of sites, especially housing sites, takes flood risk into account. It will also contribute positively to the local authority's duties under Section 44 of Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025, p24-25).

OP4 Mill Street (south side)

Colin Murray (0037/02/003): Unsure about this proposal as it currently provides car parking and Banks warehouse

SEPA (0742/02/023 + 0742/01/068): Please refer to the common SEPA position as set out in under the sub heading 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood defence schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4.

SEPA support the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment as this accords with the Local Authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006(CD036), SPP (CD004), Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD030), and the Scottish Government's online planning advice on flood risk which states that development plans should ensure that any assessment of the effectiveness of sites, especially housing sites, takes flood risk into account. It will also contribute positively to the local authority's duties under Section 44 of Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025).

With regards site OP4, SEPA guidance identifies that least vulnerable uses which SEPA presume the development to improve or create Mill Street frontage would consist of, as defined by our flood risk and land use vulnerability guidance, are acceptable where the standard of protection is equal or greater than 1 in 200 year (0.5% Annual Estimated Probability). The information provided clarifies that the Perth FPS affords this standard of protection and therefore have no objection to the proposed development at this site. Furthermore SEPA support the fact that the developer requirement identifies that areas behind the FPS should incorporate appropriate mitigation measures as this accords with the Risk Framework in paragraph 263 of SPP (CD004).

Ensuring that the vulnerability of the land use is appropriate for the location and degree of flood risk is also an adaptation measure that will help make future development resilient to a changing climate. This accords with the high level sustainability principle in SPP (para 29) (CD004) that states policies and decisions should support climate change adaptation, including taking account of flood risk. Local authorities also have a duty under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009(CD025) to contribute to the delivery of the Climate Change Adaptation Programme (May 2014) (RD052). This programme identifies the integration of climate change adaptation into planning processes and decisions as a strategic principle.

OP8 Friarton Road

Sally Doig (0125/01/001): Concerned about the proposal due to: 24 hour noise issues from the existing industrial estate which is further from their property than this proposal; impact on semi-rural feel and loss of greenspace.

OP9 Bus Station, Leonard Street

John Meiklem (0043/02/001): Supports the redevelopment of this area as the southern third of the city centre is lacking attractive buildings and character. Would like the Council to encourage hotel and associated leisure facilities here to enhance visual attractiveness, and employment opportunities.

Colin Murray (0037/01/002 + 0037/02/002): Objection to any housing development here and concerned about the potential operational impact on the bus station.

Perth and Kinross Council Tenants Organisation (0701/01/001): Considers allocation not suitable for flats, there to be lack of parking, and suggests improvements to the bus

station amenities. States that the area is poorly maintained and the play area has been removed. Considers there is a need for upgrade so that the Forteviot gifted area is the legacy intended.

Bus 'Y' Bites (0704/01/001): The café at the bus station organised and collected 435 signatures from the public against the removal of the bus station. Seeks improvement of bus station rather than relocation and considers bus station and railway station are already close to each other. No contact address details are provided but there are comments made alongside some of the signatures. Comments made generally seek to keep the bus station and café where it is as it is centrally located and close to the train station, and seek improvement instead of relocation and/or mention its social role.

OP175 City Hall

St John's Kirk of Perth (0426/01/001): Content with intention to use as a new cultural attraction but concerned that sketch proposals for the environs of the building show that the designers intended to use the space between the east elevation of the City Hall and the west elevation of the Kirk as an outdoor seating area. Considers that alternative proposals to lower the ground level on the threshold of the kirk entrance would make better use of the space. Seeks confirmation that the sketch is just illustrative and consultation in the context of expected planning application this year.

SEPA (0742/02/023+ 0742/01/115): Please refer to the common SEPA position as set out in under the sub heading 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood defence schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4.

SEPA believe that the Perth Flood Protection Scheme defends this site, and seek inclusion of a developer requirement to include mitigation measures for land behind Flood Protection Scheme.

With regards site OP175, the guidance identifies that least vulnerable uses which includes assembly and leisure, as defined by our flood risk and land use vulnerability guidance, are acceptable where the standard of protection is equal or greater than 1 in 200 year (0.5% Annual Estimated Probability). The information provided clarifies that the Perth FPS affords this standard of protection and therefore SEPA have no objection to the proposed development at this site. However SEPA require that the developer requirements are expanded to identify that areas behind the FPS should incorporate appropriate mitigation measures as this accords with the Risk Framework in paragraph 263 of SPP (CD004).

Ensuring that the vulnerability of the land use is appropriate for the location and degree of flood risk is also an adaptation measure that will help make future development resilient to a changing climate. This accords with the high level sustainability principle in SPP (para 29) that states policies and decisions should support climate change adaptation, including taking account of flood risk. Local authorities also have a duty under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025) to contribute to the delivery of the Climate Change Adaptation Programme (May 2014) (RD052). This programme identifies the integration of climate change adaptation into planning processes and decisions as a strategic principle.

OP338 St John's School, Stormont Street

SEPA (0742/01/114): Seek a change that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) be included as

a site specific developer requirement.

Considers that the proposed development site and levels should be informed by a FRA.

Considers that the inclusion of a developer requirement with regards a FRA will ensure that developers are fully informed of the flood risk issues affecting the site at the earliest opportunity thereby preventing delay and frustration later in the planning process.

Considers that this will also ensure that flooding issues are taken into account prior to submitting a planning application and potential developers recognise that the developable area of the site may be constrained by flood risk.

SEPA seek a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment as they consider that this accords with authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006(CD036), SPP (CD004), Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD030), and the Scottish Government's online planning advice on flood risk (CD043) which states that development plans should ensure that any assessment of the effectiveness of sites, especially housing sites, takes flood risk into account. It will also contribute positively to the local authority's duties under Section 44 of Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025). As identified in the SEA, this area/part of this area is at flood risk.

SEPA (0742/02/023 + 0742/01/113): Please refer to the common SEPA position as set out in under the sub heading 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood defence schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4.

SEPA seeks inclusion of a developer requirement to include mitigation measures for land behind Flood Protection Scheme.

The cumulative assessment of sites in Perth within the Environment Report Addendum identifies this site as including areas within the natural flood plain but states that the River Tay Flood Protection Scheme mitigates this risk.

With regards site OP338, the guidance identifies that least vulnerable uses which includes restaurants and offices, as defined by our flood risk and land use vulnerability guidance, are acceptable where the standard of protection is equal or greater than 1 in 200 year (0.5% Annual Estimated Probability). The information provided clarifies that the Perth FPS affords this standard of protection and therefore SEPA have no objection to the proposed development at this site. However SEPA require that the developer requirements are expanded to identify that areas behind the FPS should incorporate appropriate mitigation measures as this accords with the Risk Framework in paragraph 263 of SPP (CD004).

Ensuring that the vulnerability of the land use is appropriate for the location and degree of flood risk is also an adaptation measure that will help make future development resilient to a changing climate. This accords with the high level sustainability principle in SPP (para 29) (CD004) that states policies and decisions should support climate change adaptation, including taking account of flood risk. Local authorities also have a duty under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD025) to contribute to the delivery of the Climate Change Adaptation Programme (May 2014) (RD052). This programme identifies the integration of climate change adaptation into planning processes and decisions as a strategic principle.

Cemetery Search Area Isla Road

Lisa Cardno (0599/01/016): Considers there to be lack of evidence and clarity of the details of the cemetery to support its inclusion.

SNH (0353/01/023): Do not recommend this area: The construction of the Cross Tay Link Road will introduce significant change to the rural landscape character which forms the setting of Perth. The proposed green belt between the settlement boundary and the Cross Tay Link Road will be smaller, and will play a key role in providing a quality rural setting to Perth. The search area is located in this area, and would further introduce a more urban character with potential loss of rural quality. It would also further fragment the rural buffer between Perth Gannochy area and Scone/Scone Palace grounds. The rural qualities along the river corridor are also high and there is a popular walkway along the river.

Scone Estate (0614/01/003): Would welcome discussions with the Council on this proposal but have concerns about its location opposite the entrance to Scone Palace and as such they consider it might detract from the visitor experience. They would like to know more about the design, land required, infrastructure requirements and landscape impacts so an informed position can be taken. They are also interested in possibility of green burial site which could be in same location as the cemetery. They would like to work together to try and establish if there is a suitable site on Scone Estate land which could be evaluated against the option on the west side of Perth.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Archaeology

Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/11): Seeks site requirements for H1, E38, OP2, OP4, and OP9 to reflect the likelihood of them requiring archaeological investigation.

H1 Scott Street/Charles Street

SEPA (0742/01/107 + 0742/02/023): Please refer to the common SEPA position as set out in under the sub heading 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood defence schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4.

H3 Gannochy Road

Frances Hobbs (0152/01/008), Neil Myles (0153/01/008), John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/008), Peter and Vanessa Shand (0226/01/008), Mr JD McKerracher (0245/01/009), Scone Community Council (0265/01/009), John W Rodgers (0304/01/009), Mr and Mrs Short (0382/01/005), Mr and Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/004), Jeffrey Rowlinson (0485/01/005), David F Lewington (0486/01/005), Lisa Cardno (0599/01/009), James Thow (0668/01/008), Jennifer Thow (0669/01/008), Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/003), Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/009), George Connolly (0712/01/009), Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/009), Stewart McCowan (0714/01/009), Angela McCowan (0715/01/009), Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/009), Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/009), Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/009), Shona Cowie (0719/01/009), Paul Cowie (0720/01/009), David Roy (0730/01/009), Greer Crichton (0731/01/009), Brian Hood (0732/01/009), Gaynor Hood (0733/01/009), Philip Crichton (0734/01/009): No specific change sought but they support the comments regarding Bridgend air pollution and many of the respondents trust

that this will be developed into a full policy.

H71 Newton Farm

Robert Reid 1999 Discretionary Trust (0192/01/001): Seeks revised allocation for mixed uses for housing and retail. The requirements associated with the site should require satisfactory studies on retail impact, the sequential test and transportation.

SEPA (0742/01/110): Seeks a change that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) be included as a site specific developer requirement and supports the developer requirement regarding an energy statement.

H319 Ruthvenfield

The Fenton 2016 and the Simon Fenton Discretionary Trusts (0145/01/001), and Mr and Mrs Mackintosh (0179/01/001): support the allocation.

Stephen and Victoria Walker (0108/01/001), Ryan Porteous (0038/01/001), Gary Wright (0181/01/001), Murray Flett (0595/01/001): Seek removal of the allocation. Murray Flett (0595/01/001): also seeks protection of woodland.

SEPA (0742/01/097): Please refer to the SEPA position as set out in under the sub heading 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood defence schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4.

SNH (0353/04/001): Modify the Site Specific Developer Requirements for Site H319 to include the following criteria:

- 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 SAC.
- 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 SAC.

E1 The Triangle

Go Americano Ltd (0618/01/001): Seeks the use classification of E1 to be extended to include ancillary employment uses (including food and drink).

SEPA (0742/01/030): Support the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment.

E2 Broxden

The John Dewar Lamberkine Trust (0532/05/004): No specific change sought, but the JDLT seek site specific developer requirements to promote broad employment uses not restricted to solely class 4.

E3 Arran Road

Louise Crawford (0026/01/001): No specific change sought, but considers ample screening is needed.

SEPA (0742/01/031): Supports the developer requirement for a flood risk assessment.

E38 Ruthvenfield Road

Rossco Properties (0120/002/001): No specific change sought, but seeks greater flexibility on uses beyond class 4, 5 and 6 to include limited retail, class 3/takeaway, hotel, and motor sales uses.

SEPA (0742/01/041): SEPA support the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment.

E165 Cherrybank

D King Properties (Scotland) Ltd (0461/02/001): Seeks amendment to a mixed uses designation including scope for housing, hotel, care home, and non-residential institutions

Hansteen Land Ltd (0494/01/001): Seeks amendment to a mixed uses or residential allocation or alternatively to include as white land

SEPA (0742/01/102): SEPA seek a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment

E340 Broxden

The John Dewar Lamberkine Trust and Craigrossie Properties (No.1) (0588/01/001): Seek E340 to be rezoned from the consented class 4 employment land to residential use for a capacity of circa 50 mixed tenure residential homes.

SEPA (0742/01/103): SEPA seek a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment

MU171 Perth Quarry

SNH (0353/01/026): Add developer requirements:

i) "A revised landscape and visual appraisal of the proposed layout, existing or proposed topography, woodland screening and impact on views to ensure the layout retains the current screening of the quarry scar and mitigates new development proposed in the north of the site."

ii) "Provide a robust landscape framework informed by the appraisal and reinstatement of native woodland in the southern half of the site to enhance biodiversity and habitats."

MU331 Perth Railway Station and PH2O

Colin Murray (0037/01/003 + 0037/02/001): No specific change sought but seeks retention of children's play area and car parking facilities.

T&E Young (0213/01/01): No specific change sought but seeks retention of trees between the railway line and Glover Street and is concerned about their inclusion within the allocation.

Iona MacGregor (0707/01/001): Seeks removal of the allocation

Network Rail (0509/01/006): No specific change sought.

MU336 Murray Royal Hospital

Frances Hobbs (0152/01/008), Neil Myles (0153/01/008), John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/008), Peter and Vanessa Shand (0226/01/008), Mr JD McKerracher (0245/01/009), Scone Community Council (0265/01/009), John W Rodgers (0304/01/09), Mr and Mrs Short (0382/01/005), Mr and Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/004), Jeffrey Rowlinson (0485/01/005), David F Lewington (0486/01/005), Lisa Cardno (0599/01/009), James Thow (0668/01/008), Jennifer Thow (0669/01/008), Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/003), Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/009), Gerard Connolly (0712/01/009), Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/009), Stewart McCowan (0714/01/009), Angela McCowan (0715/01/009), Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/009), Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/009), Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/009), Shona Cowie (0719/01/009), Paul Cowie (0720/01/009), David Roy (0730/01/009), Greer Crichton (0731/01/009), Brian Hood (0732/01/009), Gaynor Hood (0733/01/009), Philip Crichton (0734/01/009): No specific change sought, but support the comments regarding Bridgend air pollution and many of the respondents trust that this will be developed into a full policy.

Matthew Lonergan (0319/01/001): No specific change sought.

Rivertree Residential (0356/01/001): Seeks to remove from the site specific development requirements "only the conversion of the Listed Buildings will be allowed to be occupied prior to the opening of the Cross Tay Link Road."

Tim Kendrick and Jane Spiers (0641/01/001) No specific change sought, but considered that they seek to remove from the site specific development requirements "only the conversion of the Listed Buildings will be allowed to be occupied prior to the opening of the Cross Tay Link Road." and they seek identification of a new build estimate significantly lower than the 70 properties.

MU337 Hillside Hospital

King James VI Golf Club (0131/01/003 + 0131/02/001): King James 6 golf club support allocation, with either temporary/permanent public parking.

SEPA (0742/01/117): Seek a change that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) be included as a site specific developer requirement.

OP2 Thimble Row

Colin Murray (0037/02/008): No specific change sought, but concerned about loss of parking

SEPA (0742/01/069): SEPA support the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment

OP4 Mill Street (south side)

Colin Murray (0037/02/003): No specific change sought.

SEPA (0742/01/068): SEPA support the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment

OP8 Friarton Road

Sally Doig (0125/01/001): No specific change sought but concerned about potential impact on residential amenity.

OP9 Bus Station, Leonard Street

Colin Murray (0037/01/002 + 0037/02/002): Seeks removal of allocation

John Meiklem (0043/01/002), PKC Tenants association (0701/01/001): No specific change sought

Bus 'Y' Bites (0704/01/001): Seeks allocation to require improvement of bus station and remove suggestion of relocation.

OP175 City Hall

SEPA (0742/01/115): Seeks inclusion of a developer requirement to include mitigation measures for land behind Flood Protection Scheme.

St Johns Kirk (0426/01/001): No specific change sought.

OP338 St John's School, Stormont Street

SEPA (0742/1/23+113): Seek inclusion of a developer requirement to include mitigation measures for land behind Flood Protection Scheme.

SEPA (0742/1/114): SEPA seek a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment.

Cemetery Search Areas

SNH (0353/01/023): SNH do not recommend the Isla Road Search area but if selected SNH recommend a landscape master plan to maximise the integration with green networks and redefine the rural edge.

Lisa Cardno (0599/01/016): No specific change sought

Scone Estate (0614/01/03): Seek removal of this search area. They express some concerns about potential impact on Scone Palace visitor experience and would like to consider other options within their estate.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

Archaeology

Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/011): This is a matter that can be picked up at the planning application stage as the Policy 26: Scheduled Monuments and Non-Designated Archaeology covers it (CD052, p40).

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter is minded to accept the modification H1, E38, OP2, OP4, OP9 to require archaeological investigation the Council

would be comfortable with making this change as it would not have any implications for any other aspect of the plan.

H1 Scott Street/Charles Street

SEPA (0742/01/107 + 0742/02/023): This same issue also comes up in relation to allocations H319 Ruthvenfield and MU73 Almond Valley so a common summary of SEPA's position, and response to it is given under the sub heading below 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood protection schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4.

H3 Gannochy Road

Frances Hobbs (0152/01/008), Neil Myles (0153/01/008), John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/008), Peter and Vanessa Shand (0226/01/008), Mr JD McKerracher (0245/01/009), Scone Community Council (0265/01/009), John W Rodgers (0304/01/009), Mr and Mrs Short (0382/01/005), Mr and Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/004), Jeffrey Rowlinson (0485/01/005), David F Lewington (0486/01/005), Lisa Cardno (0599/01/009), James Thow (0668/01/008), Jennifer Thow (0669/01/008), Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/003), Hazel Mackinnon (0705/01/009), Gerard Connolly (0712/01/009), Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/009), Stewart McCowan (0714/01/009), Angela McCowan (0715/01/009), Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/009), Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/009), Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/009), Shona Cowie (0719/01/009), Paul Cowie (0720/01/009), David Roy (0730/01/009), Greer Crichton (0731/01/009), Brian Hood (0732/01/009), Gaynor Hood (0733/01/009), Philip Crichton (0734/01/009):

The supportive comments are noted. Whilst there is no site specific air pollution policy proposed, there are policies: Policy 55: Air Quality Management Areas (CD052, p85), and Policy 58 Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements (CD052, p93-95), which provide appropriate policy context on these matters.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

H71 Newton Farm

Robert Reid 1999 Discretionary Trust (0192/01/001): It is noted that the objector mentions a small convenience store but proposes a 2,000-2,500 square metres food store. With regard to the potential for a small convenience store there is already a small newsagent nearby on the junction of Crieff Road, and Tulloch Terrace, also within close walking distance are the large Tesco superstore on Crieff Road, and the Tulloch Square Cooperative. There are sufficient neighbourhood retail facilities to serve this area. The Tulloch square centre is only marginally viable so would benefit from the support of additional residents using its facilities. There are also local facilities nearby on Garth Avenue, where there is a local newsagents, and Letham Climate Challenge (which was given a peppercorn rental agreement by the Council due to limited commercial demand). Between these neighbourhood centres and the Tesco on Crieff Road there are appropriate accessible local shops and facilities within the area.

In terms of the larger proposal the Perth and Kinross Town Centre and Retail Study 2016 (CD215) states "In terms of the distribution of potential opportunities for new store development in the Perth sub area, it is reasonable to consider that Scone is a possible location for new store development to serve the local population. For example, there

would be capacity to support the existing supermarket consent at Scone, or an alternative proposal, such as a discount food store.” The study also refers to the St Catherine’s opportunity with permission 11/01971/MPO (CD221, p70) being granted for a modification to the original planning obligation to allow for a full scale food store (3,350sqm) to be located within the retail park. These opportunities are sequentially preferable to this proposal. It is noted that the Reporter considering the current Perth and Kinross LDP concluded that (CD015, p402): ‘The effect of potentially permitting retail development in this location, which is not within a defined centre, would be to circumvent the sequential approach to site selection as it would permit development solely on the basis of there being demonstrated capacity, without considering whether that need could be satisfied by developing a sequentially preferable site.’ There has been no change to suggest that this site should be allocated now as there are still sequentially preferable opportunities.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SEPA (0742/01/110): With regards to Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) it is stated that the masterplan should be informed by FRA to identify which areas are suitable for development so no change is required.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

H319 Ruthvenfield

The Fenton 2016 and the Simon Fenton Discretionary Trusts (0145/01/001), Mr and Mrs Mackintosh (0179/01/001), Stephen and Victoria Watkins (0108/01/001), Ryan Porteous (0038/01/001), Gary Wright (0181/01/001), Murray Flett (0595/01/001):

Since it is now clear that the CTLR cannot provide a direct access into the site this western area of the existing LDP E38 is no longer considered to be effective or suitable as an employment allocation. The CTLR sits at a higher level removing frontage potential, whilst the revised access arrangements from Ruthvenfield Road would be unsuitable for employment uses.

The reallocation of this land H319 as a housing allocation is considered appropriate. There is a need for a choice of housing allocations to be identified in the Perth area. Whilst there is no need to identify this allocation in terms of housing land supply numbers, it is appropriate to have a range of smaller and larger sites. This potential allocation along with all suggested development sites were subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA, p181-194). This SEA assessment (CD075 p181-194) considers not just environmental considerations but social and economic factors and through this assessment process the site was identified as a suitable site for residential development subject to the identified site specific developer requirements.

Planning permission 10/00233/FLL was granted on part of this allocation and this permission has started so it will not lapse. The permitted layout (CD220) allowed for a safeguarding zone for the gas main demonstrating that this does not predicate against development.

There would be a change to the character and amenity of H319, however this area is identified in the existing LDP for employment uses, and the impact on amenity and character of the area would be less if it is allocated for residential. Also there will be a fundamental change to the character of this wider area with the Almond Valley MU73

development and the adjacent CTRL. It would not make sense to leave this land as agricultural land surrounded by development. Indeed the viability of a small isolated agricultural unit in this location is questionable. This proposed development would bring about some change in character however the majority of the amenity trees/ woodland, and a setback from and protection of the attractive green corridor along the Lade would be retained and integrated into any future proposal. There are site specific developer requirements for the green corridor, and trees and woodland that would need to be addressed when/if any planning applications come forward here.

With respect to land subject to the 08/00253/OUT planning application which indicatively showed 17 house plots (CD219) this proposal's appeal for non-determination was dismissed. It was considered unacceptable due to timing (uncertainty surrounding nearby Almond Valley proposal) and due to its woodland impact. However the Council agrees with the Reporter's conclusion to (CD015) 'not rule out the possibility of part of the appeal site being developed for housing in the future'. The 08/00253/OUT proposal of 17 homes within this partially wooded site was not acceptable however there is likely to be some limited scope for development within this area subject to a tree survey and access considerations. For example in 2013 an application for erection of 2 houses 13/01022/AML (CD224) within this site was permitted (CD225). Retention of the full conifer tree line that currently separates Ruthvenmill view from the rest of this allocation is not desirable. The scope for limited development with access linkages provided to the wider site should be considered as part of a wider masterplan.

Concern about impact on property price is not in itself a planning consideration. Impact on residential amenity is relevant but this can be addressed by securing an appropriate design and layout at the planning application stage (as required by the Council's Policy 1 Placemaking) (CD052, p19-20), whilst construction/ noise impacts can be controlled through condition/s on any planning permission. Whilst recognising that this area will form part of the urban area appropriate light installations will be considered at the planning application stage with consideration of Policy 53: Nuisance from Artificial Light and Light Pollution (CD052, p84). With regard to the traffic impact of the proposal the traffic modelling report (CD216) does not indicate any network capacity issues whilst detailed transport and access arrangements will be assessed further at the masterplanning/ planning application stage. Multiple vehicle access points will be sought due to the size of the site, and the access points indicated on the site drawing are considered appropriate whilst others could emerge through the masterplanning process.

It is recognised that flood risk is an issue and this is addressed through the site specific developer requirement for a FRA and Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) at the planning application stage. In addition to river flood risk there may be surface water drainage concerns to be addressed. This FRA and DIA assessment could limit the developable areas and the proposal will not be allowed to increase the probability of flooding elsewhere.

SEPA (0742/1/23 + 0742/02/023): In response to SEPA concerns regarding flood risk this same issue also comes up in relation to allocations H1 Scott Street/Charles Street, and MU73 Almond Valley so a common summary of SEPA's position and response to it is given under the sub heading below 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood protection schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SNH (0353/04/001): It is considered that amending the Site Specific Developer Requirements to incorporate mitigation measures as set out in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (CD056) would provide greater clarity and transparency for applicants in terms of how the provisions of the Plan's Policy 36A: 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.

E1 The Triangle

Go Americano Ltd (0618/01/991): The 16/01124/FLL coffee shop proposal (CD229) was recommended for refusal by the planning officer as it was considered contrary to the LDP. The review was upheld by the local review body and there is now a coffee shop here. However it is inappropriate to change this allocation as it concerns more than this individual plot and the strategy for car sales uses remains. There is scope to permit appropriate food and drink proposals in accordance with LDP2 policy 7 and specifically criteria (e) 'Proposals for service facilities (should exclude retail and commercial facilities over 100 m2) and should serve the business and industrial area rather than draw outside trade and cumulatively should not equal more than 15% of the allocated employment area.' The planning officer concern with this particular proposal was that there are already adequate local facilities of this nature nearby and this shop by its size (180 m2 of class 3 floorspace) and by its location adjacent to the Inveralmond roundabout it is designed to draw outside trade rather than service existing trade.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SEPA (0742/01/030): SEPA's comments regarding the uses proposed are noted.

E2 Broxden

The John Dewar Lamberkine Trust (0532/05/004): This allocation is identified for core employment uses. The planning permission 12/01692/IPM currently limits the use of this land to class 4 (CD223). Policy 7 Employment and Mixed Use Areas identifies more flexibility in terms of acceptable uses on core employment sites. The proposed alteration to this policy in LDP2 has created two classifications of employment land, one is strategic/core business and industrial land, and the second is general business and industrial land with potential for mixed uses. The location of this site within a TAYplan tier 1 settlement, its high amenity, it's a strategic location for transport (near park and ride, adjacent major bus routes, and giving easy access to/from: A90 Dundee, M90 Edinburgh & Fife, A9 Glasgow & Stirling, A85 Crieff, and A9 Inverness) and the limited supply of serviced land available locally made this a core site with less flexibility encouraged over uses. However within core sites it is not just class 4 uses but also class 5 and 6 that are encouraged and criteria (d) ancillary retail, (e) service facilities and (f) waste management also allow appropriate exceptions. It is considered that this provides an appropriate flexibility on uses whilst ensuring there are suitable opportunities for class 4, 5 and 6 uses. This is not to say that there will not be potential for some further flexibility on uses on a case by case basis at the planning application stage, this is what happened when planning permission was granted at another part of Broxden for a Greene King restaurant, and for the Broxden dentist centre.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

E3 Arran Road

Louise Crawford (0026/01/001): Protecting the amenity of nearby residential areas is important and is a consideration covered by Policy 1 Placemaking (CD052, p19-20). Any screening measures required to protect residential amenity are a detailed matter which will be addressed at the planning application stage.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SEPA (0742/01/031): SEPA's comments regarding the uses proposed are noted.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

E38 Ruthvenfield Road

Rossco Properties (0120/02/001): This allocation is identified for core employment uses. Policy 7 Employment and Mixed Use Areas (CD052, p25) identifies some flexibility in terms of acceptable uses on core employment sites beyond class 4, 5 and 6. The proposed alteration to this policy in LDP2 has created two classifications of employment land, one is strategic/core business and industrial land, and the second is general business and industrial land with potential for mixed uses. The location of this site within a TAYplan tier 1 settlement (CD022, p8), its high amenity, it's a strategic location for transport (adjacent to new Cross Tay Link road giving easy access to/from: A90 Dundee, M90 Edinburgh & Fife, A9 Glasgow & Stirling, A85 Crieff, and A9 Inverness) and the limited supply of serviced land available locally, made this a core site with less flexibility over uses. Within core sites it is not just class 4 uses but class 5 and 6 that are encouraged and Policy 7A Business and Industrial criteria (d) ancillary retail, (e) service facilities and (f) waste management allows appropriate exceptions. It is considered that this provides an appropriate level of flexibility on uses whilst ensuring there are suitable opportunities for class 4, 5 and 6 uses. It will provide limited opportunities for ancillary retail, whilst hotel development is not considered to be an appropriate use within the core employment areas but is a possibility within general employment areas.

The adjacent developed Inveralmond industrial estate has become more mixed use with some trade retail. There are no significant opportunities remaining within the existing estate and its identification as employment uses (general) reflects its current composition and amenity. This new employment land allocation has potential to be a more focussed, high amenity class 4, 5, 6 estate. The E38 employment land is proposed to be pragmatically reduced from LDP1 for access and viability reasons (LDP2 H319 allocation) so there is a need to ensure sufficient opportunities for the core class 4, 5 and 6 uses remain. The Council considers that there is a market for the uses identified and resists residential uses here. It is noted that there has been healthy interest from traditional class 4, 5 and 6 employers as evidenced by the Council's enquiry information (some of this information is confidential but can be provided to the Reporter on request). This allocation therefore needs to be a core employment allocation. This is not to say that there will not be potential for some further flexibility on uses on a case by case basis at the planning application stage which is what happened when planning permission was granted at another part of Broxden for a Greene King restaurant, and for the Broxden dentist centre.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter is minded to accept a modification to allow motor sales on another employment site beyond E1 (which now has no remaining opportunities with planning consents in place across the whole site) the Council would be comfortable with allowing some motor sales along the Ruthvenfield road frontage. This is in preference to E2, as E38 has the better frontage opportunity. This potential change would not have any implications for any other aspect of the plan.

SEPA (0742/01/041): SEPA's comments regarding the uses proposed are noted.

E165 Cherrybank

D King Properties (Scotland) Ltd (0461/02/001), and Hansteen Land Ltd (0494/01/001):

This allocation of land south of Necessity Brae is identified for core employment uses, hotel and non-residential institutions. Policy 7 Employment and Mixed Use Areas (CD052, p25) identifies some additional flexibility in terms of acceptable uses on core employment sites beyond class 4, 5 and 6, however residential uses are resisted. This site forms the southern part of the existing LDP1 MU1 mixed uses area. It is a sustainable site for employment uses with very good public transport provision including dedicated bus services to the adjacent Aviva.

Other areas within the LDP1 MU1 allocation were identified for housing and for employment uses. The other part of this LDP1 mixed use area 14/00269/AMM proposal was approved and developed solely for residential (CD228) on adjacent land north of Necessity Brae. This was considered to be a partial policy departure. In the committee report it was considered that, 'The broader objectives of the policy can however still be satisfied by the redevelopment of the remaining 2.44 Ha' (now identified as E165) 'of the in principle consent site boundaries for compatible mixed use projects, offsetting the single residential element currently under consideration. By virtue of the overall site layout therefore, this proposal remains proportionate and justifiable in the wider site context in satisfying Policy ED1B'. The policy statement submitted with the planning application 14/00269/AMM (CD227, p5) also acknowledged for E165 that: 'For the avoidance of doubt it is acknowledged that in planning terms the site to the south of Necessity Brae would not be acceptable for further residential development in order to comply with the terms of Policy ED1B in relation to establishing an appropriate mix of uses' and then goes on to say: 'When fully completed the site as approved through the previous outline application would constitute a sustainable mixed use development incorporating a range of potentially compatible uses including residential, office and a hotel. This would contribute to the viability and vitality of this part of the City and is deemed compatible with Perth and Kinross LDP Policy PM1B.'

This proposal for residential uses/mixed uses does not meet with the current LDP1 requirement for a mix of uses within this area of the MU1 allocation. It does not sufficiently add to the vitality and viability of the city and it conflicts with the landowner's commitment given when granted their planning application 14/00269/AMM (CD226) partial policy departure planning permission. It is noted that there was a pre application enquiry for a care home and residential/serviced apartments in 2016. Whilst there is a surplus of existing care home beds there is opportunity for a new care home with the different offering this could provide. This pre application enquiry was supported by a letter from a care home operator who considered there was capacity for a facility. The Council's response was favourable for the care home element but considered the residential/serviced apartments did not meet with the LDP requirement for a mix of uses

within this area of the MU1 allocation, or sufficiently add to the vitality and viability of the city. This indicates there is potential care home demand.

The market for employment uses is not generally as financially lucrative or as quick to generate returns as residential uses are. Since for a landowner, employment use allocations are less desirable if they are ultimately allowed to develop them for residential uses then there could become a perverse incentive not to develop them and to hold out for residential uses in the longer term. A strategic corporate group comprising Economic Development, Planning, Property Services, Finance and Legal has been established with the remit to review the overall supply and demand of business land and premises and optimise opportunities. The Council is interested in taking a more proactive role in working with developers to help them deliver employment sites (such as a joint venture) or to purchase and service employment sites. This is set out in the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee report, 29 November 2017, Commercial Property Investment Programme - Progress update and revised Programme (CD212).

The Council considers that there is a market for the uses identified and resists residential uses here. It is noted that there has been healthy interest from traditional class 4, 5 and 6 employers as evidenced by the Council's enquiry information (some of this information is confidential but can be provided to the Reporter on request). The Council's Team Leader Estates and Commercial Investment met with Hansteen on the Thursday 1st June 2017 to discuss progress. The meeting record (CD214) highlights the valuation issue, with the Council considering Handsteen's expected sale value of £1 million to be 'highly optimistic'

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SEPA (0742/01/102): With regard to flood risk the SEA site assessment (CD076, p7-8) does not indicate there is a flood risk issue on this site. On checking the SEPA mapping layers the only flood risk is adjacent to the site where there is a surface water risk relating to the burn (which lies at a lower level) and to the extent of the existing ponds adjacent to the site. Having checked with the Council's flood team this site does not require a FRA just DIA/SuD. There is no need to stipulate a DIA on its own since this is required by policy and is required of every allocation in the Plan and is not site specific.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

E340 Broxden

The John Dewar Lamberkine Trust and Craigrossie Properties (No.1) (0588/01/001): The Council resist the proposed change of use to residential. There is a 18/00480/FLL planning application (CD236) currently under consideration for 48 homes on this site. This application is contrary to the existing LDP and the proposed LDP2 and is premature to this issue of changing it from employment to housing land being considered through this Examination. The Council is seeking the withdrawal of this planning application but will refuse it under delegated powers if it is not withdrawn.

It should be noted that E2 is a 4 hectare employment land allocation not the 6 hectares stated. The scope for further employment sites to be designated in the Perth area is limited and a lot of the allocated land is not yet serviced and much of it will be delivered over the longer term within the Strategic Development Areas. This emphasises the need to ensure the delivery of this employment land which was masterplanned with cross funding provided by the adjacent residential development. There is a condition for phased

release of employment land (CD223, p2) in the planning permission for the wider site 12/01692/IPM which secures this phase 2 of the business land development to be fully serviced before the occupation of 50% of the residential dwellings associated with phase 4. This should be delivered soon and will be an important contribution of serviced and effective employment land in Perth.

The Housing Background Paper (CD018) was prepared alongside the Proposed LDP and was approved by the Council in November 2017 and this shows a significant surplus in housing land supply in the Perth Housing Market Area. There are sufficient short term deliverable housing sites of a range of size within Perth and there is no need for additional residential allocation. Significant progress has been made within the Strategic Development Areas - in principle planning permissions have been secured for Almond Valley (up to 1,500 new homes) and for Bertha Park (3,000 plus homes). There is also full planning permission secured for phase 1 at Bertha Park (1061 homes) with construction underway. There are windfall developments underway at Muirton (203 homes) and Tulloch (26 homes) whilst MU1 Broxden phase 3 (70 homes) are all currently under construction and land West of Woodlands gained detailed permission in April 2018 (46 homes). Half of the H3 Gannochy (68-96 homes) allocation secured detailed planning permission for 48 homes in November 2017. In principle permission was granted January 2018 for the former auction mart site within MU70 Perth West (up to 270 homes). At MU336 Murray Royal Hospital there is a detailed application for the listed building conversion (to form 58 flats) and an in principle planning application for new build is currently under consideration. Also there are further residential allocations H319 Ruthvenfield (115-153 homes), MU71 Perth Quarry (112-175 homes), and MU337 Hillside Hospital (61 + homes) identified in LDP2, whilst H71 Newton Farm (72 -110 homes) is carried forward from LDP1.

This allocation for employment uses is suitable, appropriate residential amenity can be maintained for adjoining eastern residential areas through: landscaping (as per the approved masterplan layout); and the types of employment uses approved and as necessary restrictions on noise, lighting and operating hours. Any development proposal will be guided using the principles set out in Policy 7A (business and industrial) which indicates that (CD052, p25) 'Proposals should not detract from the amenity of adjoining, especially residential areas', and Policy 53 Nuisance from Artificial Light and Light Pollution (CD052, p84), and Policy 54 Noise Pollution (CD052, p84). There are plenty of employment uses which would be compatible with nearby residential development and also employment proposals which could be successfully accommodated on a sloping site.

The market for employment uses is not generally as financially lucrative or as quick to generate returns as residential uses are. Since employment use allocations are less desirable for a landowner if they are ultimately allowed to change to residential uses then there is a perverse incentive not to develop them, and to hold out for residential uses in the longer term. This should be resisted. The Council considers that there is a market for the uses identified and resists residential uses here. It is noted that there has been healthy interest from traditional class 4, 5 and 6 employers as evidenced by the Council's enquiry information (some of this information is confidential but can be provided to the Reporter on request). If there has been limited interest thus far this should change when there are serviced sites available. A strategic corporate group comprising Economic Development, Planning, Property Services, Finance and Legal has been established with the remit to review the overall supply and demand of business land and premises and optimise opportunities. The Council is interested in taking a more proactive role in working with developers to help them deliver employment sites (such as a joint venture)

or to purchase and service employment sites. This is set out in the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee report, 29 November 2017, Commercial Property Investment Programme - Progress update and revised Programme (CD212).

With regard to the Costar report (CD213) this only includes class 4 uses whereas the allocation also includes class 5 and 6. The Council can also make some observations on this report. Much of the office stock included in it is older and not fit for purpose to attract high value jobs and occupiers. It appears there is little modern stock that would be appropriate for company Headquarters with good transport connectivity. Only Earn House at Broxden and Inveralmond Business Centre would appear to fit this criteria and the report indicates availability of 22,500 sq. ft. and 1,508 sq. ft. in these buildings respectively. More specifically:

- The floorspace is comprised of 38 properties
- Of these 9 are not in Perth but other settlements including Kinross, Blairgowrie, Aberuthven and more rural locations
- The report includes 4 non-Class 4 (office) properties (variety of former retail/shops, warehouse etc.)
- There are only 9 modern purpose built offices in the provision of which 4 are out with Perth City
- A significant number of the properties (14) are converted townhouse properties which often have restrictive cellular layouts whereas modern agile ways of working usually favour open plan large floor plate buildings
- 3 of the entries within the report are no longer available.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SEPA (0742/01/103): With regards to the SEPA sought requirement for a FRA, there is already an in principle planning permission 12/01692/IPM (CD223) for the wider site which has an approved FRA and drainage strategy. However it is acknowledged that due to the age of this FRA an update of this would be required for any future planning applications.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter is minded to accept the modification the Council would be comfortable with making this change as it would not have any implications for any other aspect of the plan.

MU171 Perth Quarry

SNH (0353/01/026): SNH suggest an additional requirement (i) "A revised landscape and visual appraisal of the proposed layout, existing or proposed topography, woodland screening and impact on views to ensure the layout retains the current screening of the quarry scar and mitigates new development proposed in the north of the site." This requirement could clarify the requirement for further LVIA work.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter is minded to accept the modification the Council would be comfortable with making this change as it would not have any implications for any other aspect of the plan.

SNH also suggest an additional requirement (ii) "Provide a robust landscape framework informed by the appraisal and reinstatement of native woodland in the southern half of the site to enhance biodiversity and habitats." The current developer requirements state housing/employment uses should be contained on lower ground, and should not

constitute more than roughly a third of the site, and there is also a requirement for a tree survey. Then the specification of the masterplan requirements includes a requirement for a phased restoration programme and landscape management plan to maximise the potential to enhance biodiversity and protect habitats. There is also a site drawing which shows existing woodland and the proposed landscape area or physical landscape works. This SNH suggested requirement does not appear to add anything additional and so is resisted.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

MU331 Perth Railway Station and PH2O

Colin Murray (0037/01/003 + 0037/02/001): It is agreed that there should be no downgrading of the existing play facilities here and that parking will need to be integrated into any proposal. For any planning application coming forward Policy 14A Open Space Retention and Provision (CD052, p32-33), and Policy 58 Transport Standards and Accessibility requirements would apply and require this (CD052, p93-95). However if the Reporter is so minded a site specific developer requirement could be added to clarify that the play area facility should be retained or replaced by one of comparable or better benefit.

T&E Young (0213/01/001), Iona MacMregor (0707/01/001): The woodland to the rear of Glover Street does provide amenity and helps buffer the railway line for the adjacent residential areas. This woodland already has some policy protection through policies 1B Placemaking (CD052, 19-20) and 38B Trees, Woodland and Development (CD052, p65). It would be difficult to precisely map the extent and exclude just the woodland from the allocation and depending on the proposal that comes forward it might be acceptable for there to be some loss of woodland. This issue is best considered at the masterplanning planning application stage. With regard to archaeology there is a site specific developer requirement for an archaeological survey as there is a non-designated asset (Glover Street Works/distillery record), this will require the survey and recording of what is found but it will not predicate against development.

Network Rail (0509/01/006): Network Rail's support for this allocation is noted. Responding to comments regarding developer contributions The Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance (CD021) will be reviewed to take account of the new Local Development Plan. Through this Local Development Plan the Council is committing to the preparation of a comprehensive Transport Strategy which will consider all aspects of the Transport Network. This is considered in the schedule 4, 4 Policy 5 Infrastructure contributions.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

MU336 Murray Royal Hospital

Frances Hobbs (0152/01/008) Neil Myles (0153/01/008) John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/008) Peter and Vanessa Shand (0226/01/008), Mr JD McKerracher (0245/01/009), Scone Community Council (0265/01/009) John W Rodgers (0304/01/009), Mr and Mrs Short (0382/01/005), Mr and Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/004), Jeffrey

Rowlinson (0485/01/005) David F Lewington (0486/01/005), Lisa Cardno (0599/01/009), James Thow (0668/01/008) Jennifer Thow (0669/01/008), Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/008), Hazel MacKinnon (07051/01/009), Gerard Connolly (0712/01/009), Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/009), Stewart McCowan (0714/01/009), Angela McCowan (0715/01/009), Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/009) Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/009), Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/009), Shona Cowie (0719/01/009), Paul Cowie (0720/01/009), David Roy (0730/01/009), Greer Crighton (0731/01/009), Brian Hood (0732/01/009), Gaynor Hood (0733/01/009), Philip Crighton (0734/01/009):

The supportive comments are noted. Whilst there is no site specific air pollution policy proposed, there are policies: Policy 55: Air Quality Management Areas (CD052, p85), and Policy 58 Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements (CD052, p93-95), which provide appropriate policy context on these matters.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Matthew Lonergan (0319/01/001, Rivertree Residential (0356/01/001) and Tim Kendrick and Jane Spiers (0641/01/001):

There are planning applications (18/00094/IPM) (CD232) for new build residential in principle and (18/00408/FLM) (CD235) for change of use, alteration, selected demolition and conversion of the main listed hospital buildings to form 58 flats currently under consideration. The 18/00094/IPM Development Plan consultation response (CD231) to the new build residential planning application raises issues, principally with: the lack of a full masterplan; impact on trees, open space protection and provision; lack of evidence to determine the minimum enabling development; and that the indicative layout does not show good connectivity. However the Development Plan team do not consider these planning applications to be premature because they could potentially be considered under the existing LDP1 general policies. Also some of these issues have been flagged up but will be picked up again in the detailed application/s for new build residential. SPP paragraph 34 says (CD004, p11), "Where a plan is under review, it may be appropriate in some circumstances to consider whether granting planning permission would prejudice the emerging plan." These proposals would not prejudice the emerging plan as the LDP1 RD1 Residential Areas policy (CD014, p30) applies on the majority of the site and this gives a favourable context subject to the proposal being compatible with the character and amenity of the area. These issues and others particularly in relation to traffic and transport are being considered as part of the development management process of determining these planning applications.

The Council's Traffic modelling (CD216) shows there are existing traffic issues relating to this part of the city and a suitable Transport Assessment is required alongside planning applications to help determine the phasing and any mitigation measures. This modelling work indicates that there will be capacity released when the CTRL is in place so the allocation is appropriate and if required phasing can be appropriately conditioned in any permission. The phasing and timing of this allocation, alongside the CTRL, requiring only listed buildings to be occupied before the CTRL complete, will be treated as a material consideration in determining the planning applications. This requirement was a Council decision and should be retained to limit the traffic impact of the proposal prior to the CTRL. The Council does not agree with Rivertree developments that there are no capacity issues. The applicant's Transport Assessment (TA) (CD233) for both applications was subject to a rigorous audit process, which included being assessed

using the Perth Traffic model and being independently reviewed by Systra Ltd, as well as being audited internally by Transport Planning. Responding to the Murray Royal Hospital planning applications Transport Planning (CD234) are of the opinion that these applications are premature, pending the completion of the CTLR programme.

Unfortunately, the TA which was provided by the applicant's consultants was not of the standard that the Council would expect in terms of robustness for an application of this nature. It should also be noted that the Council in order to check the actual, current conditions at the Bridgend junction commissioned a full set of new traffic counts and queue length surveys. Once the CTLR programme has been completed, Transport Planning would be of the opinion that due to the relief that would be afforded to the Bridgend junction that this site would be a reasonable site for redevelopment. However, in terms of the current planning applications Transport Planning 'object to this proposal as it is contrary to policy TA1B (CD234, p34), in the adopted 2014 Local Development Plan in that the TA fails to demonstrate that the proposals would not have a detrimental effect on the local transport network.' Ultimately in the case of the planning application for the listed building conversion the Council will need to consider and balance the impact on the road network and the benefit of getting the listed building converted before its condition deteriorates further. Also the applicant may amend their planning application/s to propose a phased approach and be able to show an acceptable impact on the road network with a limited amount of the development allowed prior to the CTLR completion. However these issues are still to be resolved.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Tim Kendrick and Jane Spiers (0641/01/001): Identifying a capacity for the site, although somewhat clearer with the planning applications submitted and the conversion being identified for 58 units is still too difficult to determine without a full masterplan and possibly a financial appraisal to determine the minimum enabling development with regard to the listed buildings. This is an issue best determined through the masterplanning and planning application process.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

MU337 Hillside Hospital

King James VI Golf Club (0131/01/003 + 0131/02/001): The temporary or long term use of this site for public parking cannot be required of the landowner, there are adequate public parking opportunities nearby associated to the Bellwood Riverside park, and at the South Inch whilst nearby residents cannot expect provision here. There will also be new parking associated to the park and ride at Walnut Grove. Also an access for a public carpark here would be too intensive in terms of traffic impact. With consideration against Policy 58 Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements of the Plan (CD052, p93-95), appropriate parking levels associated to any development proposal will be required if and when a proposal comes forward to the planning application stage.

SEPA (0742/01/117): SEPA seek a change that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) be included as a site specific developer requirement. The site itself does not lie within any of the SEPA's mapped flood risk areas, or historic flood extents. It does lie close to them but the sloping nature of the site suggests that this precautionary approach is over onerous. Having checked this with the Council's Flood team they have confirmed that the site lies above the 200 year plus climate change level. Top of gate level on the opposite bank is

6.61m AOD (Shore Road viewing platform) so adding 1m for climate change gives a minimum level of 7.61m AOD. This site lies almost exclusively at more than 10 m AOD (MD201) and a FRA is not required.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

OP2 Thimble Row

Colin Murray (0037/02/004): It is accepted that the car park is important to maintain the vitality and viability of the city centre and an element of car parking will need to be provided in any redevelopment proposals. There is a site specific developer requirement for any 'Scheme to incorporate 200 spaces minimum public car parking' which ensures an appropriate retention of car parking on this site. Also elsewhere in the city under Policy 58B (CD052, p93-95) the Plan identifies important existing transport infrastructure and encourages the retention and improvement of these facilities.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

SEPA (0742/01/069): With regard to SEPA's support of the site specific developer requirement, due to SEPA's position on 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood defence schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4, this support merits further consideration. There is a small eastern area of this site which benefits from protection from the FPS so SEPA's interpretation of this developer requirement and how it should be applied is different from the Council's.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter agrees with the Council in terms of its position about development on land defended by appropriate FPS then the following site requirement could be amended for greater clarity. It could be amended to read as follows, 'Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment required which will define the developable area of the site and which ensures that (taking account of FPS) no built development takes place on the functional flood plain. Areas protected by the FPS should be subject to appropriate mitigation measures: including water resistance, and water resilience measures and evacuation procedures.'

OP4 Mill Street (south side)

Colin Murray (0037/02/003): It is noted that the Banks warehouse no longer exists. In terms of car parking the Council has recently invested significant resources in improving the streetscape of Mill Street and it is hoped that this improved amenity may encourage better utilisation of the backs of these buildings to create a more vibrant and attractive frontage for Mill Street. Under Policy 58B (CD052, p93-95) the Plan identifies important existing transport infrastructure and encourages the retention and improvement of these facilities. This carpark is not of strategic importance and elsewhere within the city centre there is sufficient protection of car parking.

SEPA (0742/01/068): With regards to SEPA's comment regarding the vulnerability of the proposed uses this allocation is not specifically promoting housing. However for the reasons given in the response under the sub heading below 'Land allocations defended by appropriate flood defence schemes' in the Policy 50 New Development and Flooding Schedule 4 the restriction on housing is nevertheless resisted.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

OP8 Friarton Road

Sally Doig (0125/01/001): There are sites adjoining OP8 that are used for specialist industrial processes with health and safety consultation zones applicable to them which if proposed on OP8 would not be compatible to nearby residential neighbours. Any development proposal on OP8 will be guided using the principles set out in Policy 7A (business and industrial) (CD052, p25) which indicates that 'Proposals should not detract from the amenity of adjoining, especially residential areas', and Policy 53 Nuisance from Artificial Light and Light Pollution (CD052, p84), and Policy 54 Noise Pollution (CD052, p84). Also there is a site specific requirement for 'Landscaping improvements to southern and western edges of site' which will provide a buffer to the nearby residential areas.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

OP9 Bus Station, Leonard Street

Colin Murray (0037/01/002 + 0037/02/002), John Meiklem (0043/01/002), Perth and Kinross Council Tenants' Organisation (0701/01/001):

Perth and Kinross Council in conjunction with Network Rail and ScotRail have been progressing long-term plans for a major revision to Perth's main rail and bus stations. Network Rail has identified as an outcome of the Scotland Route Study (SRS) (CD218) that there is a benefit in remodelling the Perth Station rail network prior to future modernisation such as electrification of the Perth to Inverness route. As well as a review of the railway infrastructure around Perth Station, there is opportunity to offer significant improvements to the Perth Rail Station passenger experience by improving the wider public realm and connections to Perth city centre as well as integration with the bus station located nearby. The potential co-location of the bus and rail station would be to the advantage of Perth and the travelling public. The project would provide an integrated transport interchange, better parking, offer an improved passenger experience and a much enhanced visitor arrival in Perth City centre.

This opportunity allocation for the bus station site in the Perth and Kinross Proposed LDP 2 seeks to carry forward the existing opportunity allocation of the Perth and Kinross LDP 1 (CD014, p81). Without knowing yet what future plans there will be (if any) for the bus station the LDP simply tries to be as flexible as possible in providing a framework to encourage all suitable options. If the bus station is relocated it is considered an appropriate site for a variety of city centre uses including housing, hotel, leisure, office. The desire to retain the café is understandable but it is not appropriate for the LDP to seek to protect individual businesses. The merits of any proposal for the bus station should be considered as a whole if and when a proposal comes forward.

The Council owns this allocation and will investigate legal title restrictions and act accordingly at the appropriate time if/when proposal/s are brought forward. This site lies in close proximity to the South Inch park which has one of Perth's best play areas. The initial view is that these titles are unlikely to provide any significant barrier to bringing forward development. There are a lot of different titles involved at the bus station and they should be considered together rather than piecemeal so it is inappropriate to incur legal fees before a scheme is in the offing.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

OP175 City Hall

St John's Kirk of Perth (0426/01/001): The use of pavement areas is supported subject to conditions, Policy 10 Town and neighbourhood centres says 'the use of pavement areas for restaurant/café/bar uses will also be acceptable in the prime retail area provided such uses do not adversely affect pedestrian flows and fit with design guidance and service access'. If there is an issue with pedestrian flows this can be considered through the planning application process and potentially managed by roads/traffic management order and permissive rights.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

SEPA (0742/02/023 +0742/01/115): The site is not protected by the FPS; it does not lie within the 1 in 1,000 year flood risk extent or the historic flood extents.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter considered it would make the position clearer the Council would not object to site specific developer requirements for a, 'Topographical flood level of site to compare to flood levels and ensure this is on higher ground' and a 'Flood Action Plan to ensure during flood conditions nobody becomes surrounded by flood water.'

OP338 St John's School, Stormont Street

SEPA (0742/01/114): With regards to the SEPA sought requirement for a FRA and to include mitigation measures for land behind Flood Protection Scheme the site gained detailed planning permission 17/01280/FLL (CD230) on the 31st of August 2017 for the conversion of the school to provide a creative exchange to provide studios for artists and office spaces for creative space and a café. There was no FRA as the flood scheme is in place, and no objection from the Council's flood team.

No modification is proposed to the Plan as there is already planning permission. However if the Reporter considered it appropriate the Council would not object to a site specific developer requirement that 'Development should be subject to appropriate mitigation measures: including water resistance, and water resilience measures and evacuation procedures.'

Cemetery Search Area Isla Road

Lisa Cardno (0599/01/016), SNH (0353/01/023), Scone Estate (0614/01/003):

There is currently an identified need for a new cemetery within the Perth area as Wellshill Cemetery will reach capacity in the next 20 years. A site of circa 8 hectares is likely to be required to serve the Perth area. Two potential areas of search were identified in the Main Issues Report (MIR) (CD046, p40-41), one at Isla Road and the other at Perth West. Whilst Isla Road was the preferred option in the MIR, investigations are not well enough advanced on the assessment of ground conditions to determine if the land is suitable for cemetery use. Also reliance on the developer to open up access provision at Perth West means it is not suitable as a sole search area. As a result, both locations were identified within the Proposed Plan as areas of search for cemetery provision. Please refer to the Perth Strategic Development Areas schedule 4 for consideration of the Perth West alternative.

The Isla Road search area location was chosen to have good proximity to Perth to function as a cemetery for Perth. A SEA assessment was carried out which assesses the merits of the proposal (CD075, p432- 443). The site lies directly across Isla Road from the existing bus stops for Scone Palace (and these are served by regular stagecoach bus service 3 which arrives directly from the city centre, and the 58 service which arrives via Scone). The search location of the cemetery is suitably close to the inner green belt boundary and could potentially round-off the north eastern edge of Perth and prevent future development encroaching into this sensitive area of Green Belt. The cemetery provision when taken forward would have a design and layout which minimises impact on the green belt and the Scone Palace entrance, please see the visualisations the Council had prepared (CD211). It is considered that a cemetery use is a compatible use for the green belt and is specified under Policy 41 Greenbelt category (f) (CD052, p70) as essential infrastructure, whilst it maintains a recreational function. The landscape impact could be minimised to maintain the rural character retaining and protecting important trees and woodland to the south and providing appropriate boundary treatments. Recreational access would also be maintained and opportunities should be explored to connect to the core path network to the south and east.

No modification is proposed to the Plan

Reporter's conclusions:
Reporter's recommendations: