

Issue 28	Perth City New Sites	
Development plan reference:	Perth Area, p249- 281	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<p>Lynne Palmer (0040) Mr John Meiklem (0043) King James VI Golf Club (0131) Mr Ian Tod and Ms Robin Tod (0239) Mr and Mrs Tom Flett (0468) ABP Development (0567) MacPherson Ltd of Aberlour (MacPherson Ltd) (0569) Gloag Investments (0590) P Keir Doe (0598/04, 0598/06) James Ewan & Fraser Niven (0613) Mr and Mrs M Lewin (0657)</p>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Perth Area	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><u>6 Milne Street</u></p> <p>Lynne Palmer (0040/01/002): Proposes demolition of single storey building at 6 Milne St, Perth owned by the Council and that the land is used more effectively for housing/social housing. This single storey building lies between 3 storey tenements and a similar scale of replacement building is considered to be better in placemaking terms.</p> <p><u>Relocation of the bus station</u></p> <p>Lynne Palmer (0040/01/007): Considers that premises occupied by Farquhar & Sons along with an area of the car park behind the Station hotel would offer a good location for relocating the bus station (also suggests part of the Station Hotel carpark could be used). Concerned that the inner ring road is poorly aligned here and seeks roundabout provision as part of this proposal.</p> <p><u>South of the M9</u></p> <p>John Meiklem (0043/01/001): Proposes that land near Aviva, beyond the M9 along Necessity Brae would be a good location for a high end financial institution, and it would provide good employment.</p> <p><u>Access improvements</u></p> <p>King James VI Golf Club (0131/01/004): Comments seek improvement to access to Moncrieffe Island at the Tay St end: mentions work planned for steps leading to Moncrieffe</p>		

Island from the Railway steps, refers to potential improvements connecting Moncrieffe Island with the Norrie Miller Walk, and notes that a new bridge is not identified across the Tay.

Mount Tabor Road

Ian and Robin Tod (0239/01/001): Provides details on site features and its context and refers to the site history. The site has had 3 planning applications for housing, the latest 16/02094/fll was refused for 4 reasons with concerns raised in relation to loss of open space, surface water drainage and the potential for overlooking.

It is proposed that land at Mount Tabor Road H169 (MD091) should be identified as a housing allocation or it should not be identified as open space for the following reasons:

- it is no longer used as a paddock
- It is fringed by trees other than the Muirhall Road site which has an open aspect
- It is an effective site when considered against the 7 criteria of PAN2/2010 (CD040):
 - it is in 1 ownership
 - there are no significant physical issues
 - access could be provided on the south side of Muirhall Road (as accepted in previous planning application 16/02094/FLL) (CD269)
 - it is well located – particularly for bus services
 - a suitable surface water drainage scheme can be designed
 - there are no contamination issues
 - its development does not need public money to be spent
 - it is a desirable, marketable site, nearby land has been sold for development, and there is developer interest
 - there are no known infrastructure deficiencies and a further study will consider availability and capacity of all utilities
- a detailed ecological study can be carried out but initial investigations show no protected species and the trees fringing the site can be retained whilst 1 central tree is nearing end of its life
- although there is need to protect setting of listed Gean Cottage which lies outwith the site the previous scheme was not specifically refused based upon impact on this suggesting a suitably designed development is achievable
- in terms of open space the previous LDP reporter concluded (CD015, p413): “There is no persuasive evidence to support the allocation of this sensitive site for housing within the plan. Any proposal for the development of this small plot of greenfield land can be readily considered at the development management stage within the framework provided by the policies of the Proposed Plan.” However subsequent application decision proves that the issue of the zoning is best considered in the LDP as the open space zoning is used as an excuse. It is not clear why it is considered open space or part of a green corridor as is suggested. There is lack open space audit to clarify why it ought to remain. It is not available for formal or informal recreation, and in terms of visual amenity there is no reason why it could be designed and landscaped in such a way that there is still a perception of openness with retention of the trees and some planting.

Tarsappie

Gloag Investments (0590/01/001): Land at Tarsappie H320 (MD094), for Perth proposed for exclusion from the Perth City greenbelt and inclusion within the settlement envelope. The land was promoted at the “call for sites” and Main Issues Report (MIR) stages in the

Plan. It is proposed that the revised settlement envelope will achieve a defensible greenbelt boundary whilst allowing for future, small scale development which can meet local needs and provide a short-term housing within the City without impacting upon strategic allocations. The site has the potential to accommodate a modest (4-6) residential properties that will not affect the amenity of adjoining properties. Providing some room for future development along the eastern side of the City of Perth is considered to be consistent with the principles of greenbelts as defined in the Scottish Planning Policy (CD006, p15-16), by allowing for the expansion of the City without impacting upon the long-term function of the greenbelt.

Town and neighbourhood centre

ABP Development (0567/01/001): Seeks reallocation of land R323 (MD102) from a commercial centre to a town and neighbourhood centre. They refer to their previous submission at Call for Sites stage and the Council's response to it (CD284, p4). They disagree with the Council's assertion that the proposal would be contrary to SPP Town Centre First principle as SPP8 (CD286) promotes the network of centres in which the individual role of each centre supports and is supported by the role of other centres. Considers that under LDP Policy RC1 (CD014, p256 and 271) and Proposed Plan Policy 10 (CD052, p29) there are policy controls in place in relation to neighbourhood centres to prevent new development within them threatening the vitality of town centres in line with SPP8 (CD286). Considers that the proximity to Tesco Superstore fails to appreciate the different provision that can be accommodated such as restaurants, cafes, travel agents, launderettes, estate agents, leisure facilities, bars, hairdressers and small offices. These tend to be small scale and encourage business start-ups and create employment. These uses are not generally found in commercial centres. There are substantial areas of existing and proposed new housing (H71) (CD052 p256 +270) for which commercial facilities on Rannoch Road are beyond easy active travel distance almost 1 km walking/driving distance. Also the site is physically separated from commercial, agricultural and sport/recreation uses to the north and west.

A neighbourhood centre here would complement the larger commercial centres uses to the north and west and provide an appropriate transition between residential on Strathtay Road and large scale commercial uses. There are site constraints which do not favour commercial centre uses, with the existing building not readily lending itself to conversion. The site is much smaller than surrounding commercial centre plots (Tesco Extra, B+Q and car dealership). Due to site access development would likely need to provide building frontage to Strathtay Road and a large scale commercial centre would likely adversely juxtapose with established residential dwellings. Access would almost certainly need to be from Strathtay Road as Crieff Road is an A road and the site is beside an existing roundabout junction. Traffic movements associated with a neighbourhood centre would be more appropriate than a commercial centre. These issues make it impractical, unviable and unneighbourly and the designation sought is considered the most conducive to facilitating redevelopment of the site.

Land east of Corsiehill Road

P Keir Doe (0598/04/001): Seeks the inclusion of H354 (MD096), 3 ha of land east of Corsiehill Road within the settlement boundary as a development site for the following reasons:

- Its size and proximity to housing means it is of limited agricultural use
- It is accessed via an existing access road

- It is bounded by a row houses to the north and west and established woodland to the south and east
- The woodland would provide a natural and definitive settlement edge
- Corsiehill is expanding with 2 houses under construction so it is considered to make sense to extend the settlement boundary to include Corsiehill and the potential development site
- New houses would be contemporary and respect their woodland surroundings
- It is important to allow for expansion on the east side of the city where there has been limited development
- The site is developable and is without site constraints and unlike large sites is not reliant on infrastructure upgrades prior to commencement of house building
- SPP encourages developing housing adjacent to settlements (CD004, p13) “using land within or adjacent to settlements for a mix of uses. This will also support the creation of more compact, higher density, accessible and more vibrant cores.”

Ruthvenfield

Mr and Mrs M Flett (0468/01/001): Seeks the H173 extension (MD093) to the south of the H319 site (CD052, p258) for the following reasons and submit maps to show the site in relation to the Cross Tay Link Road project:

- They have discussed access over the mill lade with the landowners of H319 and consider access achievable
- They need land allocated now to prevent future access issues
- Considers the steep escarpment would make a defensible southern boundary
- Newly installed road infrastructure will provide link to proposed site
- The site is level; and
- It is within walking distance of Ruthvenfield primary school and will be near the new High School at Bertha Park

James Ewan & Fraser Niven (0613/01/001): Supports the designation of land as open space for scheduled monument index 3630 and Huntingtower Castle which are excellent amenity assets and it also recognises their setting.

Compound site at Huntingtower

P Keir Doe (0598/06/01): Seeks allocation of H170 (MD092) 1.6 ha temporary compound being used for the construction of Phase 1 of the CLTR for permanent employment use and inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary. This land is due to be reinstated as agricultural land when it is vacated in a couple of years. There has been interest from businesses to rent the site afterwards and the client's preference is to retain the compound site. States that it is a predominantly commercial area bounded to the east by the CLTR and to the south by the A85 and that it is compatible with neighbouring land uses. Considers there to be a shortage of available compound/yard space, and that a permanent site would generate economic benefits.

Considers that this proposal is in accordance with the LDP which allocates a wide range of sites for employment, promotes sustainable employment areas linked to residential areas and public transport, takes a hierarchical approach to employment land, and promotes sites that allow existing businesses to expand and new ones to establish. Considers that Scottish Government encourages reuse of brownfield land, that there is limited brownfield land in Perth, that its reinstatement is not environmentally beneficial, and that it would put

pressure on greenfield and prime agricultural land. Furthermore government encourages a flexible approach to ensure economic opportunities can be realised and LDPs locating development which generates significant freight movements, such as manufacturing, processing, distribution and warehousing, on sites accessible to suitable railheads or harbours, or the strategic road network.

James Ewan & Fraser Niven (0613/01/001): Supports the designation of land as open space for scheduled monument index 3630 and Huntingtower Castle which are excellent amenity assets and it also recognises their setting.

Land east of College Mill Road, Almondbank

MacPherson Ltd of Aberdour (MacPherson Ltd) (0569/01/001): Seeks allocation H353 for residential uses of 6.4 hectares of land east of College Mill Road (MD095) for up to 100 homes the site which was developed during World War II as the Ministry of Defence (MOD) site for the manufacture and maintenance of aeroplane parts/engines.

The site lies adjacent to the Almond Valley MU73 allocation. Planning permission in principle was granted in September 2017 for the adjacent MU73 and the approved masterplan 15/01157/IPM (CD189) illustrates how the Almond Valley residential development will border the College Mill Road site to the north, south and east.

Further details of the 8 main buildings onsite and their history are provided. The representation seeks a residential allocation.

Considers the location of such industrial uses is better located adjacent and accessible to the major road network away from residential properties. Considers this proposal a natural extension of Almondbank village. They have prepared two concept masterplans (RD050) and a transport appraisal (CD278) to illustrate how such a proposal could help meet short to medium term housing delivery.

They detail the planning history including the Perth Area Local Plan (1995) (CD138) where the site with a field to the south was identified as an opportunity site for 150 homes, and Draft Perth Local Plan (December 2004) (CD263, p78-79), where the site along with the field to the south, was identified for a total of 250 houses. This Draft Plan was abandoned before adoption. The site lies within the settlement boundary of the existing LDP and the Proposed LDP2 with identification of part of the site as a waste management area. It is considered that in May 2014 confirmation was provided through a pre application enquiry response (RD051) that residential development is acceptable in principle. However a formal residential allocation would give greater comfort and certainty to the landowner.

Two Preliminary Concept Masterplans (PCM) (one based on the MU73 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and the other SEPA indicative flood risk areas have been prepared to illustrate how the site might be developed subject to a full set of assessments being undertaken. In the case of MU73 Kaya Consulting prepared a FRA (March 2015) to inform the proposals there. The figures and conclusions produced by Kaya Consulting were formally accepted by both SEPA and the Council. The Almondbank Flood Protection Scheme is currently ongoing and in relation to the College Mill Road site, the existing flooding embankment to the south is to be replaced and extended, with new flood walls located to the south west and south east along the River Almond. These improvements will help lessen the impact of future flood events on the College Mill Road site. Considers that the detailed FRA prepared for the Almond Valley planning application shows a smaller

area affected by flooding and that this has been accepted by the Council and SEPA.

Pedestrian access to Almondbank is proposed by a staggered path through the woodland linking up with Lumsden Crescent. The land to the north incorporates an area of open space within the approved Almond Valley residential scheme. Discussions with the neighbouring landowner have confirmed that the proposed path is acceptable in principle. An area of proposed community woodland to the south approved as part of the approved Almond Valley residential scheme could act as an attractive area of open space for the College Mill Road site. In terms of cultural heritage, they mention that a scheduled monument (a prehistoric domestic and defensive fort) is located to the north of the site within the existing woodland. Any future planning application would undertake a detailed archaeological assessment to assess if mitigation measures are required.

SWECO undertook a supporting Transport Appraisal (CD278) in January 2018. Detailed findings are outlined in their submission but the key finding is that a development of circa 100 residential units could be accommodated on the site. It is stated that the existing site access on College Mill Road, with associated verge maintenance can achieve the design standards identified within Designing Streets. It is also considered that the existing priority junction access will have sufficient capacity to serve the development, subject to a detailed junction capacity assessment. It is not anticipated that there will be a requirement for any major infrastructure intervention in contrast to infrastructure investment required for other allocated schemes.

Open space north of East Drive

Mr and Mrs M Lewin (0657/01/001): Seeks removal of this 0.4 hectare of land H355 (MD097) from open space to identify it as white land suitable for residential use. This land is considered to be suitable for residential use for the following reasons:

- It is not used for recreation and has been identified as open space for amenity value
- Considers the tightly wooded conifer trees need to be felled, submitting photos to support this
- Felling is considered to improve residential amenity (reduce overshadowing and improve daylight) for housing on other side of East Drive
- The site is adjacent to housing on the north south and east boundaries
- It could be a windfall site
- There would be no significant impact on the open space resource within the area with a significant area of open space within Almondbank to the south
- East Drive is a suitable access

West of County place

Mr and Mrs M Lewin (0657/02/001+ 002): Seeks inclusion of H356 (MD098), 2 hectares of land within their ownership as being within the settlement boundary suitable for residential use. This land is considered to be suitable for residential use for the following reasons:

- It has strong defensible boundaries to the north and west
- Is a logical extension to housing adjacent County Plan
- It would not take the western boundary any further west
- It is considered to offer strong containment and to not compromise the green belt which acts to contain urban sprawl
- It would not be a significant loss of farm land

- It would provide a windfall opportunity of less than 20 homes (and the Council's housing study acknowledges the importance of windfall 'the contributions since 2013 has been consistently been above 50%. LDP2, however, will continue that conservative estimate that 10% of the housing land requirement will be met from windfall sites')
- Vehicle access could be made from the hammerhead at County Plan and from the southern boundary west of Sparrow road

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

6 Milne Street

Lynne Palmer (0040/01/002): No specific change sought.

Relocation of the bus station

Lynne Palmer (0040/01/007): No specific change sought

South of the M9

John Meiklem (0043/01/001): No specific change sought

Access improvements

King James VI Golf Club (0131/01/004): No specific change sought but seeks improvements to the access at Tay St from Moncrieffe Island, connection from Moncrieffe Island with the Norrie Miller Walk, steps leading to Moncrieffe Island from the Railway steps.

Mount Tabor Road

Ian and Robin Tod (0239/01/001): Seeks H169 at Mount Tabor Road to be identified as a housing allocation or not be identified as open space.

Tarsappie

Gloag Investments (0590/01/001): Seeks land at Tarsappie H320, Perth to be excluded from the Perth City greenbelt and included within the settlement envelope.

Town and neighbourhood centre

ABP Development (0567/01/001): Seeks reallocation of land R323 from a commercial centre to a town and neighbourhood centre.

Land east of Corsiehill Road

P Keir Doe (0598/04/001): Seeks the inclusion of H354, land east of Corsiehill Road within the settlement boundary.

Ruthvenfield

Mr and Mrs Tom Flett (0468/01/001): Seeks inclusion of H173 as an extension of the

H319 site.

James Ewan & Fraser Niven (0613/01/001): Supports its identification as open space.

Compound site at Huntingtower

P Keir Doe (0598/06/001): Seeks allocation of H170 as a temporary compound for the construction of Phase 1 of the CTRLR for employment use and inclusion within the settlement boundary.

James Ewan & Fraser Niven (0613/01/001): Supports its identification as open space.

Land east of College Mill Road, Almondbank

MacPherson Ltd of Aberlour (MacPherson Ltd) (0569/01/001): Seeks allocation of H353 for residential uses of 6.4 hectares of land east of east College Mill Road.

Open space north of East Drive

Mr and Mrs M Lewin (0657/01/001): Seeks removal of H355 from open space to identify it as suitable for residential use.

West of County place

Mr and Mrs M Lewin (0657/02/001+002): Seeks inclusion of H356 within the settlement boundary suitable for residential use.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

6 Milne Street

Lynne Palmer (0040/01/002): In the Strategic Housing Investment Plan 2017/18 – 2021/22 there is a proposal for demolition of 6 Milne Street and replacement with 8 homes (CD287, p16) with a start date anticipated 2018. The Proposed LDP2 will not prevent this proposal from coming forward. The scale and nature of the proposal means it can be taken forward and assessed on its merits against LDP2 policies as a planning application. It does not require an allocation in the LDP2.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Relocation of the bus station

Lynne Palmer (0040/01/007): There is no firm proposal at the moment for relocation of the bus station but its potential relocation is a possibility as acknowledged by its allocation as an opportunity site for redevelopment. The Proposed LDP2 would not prevent a proposal for its relocation coming forward but at this stage there is no proposal or land earmarked for this purpose and this site is unlikely to be big enough. If a proposal comes forward it will be considered on its merits against the policies, vision and strategy of LDP2.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

South of the M9

John Meiklem (0043/01/001): There has been no developer/landowner interest in this proposal. The Proposed LDP2 has sufficient employment sites allocated. This was not a proposal suggested through any of the earlier consultation stages of the LDP2 preparation. This may be considered in a future review of the LDP if there is landowner interest however it lies within the greenbelt, and there are significant landscape and visual sensitivities and accessibility issues.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Access improvements

King James VI Golf Club (0131/01/004): The proposals mentioned would not necessarily need to be identified in the Local Development Plan 2, as they can be considered on their merits as planning applications, but in terms of future potential actions/delivery of these access projects these comments have been passed onto Community Greenspace. There is no proposal within the life of this Local Development Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mount Tabor Road

Ian and Robin Tod (0239/01/001): The proposal to reallocate H169 (MD091) open space land at Mount Tabor road is resisted. The SEA (CD075, p251-261) raised significant issues. Also while the proposal was submitted during pre-MIR call for sites stage the Council did not take it forward into either the MIR or the Proposed Plan. The site has therefore not had the benefit of full public consultation.

The Plan does not exclusively protect publically accessible open spaces; some sites are protected as they contribute to the character of the area or provide a breathing space in the urban fabric. It is a sensitive site due to the impact its development would have on the open space network, rural character of the area, and on the setting of the B listed Gean cottage. The site lies immediately to the north and east of Gean Cottage which is B listed and the childhood home of Sir Patrick Geddes. Taking away the open space designation would open up the whole area for development. This is not advisable as it would affect the setting of Gean cottage and would have a significant impact on the character of this area, this amenity space, and the green network.

In general, the value of an overarching Open Space Audit & Strategy is acknowledged however the Council does not have resources allocated for this exercise at the moment. However this site has been identified as open space for over 20 years. This open space contributes to the network of open space which leads up out of Perth onto Kinnoull Hill and Sidlaws and it is visible and contributes significantly to the character of the area. This issue was considered at Examination stage of the previous LDP. The Reporter agreed with the Council and concluded (CD015, p413), "There is no persuasive evidence to support the allocation of this sensitive site for housing within the plan. Any proposal for the development of this small plot of greenfield land can be readily considered at the development management stage within the framework provided by the policies of the Proposed Plan."

There have been three planning applications for 6 houses, and formation of a community garden on this site since 2016, one was withdrawn and two have been refused with the

last one having its review dismissed by the Local Review Body. There were 11 valid letters of representation objecting to the most recent planning application including one from Bridgend, Gannochy and Kinnoull Community Council. For the most recent of these planning applications the Development Plan response (CD271, p2) concluded that, 'Part b of CF1 identifies that open space can be a recreational or amenity resource. It is also noted that the size of the community garden/allotments is 30% of the site. Referring to criteria (b) the proposed development is not on a minor part of the site and as already mentioned it will have some negative impacts on the amenity of this area and on the network of open spaces.' It goes on to add 'It is understood that there is some demand for allotments but the demand for the community garden proposal is less clear as is the long term viability of the proposed maintenance arrangements. There is a need to demonstrate there is clear community support for this proposal and to ensure that it will be maintained and managed by the community in the longer term. I do not feel this has been demonstrated in this application.' The proposed means of maintaining the community garden through charges levied on the proposed new houses raised some concerns in relation to the long term maintenance of the site and that it would be likely to lead to it being considered as private ground. Community Greenspace officers considered at just 25 square metres the allotment sizes were very small, with the normal standard recognised size for one allotment plot being 250 square metres. They also highlighted that there are also other sites within Perth with very small waiting lists.

It is considered that the open space allocation should remain as taking it away would open up the whole area for development and it could set a precedent on other open space allocations. As per the LDP1 Reporter's conclusion there is scope to consider a proposal within the framework provided by the policies of the Plan. The Plan framework allows for a proposal on a minor part of the site and this is something none of the planning applications to date have proposed. The planning applications that have been pursued have not been in accordance with the Development Plan (as detailed in the paragraph above) and would have had a significant impact on the open space and amenity.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Tarsappie

Gloag Investments (0590/01/001): While the proposal H320 (MD094) was submitted during pre-MIR call for sites stage the Council did not take it forward into either the MIR or the Proposed Plan. The site has therefore not had the benefit of full public consultation. This group has not been defined as a settlement in the existing LDP and is resisted. The Reporter agreed with the Council when this issue was considered through LDP1 Examination. The area is a part of highly prominent steeply sloping hillside which rises up from the river to a ribbon of 1940's style houses which extend along the north side of the Rhynd Road. The site is very open and prominent from the M90, the Friarton Bridge, the railway, the sailing club and the river as well as from the road network at Walnut Grove and from Kinnoull Hill. The area is identified as Green Belt. Policy 1 of TAYplan approved October 2017 (CD022, p8) indicates that preservation of the setting of Perth is one of the purposes of the Green Belt. The proposed development of this area would damage the integrity of the green belt and adversely affect the setting of the city. The site is very open and any development will be visually prominent.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Town and neighbourhood centre

ABP Development (0567/01/001): Reallocation of this site R323 (MD102) on Strathtay Road from a commercial to a town and neighbourhood centre is resisted. While the proposal was submitted during pre-MIR call for sites stage the Council did not take it forward into either the MIR or the Proposed Plan. The site has therefore not had the benefit of full public consultation. This site is owned by the Council and is leased to Kalvec Ltd. The user clause in the lease is for a distribution depot. No consent has been sought for this proposed change and it's within the Council's Estate's team control to withhold consent for an alternative proposal. The Council would not want to undermine the other neighbourhood centres so the Council is not supportive of this proposal.

There are a range of local facilities and centres nearby which provide appropriate provision for the local communities. Although the Tesco on Crieff Road would not provide the full range of provision and services that can be accommodated in these centres it is a Tesco extra and includes a café, Timpsons, and a Vision Express. There is also the Council's Tulloch square neighbourhood centre nearby. This would serve the new residential development at H71 Newton Farm (within 600 m), and contains a range of services. Tulloch square centre is only marginally viable so would benefit from the support of additional residents using its facilities. There are also local facilities (less than 400m away) 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 the Rannoch Road, Garth Avenue, Tulloch square, and the Tesco on Crieff Road there are appropriate accessible local shops and facilities within the area. Given the local neighbourhood shops already available, the scale of the site proposed, and the limited demand/viability for buildings within existing neighbourhood centres nearby this proposal is resisted.

There is also a need to retain appropriate commercial centre opportunities. Located adjacent to an area of predicted substantial population growth suggests there is potential for increase in retail/leisure/commercial floorspace and enhanced community functions in this commercial centre. Picking up on concerns about effectiveness and adverse amenity, the rest of the commercial centre south of the Crieff Road is also directly adjacent to a residential area and is successful. Nissan motors and Nationwide Crash Repair Centre are already accessed from Strathtay Road, and the road is capable of servicing an appropriate commercial proposal. With regards to the site size this site is commensurate with many of the others here including the Nissan garage and the Nationwide Crash Repair Centre. The most likely/ appropriate use of this site would be either for bulky good retail or for a car showroom as part of the commercial centre.

It is an appropriate and effective site for commercial uses, and there are already sufficient local neighbourhood facilities. Therefore this proposal is resisted.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Ruthvenfield

Mr and Mrs Tom Flett (0468/01/001) and James Ewan & Fraser Niven (0613/01/001):

This H173 (MD093) proposal is resisted. While the proposal was submitted during pre-MIR call for sites stage the Council did not take it forward into either the MIR or the Proposed Plan. The site has therefore not had the benefit of full public consultation. The SEA (CD075, p302-315) raised significant issues. The whole site lies within the Ancient

woodlands inventory. The Scottish Government Policy of Control of Woodland Removal references the UK Forestry Standard and the National Inventory of Woodlands and Trees (CD07, p19) combined which identifies the woodland as being 'The part of woods and forests where the ecological condition is, or will be, strongly influenced by the tree canopy. This embraces land under stands of trees with a canopy cover of at least 20%, or having the potential to achieve this, including integral open space, and including felled areas that are awaiting restocking. The minimum area is 0.1 hectares.' Whilst this site is not treed it is all within the defined woodland (as confirmed by the inventory boundary) and its development would have an ecological impact on the woodland.

There is possibly not sufficient land on this site to provide adequate setback from the trees for safety (with a depth of less than 40 metres between the canopies north and south at the widest points). The larger the tree the greater the separation required, particularly when located to the south of a building and there are very large trees to the south of this site. As well as safety issues because there are large trees to the south this would cause restricted sunlight issues and shading by trees. Where trees restrict views/shade properties/restrict sunlight/ represent a safety concern, there is often pressure to remove, or continually trim back foliage to maintain or enhance a view and this would be a concern for the trees to the north and south. Removal of trees to the north would have an impact on the quality and value of the wider landscape and the amenity of the lade/ancient woodland. Pressure to remove trees would have a negative impact on the setting of Huntingtower castle. Mitigation of the shading/safety issues and restricted outlook of this site would result in unacceptable impacts on inventory woodland, its amenity and biodiversity value and would result in fragmentation of the habitat. Alternatively if daylight and shading issues were not mitigated then the residents of the housing would suffer in terms of solar gain and providing sufficient amenity.

In terms of access the two suggestions are an access from the north across the mill lade from H319 (which would be undesirable for the impact it would have on the landscape and amenity of this area) whilst access from the west looks difficult to achieve due to the proliferation of existing junctions here and private garden ground involved. In addition to woodland habitat impacts the amenity of new housing here would be compromised by its vicinity to the new slip, its lack of outlook and shading.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Land east of Corsiehill Road

P Keir Doe (0598/04/001): This H354 (MD096) proposal is resisted. The SEA (CD277) raises significant issues. The importance Kinnoull Hill to the setting of the city has been recognised by its designation within a local landscape designated area in Proposed LDP2. The importance of the hill to the setting of the city can be seen from a wide range of locations throughout the city and in particular from, the south inch, the footpaths on Tay street especially between the railway bridge and the Queen's Bridge, the viewing platform on Tay Street at the east end of High Street and the car park on Moncrieffe Hill.

This site is one of the transitional paddock areas with extensive woodland on its east and south boundaries. Though these areas are screened from long distance views they are important parts of the local landscape and contribute significantly to the overall character of the area. If housing were allowed it would destroy the patchwork nature of the area which makes it so attractive. Core paths run on the edges of the area which give access to the Kinnoull Hill and Deuchny Wood the site is highly visible to walkers using these routes.

The site has a history of refusals for housing development on the grounds of the impact on the AGLV and was the subject of the Perth Area Local Plan Inquiry where the reporter did not support the development of the site. Through the Examination of LDP1 the Reporter also did not support the site or the other proposals in this area and concluded, 'they are poorly related to the established built form of this edge of the city and, if developed, would have the appearance on an urban encroachment into the landscape setting of the city.'

This proposal was not submitted during the earlier LDP2 plan preparation stages at pre MIR or MIR and so has not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation and in any case is considered unsuitable.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Compound site at Huntingtower

P Keir Doe (0598/06/01), and James Ewan & Fraser Niven (0613/01/001): This H170 (MD095) proposal is resisted. The SEA (CD274) raised significant issues. Also this proposal was not submitted during the earlier LDP2 plan preparation stages at pre MIR or MIR and so has not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation.

Also it is not considered a suitable proposal. The temporary compound is acceptable due to its proximity to this key roads infrastructure junction improvement to the A85 and A9. However the impact a permanent compound would have on the setting and views towards the Huntingtower Castle Scheduled Monument would be unacceptable and could not be controlled through design and layout. This is a sensitive site in landscape and visual terms and a long term compound or employment uses would be significantly detrimental. This site and this view of the castle from the A85 are extremely important to the setting of the castle and so the site should be reinstated as agricultural land after its use as a temporary compound and it should remain protected in LDP2 as amenity greenspace.

There are sufficient employment allocations identified in Perth in the Proposed LDP2 to meet needs. Some of the employment land has requirement for servicing tied to the delivery of housing land and it provides an effective supply. The Council's Transport Planning have significant concerns regarding this proposal's potential impact on the proper operation of the existing traffic control at both the slip and the old Pert Mart, as well as the junction separation distance from the slip itself. It is also unclear whether Transport Scotland would accept a permanent access here onto the A85 so close to the new slip.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Land east of College Mill Road, Almondbank

MacPherson Ltd of Aberlour (MacPherson Ltd) (0569/01/001): This H353 (MD095) proposal is resisted. This proposal was not submitted during the earlier LDP2 plan preparation stages at pre MIR or MIR and so has not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation. There is no requirement to identify any more housing land within the Perth Housing Market Area with a healthy surplus and flexibility.

The SEA (CD276) raises significant issues. There was a pre application response to a proposal here which did raise some of the potential issues namely access, contaminated land and flood risk but it considered that residential would be acceptable in principle. This

response does not indicate the scale of residential development that would be appropriate or whether it would be a viable site. The LDP residential areas policy (CD014, p31) states there is a presumption against 'Changes away from ancillary uses such as employment land' and that this, 'will be resisted unless there is demonstrable market evidence that the existing use is no longer viable as a commercial venture or community-run enterprise.' Also no information has been submitted to demonstrate that the existing use is no longer viable so the principle of a change of use is not established. With regard to the impact on the LDP waste management designation; this refers to its previous use as a waste transfer station for metal and other special waste use which ceased in 2010. SEPA have confirmed these licenses have been surrendered and contamination has been removed.

There are significant concerns about the effectiveness and deliverability of this proposal due to the access difficulties, and there may also be issues of contamination. These concerns are not adequately addressed in the submission. There are issues with the Transport Appraisal submitted (CD278). The Transport Appraisal does not contain the information to audit the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICs) applied to the development to establish trip generation. Traffic counts on Main Street/College Mill Road would be needed to determine impact of traffic increase. The time of peak am/pm trip generation is also not given. It also refers to a detailed junction capacity assessment of College Mill Road onto Main Street which has not been carried out yet. There are significant concerns about this junction and visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m would be required onto Main Street. The site would undoubtedly benefit from a second access bridge. The Perth Area Local Plan (1995) (CD138) indicated this as an opportunity site with the likely necessity of a new bridge, whilst the Perth Draft Area Local Plan 2004 (CD263, p78-79) required a new bridge. Also currently there are no footways along the private College Mill Road and it does not achieve the street hierarchy set out in Designing Streets which questions its adoptability. Impact on the National Cycle Route (NCR) 77 has also not been assessed. With the increase in traffic due to the proposed development this is likely to have a negative impact on its use, as there are no off road facilities on College Mill Road. A link path to Lumsden Crescent of at least 3m would benefit cycle movements.

Notwithstanding the Council's views, SEPA object to residential development within the pre defended 1 in 200 year risk area which is likely to limit the extent of the possible developable area. However the detailed FRA for the Almond Valley planning application which included a pre defended 1 in 200 year risk map does indicate that just a small area of the site would be affected by flood risk. There would also be a need to protect broadleaf semi natural woodland to the north of the site and along the riverside.

With the uncertainties that surround the suitability, deliverability and effectiveness of this proposal and the lack of consultation and engagement it would be inappropriate to add this site at this late stage of the process. As previously acknowledged through the pre application advice in 2015 this would not preclude a developer from taking forward a proposal but the first consideration would be whether they could demonstrate that the existing use is no longer viable.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Open space north of East Drive

Mr and Mrs M Lewin (0657/01/001): This H355 (MD097) proposal is resisted. This proposal was not submitted during the earlier LDP2 plan preparation stages at pre MIR or MIR and so has not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation.

The SEA (CD279) raises significant issues. This proposal is in any case considered unsuitable as it would involve loss of existing LDP, and Proposed LDP2 open space. This site is valued amenity woodland. This conifer woodland has high amenity and character. The spacing of the trees does not appear to be an issue but if there are issues these could be addressed through woodland management or replanting. The proposed loss of this woodland would not meet with the principles of Policy 38B Trees, Woodland and Development (CD052, p66) and the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal (CD007, p6-8) which only allows woodland removal where it would achieve significant and clearly defined additional public benefits. There is no requirement to identify housing land in this location so there is no significant public benefit and no compensatory planting has been identified either.

The woodland largely lies largely to the north of residential properties with some further residential properties to the west, and the woodland only truly lies south of one property (2A Scroogiehill Road which has a large garden with the house lying 25m + from the edge of the woodland). The amenity/sunlight/shading/safety impacts for existing residents from this woodland are minimal.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

West of County Place

Mr and Mrs M Lewin (0657/02/001+002): This H356 (MD098) proposal is resisted. This proposal was not submitted during the earlier LDP2 plan preparation stages at pre MIR or MIR and so has not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation.

The SEA (CD280) raises some issues. The site lies within the greenbelt and lies beyond the existing built up area. It would impact on the greenbelt, however in landscape and visual terms if the western boundary was strengthened by further planting this site could offer good visual and landscape containment. However it lies within the greenbelt and any changes should be consulted on before a change is considered. In terms of access County Place is single track road and is without any pavement provision. Sparrow road is a private access road which is part of the core path network and at its junction with Scroogiehill Road has a pinch point between properties Horse Mill, and 20 Scroogiehill Road. Both these properties provide significant character and amenity. Use of Sparrow road as a vehicular access would therefore be resisted. There is no evidence that a satisfactory and safe vehicular and pedestrian access could be provided. The Council were not seeking new sites to be submitted at this stage in the Plan preparation and the necessary details have not been submitted to clarify the proposal, or identify suitable and deliverable access solutions.

The scale of the site at 2 hectares is too large to be included within the settlement boundary without an allocation. If this site is considered in a future LDP review it would allow for details of the access and planting, and a possible amendment to the green belt to be consulted on and for public feedback and stakeholder engagement to inform the decision.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Reporter's conclusions:

Reporter's recommendations: