

<b>Issue 29</b>	<b>Perth Core Settlements</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Balbeggie, pages 121-2 Bridge of Earn/Oudendarde, pages 144-7 Luncarty pages 236-238 Methven, page 242 Perth Airport, pages 280-1 Scone, pages 293-296 Stanley, pages 301-5	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<div> <div> Michelle Gillies (0036)  Tayside &amp; Central Scotland Transport Partnership (TACTRAN) (0057)  John Fowle (0047)  David Dykes (0086)  Ian Stephens (0090)  David Gordon (0130)  Ishbel MacKinnon (0136)  Ian &amp; Fiona Heywood (0144)  Mr &amp; Mrs Fleming (0150)  Frances Hobbs (0152)  Neil Myles (0153)  Mr Archibald McHardy (0156)  John Brian Milarvie (0171)  Drs Moira &amp; Alastair Bulcraig (0185)  Shell UK Ltd (0195)  EG Lamont (0207)  J Lamont (0208)  Linda Simpson (0222)  Mrs Sheena Thom (0224)  Peter &amp; Vanessa Shand (0226)  Mrs Morag Craig (0233)  Morris Leslie Group (0241)  J D McKerracher (0245)  Bobbie Stibbles (0247)  Rachel Moir (0264)  Scone Community Council (0265)  Perth &amp; Kinross Heritage Trust (0272)  Mr &amp; Mrs J McLaren (0282)  Alison Peters-Waistell (0288)  John W Rodgers (0304)  Mr Malcolm Cameron (0324)  Alastair Bews (0366)  Brenda Elizabeth Bews (0367)  Mr &amp; Mrs Short (0382)  Mr &amp; Mrs Stewart Reith (0389)  Edwin &amp; Irene Barclay (0394)  Janet Ramsey (0406)  ES Wells (0409)  Alistair Godfrey (0410)  Harris and Sheldon (0518)  Frank Stevenson (0422) </div> <div> David Fenner (0593)  Lisa Cardno (0599)  Rosalind Vallance (0606)  James Vallance (0612)  Scone Estate (0614)  Louise Moir (0615)  A Robb (0619)  Miss Fiona Black (0617)  A &amp; J Stephen Limited (0622)  Laura Simpson (0631)  Mrs I Brown (0637)  Margaret &amp; Graeme Irvine (0642)  Mr &amp; Mrs P Sloan (0655/01 &amp; 0655/02)  Bruce Burns (0663/01)  Clare &amp; Ian Nicol (0665)  James Thow (0668)  Jennifer Throw (0669)  Douglas A Sutherland (0670)  Martin RW Rhodes (0675)  M Moir (0677)  Helen Moir (0678)  William JM Craig (0682)  Mandy Maier (0683)  Andrew Bruce (0684)  Miss TJ Lamb (0685)  J Wheeler (0686)  Ross Cuthbertson (0687)  S. Goodacre (0688)  H Goodacre (0689)  John &amp; Lynn Kendal (0690)  Joaquin &amp; Nidia Puga (0691)  Suzanne Whyte (0692)  M Burke (0693)  Mrs Mary FB Christie (0694)  G Collins (0695)  Catriona Shand (0696)  Jane Crawford (0697)  Lesley Baird (0698)  Luncarty, Redgorton and Moneydie Community Council (0703)  Hazel MacKinnon (0705)  Mr John Armstrong (0710) </div> </div>		

<p> Ian Fairley (0427)  George Black (0428)  Moira Andrew &amp; William Hadden (0432)  Mrs June Dunn (0442)  Gordon &amp; Elaine Bannerman (0450)  D King Properties Ltd (0461/03)  Woodland Trust Scotland (0462)  Vilma Dovidaityte (0469)  Mrs Norah Stewart (0471)  Mr CM Evans (0474)  Jill Guthrie (0477)  William Stewart (0478)  John &amp; Janet Greaves (0479)  Ian Stratton (0480)  Jeffery Rowlingson (0485)  David F Lewington (0486)  Lorna Nicoll (0503)  Jill Belch &amp; Lucy Vanderham (0505)  Network Rail (0509)  Janis Walker (0511)  Mrs Susan Duncan (0527)  Lorna Wallace (0531)  Andrew &amp; Margaret Manson (0533)  Mr William Glen &amp; Sons (0564)  Dr Clare Lee (0565)  James Nicol (0568) </p>	<p> Mrs Catherine Armstrong (0711)  Gerald Connolly (0712)  Eric Ogilvy (0713)  Stewart McCowan (0714)  Angela McCowan (0715)  Gladys Ogilvy (0716)  Graham Ogilvie (0717)  Tracy Ogilvie (0718)  Shona Cowie (0719)  Paul Cowie (0720)  S. Coyle (0721)  Fiona Coyle (0722)  Douglas Marshall (0723)  Susan Patterson (0724)  Alexander Haggart (0725)  Lucy Haggart (0726)  Richard Hamilton (0727)  Michelle Hamilton (0728)  Mrs Ray Bell (0729)  David Roy (0730)  Greer Crighton (0731)  Brian Hood (0732)  Gaynor Hood (0733)  Phillip Crighton (0734)  Ian &amp; Helen Burnett (0740)  Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) (0742/01) </p>
<p><b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b></p>	<p>Perth Core Settlements (outwith Perth) including Balbeggie, Bridge of Earn/Oudenarde, Luncarty, Methven, Perth Airport, Scone, Stanley.</p>
<p><b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b></p>	
<p><b>Balbeggie</b></p> <p><u>Housing Allocation H13</u></p> <p>Archibald McHardy (0156/01/001): Supports the site allocation. In particular, McHarvey supports the Site Specific Developer Requirements that access to the site should be from both the A94 and St Martins Road and the indicative route of said access is shown on the plan. The respondent's property fronts the A94 Perth road and states a willingness to work with the owner of the remainder of Site H13 to bring this site to fruition. Our client wishes it noted that his property is currently, and has always been, served by a private drainage system. The septic tank is within the boundaries of his property but the soakaway leads northwards along the west edge of Site H13. The route of this drainage system will be unaffected according to the site drawing indicative landscaping proposals and developable areas.</p> <p>Morris Leslie Group (0241/03/001): Supports the continued allocation of this site, but request that the 'Site Specific Developer Requirements' be slightly altered, as follows. Deletion of the reference to "phased development linked to expansion of primary school</p>	

capacity in this or adjacent catchment". There is no mention of any current capacity issue with Balbeggie Primary School in the Plan, and anyway, if there were, then that issue will come out once an application is submitted. Deletion of the reference to "road and access improvements to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads Authority". Any consequent improvements necessary to facilitate development, and that are reasonably related to it, will come out of undertaking a 'Transport Assessment', so there is no reason to include this comment, at this stage. Amendment of the reference to providing "access from the A94 Perth Road and St Martins Road" to make it clear that access can be taken from both roads, but that only one is necessary to allow the development to start, and for units to be completed, with the exact number accessible from each road to be determined by a Transport Assessment. The following revised wording would be appropriate: "Provide access from the A94 Perth Road and/or from St Martins Road, subject to the findings of a Transport Assessment". Amendment to the reference to "Path links through site from village to the core path network", to make it clear that this is one link only, and that it need only be provided on a phased basis, as the site is developed. The following revised wording would be appropriate: "A path link through the site from the village to the core path network is to be completed on a phased basis".

SEPA (0742/01/043): Supports the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment as it accords with the authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (CD036) to ensure that development plans contribute to sustainable development.

Margaret & Graeme Irvine (0642/01/001): Objects to the site because they feel that before any development starts the third crossing over the Tay must be completed. Not approved but completed. They consider that this will prevent further pollution and traffic congestion in Scone, Bridgend and the Atholl Street area, which currently is one of the most polluted streets in the country. They also consider that the current sewage system is at full capacity. If more dwellings are added to this system without further expansion, they are concerned that this may lead to pollution of the area surrounding the treatment site and may well lead to environmental health issues. Finally they are concerned that the local primary school can cope with the additional school role generated by the housing.

## **Bridge of Earn / Oudenarde**

### Infrastructure & Services

Edwin & Irene Barclay (0394/01/002) express concerns about the infrastructure of Bridge of Earn to support any further development in addition to the proposed development at Oudenarde, particularly the impact on medical services in the village.

### Site - H14

Bobbie Stibbles (0247/01/001) and Edwin & Irene Barclay (0394/01/001) object to Site H14 on the basis of development causing additional flooding and drainage impacts in the surrounding area, including impacts on own properties. Edwin & Irene Barclay (0394/01/001) also object on the basis of the impact of additional houses on vehicle and pedestrian network, and suggest adequate parking would have to be incorporated in to any new housing development.

D King Properties Ltd (0461/03/002) support the re-allocation of Site H14 however request that the capacity and landscaped edge as shown on page 145 of the Proposed Plan is amended to reflect the position established at the adjacent H72 site, based on the

following points:

- As detailed planning permission for site H72 has been granted, it would therefore be appropriate for the approach established for site H72 to be followed through to Site H14 in terms of rationalising the southern boundary of the village.
- Indicative capacity for Site H14 should be increased from '67-104' units to '105 to 170 units' to match the densities approved on Site H72.
- Site H14 boundary should also be extended (site ref H411 (MD146)) to the south to tie in with the new settlement edge established at site H72 and the landscaped edge is adjusted accordingly.
- Bridge of Earn Settlement Map should also be amended to reflect the adjusted boundaries for site H14.
- Option agreement recently concluded with site owners and formal planning application to be submitted for Site H14 in 2018. Approach for the development of the H14 site will follow the principles established on the adjacent H72 site which has already been granted planning permission. Therefore consider it would be appropriate for the densities and landscape structure for both of the sites to be consistent, to ensure the development of the village to the south is implemented in a well-designed and coordinated manner.

#### Site – H72

D King Properties Ltd (0461/03/001) support the retained allocation of Site H72 in the Proposed Plan with associated increased capacity range and amended landscaped edge which reflects the detailed planning permission granted (15/02176/FLM). The site is expected to commence on site in early 2018 [construction started on site early 2018]. D King Properties Ltd also seek changes to Site H72 to make reference to the detailed planning permission. Specifically, a Site Specific Developer Requirements is sought on page 147 advising that: 'Detailed Planning Permission for the development of this site was granted in November 2017 (15/02176/FLM) with work anticipated to commence in early 2018 by Ogilvie Homes.' This change is considered to ensure that the LDP takes full account of the detailed planning permission in place for the site and thereby ensure the allocation is up-to-date when the replacement LDP is adopted.

#### Site – H15 (Oudenarde)

TACTRAN (0057/01/021) note the developer requirement for a potential new railway station for Site H15 and highlight the requirement for the transport appraisal is contained in Project R5.5 within the Regional Transport Strategy Delivery Plan (CD262) and involves a range of partners. No specific changes are sought.

Shell UK Limited (0195/01/003) seeks minor amendments to the Oudenarde Site Requirements and accompanying layout plan to ensure appropriate recognition is made of the pipelines crossing the site.

Network Rail (0509/01/007) note that land has been set aside in the Oudenarde Masterplan area for a rail halt facility and that a strategic transport and economic appraisal for the station will be required. Network Rail is happy to work with promoters of new stations and provide support in the preparation of proposals. No specific changes are sought.

SEPA (0742/01/044) supports the requirement for the Oudenarde Housing Allocation H15 to investigate the feasibility of a heat network using renewable or low carbon energy

sources to be submitted.

## **Luncarty**

### Luncarty South MU27

John Fowle (0047/01/001); Ian & Fiona Heywood (0144/01/001); Moira & Alastair Bulcraig (0185/01/001); Alison Peters-Waistell (0288/01/001); Janet Ramsey (0406/01/001); Alisdair Godfrey (0410/01/018); Frank Stevenson (0422/01/002); George Black (0428/01/001); Lorna Nicoll (0503/01/001); Susan Duncan (0527/01/003); Lorna Wallace (0531/01/001); Clare Lee (0565/01/001); David Fenner (0593/01/001); A Robb (0619/01/001); Mrs I Brown (0637/01/001); Bruce Burns (0663/01/003 & 004); Luncarty, Redgorton and Moneydie Community Council (0703/01/002): All objecting to the site for one or more of the following reasons:

- There are a range of issues regarding road access. A number of people have stated concern regarding access into the site and the modifications that will be required to the existing road network, particularly the A9 realignment and the CTRL. They raise the need for integration into the wider road network and the need for a southern access point into the site. Some responses state that the A9 can often be gridlocked at peak times particularly when getting closer to Perth and raise concerns over the generation of pollution. There are also worries regarding the local minor roads and the impact of more traffic on them as well as construction traffic. Local junctions should also be upgraded as they will not cope with further traffic.
- There are a number of people concerned with active travel issues. Cycle paths, core paths and rights of way should remain rural in nature. There is concern over the lack of public transport to Luncarty. Some have also stated that the current footways are not complete within Luncarty. Pedestrian access for residents between Luncarty and Redgorton is also considered inadequate at the A9 flyover due to lack of footways and increasing traffic,
- Several responses raise concerns regarding the housing density of the site and the impact that this will have on Luncarty. They note that the density range has increased from LDP1 to LDP2. Some consider the housing need is met at Bertha Park. They are worried that the timeframe is long term and this could involve years of construction traffic, particularly for the residents of Scarf Road and Fairview. Some state that the new development should be in keeping with the village ensuring the style and location does not impact on existing properties. The risk of coalescence with Perth is also a concern and one respondent requests that the site should be changed to Green Belt to ensure separation from Perth.
- Many voice concerns over the impact on existing village facilities, including the primary school, recreational facilities, shops and the NHS surgery. They state that there is no employment locally and people will need to travel to Perth. They raise issues with the lack of detail regarding the proposed area of employment land and its location. Some state that there are currently no suitable commercial premises proposed.
- Some residents state that the site will require planting to adjoining housing areas at an early stage to create a screen. They raise concerns over the loss of green areas around Luncarty and state that topography would be difficult to develop.
- There are a number of representations that raise concerns regarding the impact development will have on the environment and biodiversity. They also highlight the loss of agricultural land. There are concerns regarding potential flooding next to the

River Tay. There is also a comment requesting that soils should not be removed from site when under construction.

- Some respondents are concerned about the site of an ancient battleground at Denmarkfield. There is also concern over 'Turnagain Hillock' which is considered a significantly important historical and landscape feature for the community that they would like to remain intact.

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/010): Supports the current allocation MU27 Luncarty South, which remains an effective site within the Perth Core Area; and the recognition within the Proposed Plan that the site is capable of delivering at least 589 - 760 houses and 5ha of employment land.

SEPA (0742/01/065): Support the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment as it accords with the authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (CD036) to ensure that development plans contribute to sustainable development.

## **Methven**

### New Sites

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/011) seeks to change the Plan to identify a new residential allocation (site ref: H418 (MD161)) at Methven as phase 1 of a longer term development area, based on the following points:

- The proposal would comprise a small central development of between 10-15 cottage and flatted dwellings, promoting an inclusive approach to community planning and incorporating a new village green at its core, and identification of future strategic phases beyond.
- Phase 1 proposals formulated to provide a village square, an ambitious yet deliverable feature framed with high quality architecture.
- In accordance with TAYplan's spatial strategy (CD022), Methven falls within the Perth Tier 1 Principal Settlement and therefore has the potential to accommodate additional development over the plan period. Methven should therefore be considered for strategic housing land and mixed use allocation and therefore do not agree with Plan's lack of allocation at Methven.
- Current supply from consented development at Drumgrain Avenue is not large enough to satisfy TAYplan's locational and strategic housing requirements.
- Various sites suggested as part of last LDP review to the north of settlement, which were considered unacceptably prominent, a position supported by A & J Stephen.
- Subject land and land beyond to the south both considered at the previous LDP Examination (CD015) although not considered at MIR stage and not subject to SEA. The Reporter considered the site inappropriate to allocate however the Reporter did recognise the opportunity for a large mixed use development in the core area which complied with TAYplan policy. This TAYplan policy context still exists and is therefore an opportunity to utilise this context to identify an appropriate level of additional allocation in a sustainable Tier 1 settlement location outwith greenbelt.
- Proposal is considered to comply with Placemaking Policies 1A, 1B and 1C by virtue of the design, layout, form, and siting of the designed development and its positive relationship with the surrounding built and natural environment.
- To facilitate a high quality designed development, a masterplan will be prepared to take in to account the larger area of growth, which will involve extensive consultation and design based workshops which should be held during the

preparation of the next LDP. The opportunity should be taken through LDP2 to identify first phase of development and allow context of village green to be set.

- Subject land is effective and deliverable as there is a willing landowner and developer. There are no technical or environmental constraints to its development, through an appropriate access onto the A85 Crieff Road. This access and adjoining two houses are in the control of the landowner/developer and present opportunity to create new focal point for the village.
- The previous Perth Area Local Plan (CD138) identified the subject land and land to the south as the future direction for growth of the settlement and the strategic opportunity has been presented through previous and current TAYplan (CD022) to plan for its delivery through a first phase development and longer term strategic masterplanning. This would allow for appropriate placemaking short term and appropriate strategic expansion long term.
- Site lies on the A85 with good connections to employment opportunities, access to bus routes to and from Perth and beyond, and bus stops and local facilities within walking distance of the site.

Mr & Mrs P. Sloan (0655/01/001 & 0655/02/001) have submitted two separate representations seeking to change the plan to allocate either proposal to identify an area of existing farmland to the north of Methven to be included in the settlement boundary as 'white land' suitable for residential use.

The first site (0655/01/001) which extends to approximately 0.84ha (site ref: H412 (MD160)) is promoted for the following reasons:

- Proposed extension is directly adjacent to the existing northern boundary of Methven and in terms of site configuration the proposal constitutes a logical extension of the existing building line to the west of the site and is at a similar elevation. Proposal will be acceptable in terms of visual impact and will not encroach above the 95m contour line and would therefore not adversely affect the setting of the village and would be in accordance with the Perth Landscape Capacity Study (CD047).
- Based on housing density and surrounding pattern of development, site could accommodate approximately 10 units. In terms of housing supply the proposed site as white land within settlement boundary would function as a windfall site providing less than 20 units and therefore would make important contribution to housing land supply. Provision of windfall sites is considered important within the context of Council's Housing Study for Proposed Plan (CD018).
- Access to the site will be via an existing access off Strathview Place and proposed access is sufficiently wide to accommodate the proposed site and provide a safe access for all users in accordance with roads design guidelines; contrary to Council's site assessment findings.

The second site (0655/02/001) which extends to approximately 3.8ha (site ref: H221 (MD159)) and is wholly inclusive of the first site is promoted for the following reasons:

- Proposal is directly adjacent to the existing northern boundary of the settlement
- Site could be developed as a windfall site for 20 houses based on surrounding density and would make a contribution to housing land supply, the important contribution of which is emphasized in LDP2.
- Settlement falls within Perth Core area and therefore should be considered for further development.
- Site has a dedicated access and an appropriate relationship to the settlement, and is of a scale capable of delivery within the short/medium term.

- Site can be suitably contained within an enhanced landscape setting taking due cognisance of the existing woodland and improving links to it as well enhancing field boundaries.
- Site will not give rise to significant visual impacts due to its location and in particular the northern backdrop.
- Site would add choice and variety of homes to the area to support identified community needs and is fully in compliance with sustainability criteria of TAYplan (CD022) and emerging LDP spatial strategies.
- Site is well served by existing public transport and links to the wider area, and would not give rise to any significant negative transport issues. Site access from Strathview Place considered to be acceptable to serve the development and in line with roads design guidelines.

## **Perth Airport**

### Settlement Summary

Morris Leslie Group (0241/04/002): Delete - "A more holistic approach to Masterplanning the whole area is desirable in the long-term to ensure compatible uses." Replace with - "A Masterplanning exercise is required to ascertain the appropriate future for the Airport and adjoining land. This document, once finalised, will be approved as supplementary guidance by the Council, and will be an important material consideration in the determination of any future planning applications. The Masterplan will consider the appropriate uses at Perth Airport, additional development that could take place both within the Airport, and on adjoining land, and the infrastructure required to deliver that." If the Council do not wish to go that far, then the following wording, whilst less binding, would be preferred to no change at all. The Council has a history of producing Development Briefs for major sites, and so such an approach could be applied to Perth Airport. Replace with "A Development Brief will be prepared for Perth Airport and adjoining land, which will consider the appropriate uses at Perth Airport, additional development that could take place both within the Airport, and on adjoining land, and the infrastructure required to deliver that".

### Employment safeguarded site

Morris Leslie Group (0241/04/001): The Employment Safeguarding zoning for the site has proved problematic for Morris Leslie. It recently led to Perth and Kinross Council planning officers refusing planning permission for the conversion of the Destiny Building within the Airport to residential use. The Local Review Statement prepared in relation to that decision is attached (RD005), as is the Decision of the Perth and Kinross Local Review Body (CD171) (LRB) overturning that decision and granting planning permission. That decision was reached once the LRB councillors had visited the Airport, and understood the context of the Destiny building in an area of the Airport where residential is the prevailing (i.e. main) use. That decision, it is suggested, represents a reasonable response to the current circumstances at the Airport, where residential use is an important component, and the Airport is more a mixed use location, in some respects more akin to a settlement, than being purely a business park/industrial estate, as the Employment Safeguarding zoning suggests. For that reason, it is suggested that the Airport should instead be retained with its own page in the Plan, but whilst being defined by a boundary, as currently, should either be identified as a mixed use area, or, if that is not a zoning used in the Plan, then as 'white land', so that any future planning applications do not face the same issue as that at the Destiny Building, and are simply considered against general policies in the Plan.

### Site allocation MU3

SEPA (0742/01/105): 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.

SEPA (0742/01/106): The site is a former military airfield and although SEPA are not aware of any measured radioactive contaminants on the site or any documentary evidence to suggest that radioactive contaminants may be present. However, given the site's former use as military airfield radium 226 may be present due to its use in aircraft dials during WWII. We therefore recommend that a developer requirement is attached which addresses this issue.

### **Scone**

#### Settlement statement

David Dykes (0086/001/010): Objects to sites having unrestrictive development.

Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/001): Objects to the settlement statement because it does not reflect the existing facilities and community services. Consistent objections to pollution have been ignored.

Ian Stratton (0480/01/001): Objects to the lack of community improvements proposed in Scone.

Maira Andrew & William Hadden (0432/01/001): Supports the embargo on housing development in Scone.

Malcolm Cameron (0324/01/001); Maira Andrew & William Hadden (0432/01/002); June Dunn (0442/01/002): All object to the development embargo only being in place until 2019.

#### Open Space

EG Lamont (0207/01/001); J Lamont (0208/01/001); Linda Simpson (0222/01/001); Morag Craig (0233/01/001); Rachel Moir (0264/01/001); Alastair Bews (0366/01/001); Brenda Elizabeth Bews (0367/01/001); Ian Fairley (0427/01/003); Louise Moir (0615/01/001); Fiona Black (0617/01/001); Laura Simpson (0631/01/001); M Moir (0677/01/001); Helen Moir (0678/01/001); William JM Craig (0682/01/001); Mandy Maier (0683/01/001); Andrew Bruce (0684/01/001); TJ Lamb (0685/01/001); J. Wheeler (0686/01/001); Ross Cuthbertson (0687/01/001); S. Goodacre (0688/01/001); H. Goodacre (0689/01/001); John & Lynn Kendal (0690/01/001); Joaquin & Nidia Puga (0691/01/001); Suzanne Whyte (0692/01/001); M Burke (0693/01/001); Mary FB Christie (0694/01/001); G Collins (0695/01/001); Catriona Shand (0696/01/001); Jane Crawford (0697/01/001); Lesley Baird (0698/01/001); John Armstrong (0710/01/001); Catherine Armstrong (0711/01/001); S. Coyle (0721/01/001); Fiona Coyle (0722/01/001); Douglas Marshall (0723/01/001); Susan

Patterson (0724/01/001); Alexander Haggart (0725/01/001); Lucy Haggart (0726/01/001); Richard Hamilton (0727/01/001); Michelle Hamilton (0728/01/001); Ray Bell (0729/01/001): All support the retention of the Woollcombe Square amenity area, shown as an open space on map of p293 of the plan.

#### Scone Settlement Boundary

David Dykes (0086/01/001 & 008); David Gordon (0130/01/005); Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/006); Frances Hobbs (0152/01/005); Neil Myles (0153/01/005); John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/005); Peter & Vanessa Shand (0226/01/005); J D McKerracher (0245/01/006); Scone Community Council (0265/01/006); John W Rodgers (0304/01/006); Mr & Mrs Short (0382/01/003 & 11); Mr & Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/003); Ian Stratton (0480/01/001); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/003); David F Lewington (0486/01/003); Lisa Cardno (0599/01/006); James Thow (0668/01/005); Jennifer Throw (0669/01/005); Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/005); Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/006); Gerald Connolly (0712/01/006); Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/006); Stewart McCowan (0714/01/006); Angela McCowan (0715/01/006); Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/006); Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/006); Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/006); Shona Cowie (0719/01/006); Paul Cowie (0720/01/006); David Roy (0730/01/006); Greer Crighton (0731/01/006); Brian Hood (0732/01/006); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/006); Phillip Crighton (0734/01/006): All object to the settlement boundary change at the Scone North H29 site.

William Stewart (0478/01/001): Objects to the settlement boundary at Newmains Steadings because it cuts through the through the garden area attached to the house.

David Dykes (0086/01/006 & 007); David Gordon (0130/01/005); Frances Hobbs (0152/01/005); Neil Myles (0153/01/005); John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/005); Peter & Vanessa Shand (0226/01/005); J D McKerracher (0245/01/006); Scone Community Council (0265/01/006); John W Rodgers (0304/01/006); Mr & Mrs Short (0382/01/003); Mr & Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/003); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/003); David Lewington (0486/01/003); Lisa Cardno (0599/01/006); James Thow (0668/01/005); Jennifer Throw (0669/01/005); Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/004); Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/005); Gerald Connolly (0712/01/005); Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/005); Stewart McCowan (0714/01/005); Angela McCowan (0715/01/005); Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/005); Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/005); Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/005); Shona Cowie (0719/01/005); Paul Cowie (0720/01/005); David Roy (0730/01/005); Greer Crighton (0731/01/005); Brian Hood (0732/01/005); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/005); Phillip Crighton (0734/01/005): All support the settlement boundary preventing any more housing development in Scone.

William Glen & Sons (0564/01/001): Proposes that the settlement boundary is extended to accommodate two sites: one at Balgarvie Farm and the Balgarvie Cottages (Site Reference: H372, Map: MD132) and one adjacent to the A94 for a mixed use development (Site Reference: MU373, Map: MD134).

Scone Estate (0614/01/002): Objects to the settlement boundary as they dispute the inclusion of white land in the boundary to the south of MU4. They consider new sites for long term development should be formally identified and propose that an area to the south of Scone is included at Pictstonhill (Site Reference: H278, Map: MD131).

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016); Gordon & Elaine Bannerman (0450/01/001); John & Janet Greaves (0479/01/001): All suggest a change to the settlement boundary to accommodate the "Enhanced Western Gateway" to the village (Site Reference: H417,

Map: MD133).

Scone North Housing Site Allocation H29:

Principle of site

ES Wells (0409/01/001); Gordon & Elaine Bannerman (0450/01/001); Norah Stewart (0471/01/001); William Stewart (0478/01/002); John & Janet Greaves (0479/01/001); Rosalind Vallance (0606/01/001); James Vallance (0612/01/001); Clare & Ian Nicol (0665/01/001): Object to the principle of the Scone North H29 housing site.

CM Evans (0474/01/002): Objects to the site because of the impact on biodiversity and archaeology, which the respondent considers has not been fully investigated by the developer.

Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/009): Site Specific Developer Requirements are updated to reflect the likelihood of an archaeological investigation and/or protection of Scheduled Monuments being required.

Ian Fairley (0427/01/002): Objects to the site and suggests that a much smaller allocation would be permissible.

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016); Scone Estate (0614/01/001): Support the allocation of H29.

Change of boundary

Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/003): Object to the Scone North H29 site boundary change in response to the planning approval because of the impact it might have on the woodland.

Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/005); Neil Myles (0153/01/003); John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/003); Linda Simpson (0222/01/003); Fiona Black (0617/01/003); Laura Simpson (0631/01/003); James Thow (0668/01/003); Jennifer Thow (0669/01/003): Support the boundary of the H29 site not being extended as proposed in the MIR.

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016): Seek to allocate an extra area of land to create an enhanced western gateway to Scone as an extension to the H29 site or as a standalone bespoke residential and open space allocation with an appropriate design brief. They consider that this will create an attractive entrance way and overcome the access issues associated with this area (Site Reference: H417, Map: MD133).

Gordon & Elaine Bannerman (0450/01/001); John & Janet Greaves (0479/01/001): Support the developers' "Enhanced Western Gateway" to the village, which was displayed last year at a meeting in the church hall (CD243). It would benefit not just the residents of Harper Way and motorists and pedestrians using the current "back door" to Scone, but also villagers in general. They believe it would make the approach from the Blairgowrie road both safer and more attractive, creating a "hammerhead" at Harper Way and removing the bend and dangerous access to the cul-de-sac. This gateway proposal would also benefit householders in the proposed development to the north of Harper Way, especially if a pavement could link the edge of the village with the Blairgowrie road en route to the Isla Road in Perth.' Harper Way is a private and un-adopted road and it seems eminently sensible from a planning perspective to divert from the development plan to include the "Enhanced Western Gateway" option (Site Reference: H417, Map: MD133).

### Density range

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016): Propose that the number of units should be increased to 1000 at H29. They consider the current density low in comparison to other sites such as Bertha Park.

### Developer requirements

David Dykes (0086/01/009); Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/007); Frances Hobbs (0152/01/006); Neil Myles (0153/01/006); John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/006); Vanessa Shand (0226/01/006); J D McKerracher (0245/01/007); Scone Community Council (0265/01/007); John W Rodgers (0304/01/007); Mr & Mrs Short (0382/01/009); Mr & Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/001); Moira Andrew & William Hadden (0432/01/003); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/002); David F Lewington (0486/01/001); Jill Belch & Lucy Vanderham (0505/02/001); Andrew & Margaret Manson (0533/01/001); James Nicol (0568/01/001); Lisa Cardno (0599/01/007); James Thow (0668/01/006); Jennifer Throw (0669/01/006); Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/006); Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/007); Gerald Connolly (0712/01/007); Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/007); Stewart McCowan (0714/01/007); Angela McCowan (0715/01/007); Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/007); Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/007); Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/007); Shona Cowie (0719/01/007); Paul Cowie (0720/01/007); David Roy (0730/01/007); Greer Crighton (0731/01/007); Brian Hood (0732/01/007); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/007); Phillip Crighton (0734/01/007); SEPA (0742/01/108): Object to the change of development requirements for this site. In particular, they would like to see the developer requirement regarding flooding that was in Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan Adopted (2014) (CD014) to be reinstated.

Ian Stratton (0480/01/003): States it is not clear how the low carbon energy building to meet the lowering of carbon limits will be met.

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/015): Objects to this development as they have identified areas of long established LEPO ancient woodland which would be negatively affected by this development. They recommend a 50m buffer as a measure to elevate indirect impacts.

### Site drawing of H29

Ian Stephens (0090/01/003): Objects to the H29 site drawing and feels that the correct junction information should be provided for the CTLR.

David Dykes (0086/01/013); Scone Community Council (0265/01/010); Moira Andrew & William Hadden (0432/01/007); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/002); David F Lewington (0486/01/001); Jill Belch & Lucy Vanderham (0505/01/001); Lisa Cardno (0599/01/013); Rosalind Vallance (0606/01/002); James Vallance (0612/01/002); Greer Crighton (0731/01/013); Brian Hood (0732/01/013); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/013); Phillip Crighton (0734/01/007); Ian & Helen Burnett (0740/01/001): Object to the loss of greenspace removal along the southern boundary of the site on the site drawing. There is a lack of consistency between the site drawing and the Masterplan.

Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/013); Andrew & Margaret Manson (0533/01/001): Object to the unrestrictive development potential of the site and the loss of greenspace removal along the southern boundary of the site on the site drawing. There is a lack of consistency between the site drawing and the Masterplan (CD172). They consider that the drainage, flooding and environmental issues have not been fully addressed through the Masterplanning process.

#### Access to the site

David Gordon (0130/01/004): Objects to Scone North H29 site as the respondent considers it to be fundamentally unsuitable in terms of its road connections into the existing settlement and the CTLR splitting the site. The respondent considers that the local resident's views were ignored.

Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/003): Raises concerns about access to the site and states it should not impact on Highfields Woods as it is an area of "delicate conservational fragility".

Ian Fairley (0427/01/002): Considers that the Old Scone-New Scone Road are totally unsuited to traffic generated through construction.

#### Embargo on development of the site

June Dunn (0442/01/001): Considers that no development should take place on the site until the CTLR is completed. Any development work started before bridge completion can only increase traffic through Scone village & Bridgend which is already overburdened by local residential, agricultural and long distance HGV traffic. This could lead to heightened pollution and endanger the health of local residents. The respondent considers that allowing 100 units to be constructed prior to the CTLR being committed is contradictory to the overall embargo and will be detrimental to the local community.

#### The Glebe School site OP22

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/016): Highlights the LEPO ancient woodland which is adjacent to the northern boundary of the site and emphasise the need to plan appropriate protection measures to avoid negative edge effects to the area of LEPO.

Sheena Thom (0224/01/002); Mr & Mrs J McLaren (0282/01/001); Jill Guthrie (0477/01/001); Janis Walker (0511/01/001); Douglas A Sutherland (0670/01/001): Object to the site because of access issues, specifically in terms of increased traffic from Abbey Road, pedestrian access to the local walks, loss of recreational space, concern for the existing mature trees, the local school is at capacity and lack of parking within the area.

Mr & Mrs J McLaren (0282/01/001): Objects to the increase in capacity of the site.

Sheena Thom (0224/01/002): Considers that further clarity is required regarding the Site Specific Developer Requirements for Site OP22 as an 'Affordable housing site'. The respondent would like to know if the site will also accommodate market housing and an explanation as to the reason for this. Policy 20 of the proposed LDP provides that 'where practical, affordable housing should be integrated with and indistinguishable from market housing.' A range of housing tenures, including market share, should therefore be provided for within the site to cater for the diverse range of housing requirements in the area.

#### Angus Road site MU4

SEPA (0742/01/112): Object to development requirements for this site and would like to see a Flood Risk Assessment.

#### **Stanley**

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/017): Notes that there is ancient semi natural woodland at the south of the settlement boundary. The respondent recommends that necessary measures are taken to designate this area and ensure they are not made available for development.

Vilma Dovidaityte (0469/01/002): Raises concerns about the cumulative impact of development within the village on the following: the school capacity for the village and the potential closure of other schools in the area, the medical centre which the respondent considers is at capacity, the shopping facilities within the village and local public transport which is limited.

#### Housing site H30

David Fenner (0593/01/002): Objects to more housing within the area due to traffic generation.

SEPA (0742/02/048): Supports the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment as it accords with the authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (CD036) to ensure that development plans contribute to sustainable development.

#### Housing site H31

Michelle Gillies (0036/01/001); Ishbel MacKinnon (0136/01/001): Support the proposed access route into the site as a better solution to the original one proposed in the planning application.

Vilma Dovidaityte (0469/01/001): Objects to the site for the following reasons: sunlight and loss of privacy, relationship to nearby land uses, corrosion, landslide and River Tay contamination, sewage system and odour issues, floodrisk and drainage, air quality, dust and noise, traffic generation and local infrastructure.

Harris and Sheldon (0518/01/001): Propose an extension to Site H31/change of use of Site H332 from greenspace to residential use. Site H332 should be included within the Proposed LDP 2 as an allocated site for housing, primarily because the Approved Masterplan for Stanley (17/00088/IPM) zones this site for housing (CD173). When compared to the approved Masterplan for Stanley, the Proposed LDP 2 shows a number of inconsistencies. It identifies Site H31 in a purple outline and shows the remainder of the site to be a mixture of both residential development and open/green space. The Proposed LDP 2 however, identifies Site H31 in red and the remainder of the site is identified as open/green space.

David Fenner (0593/01/002): Objects to more housing within the area due to traffic generation.

SEPA (0742/02/048): Supports the developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment as it accords with the authority's duties under The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (CD036) to ensure that development plans contribute to sustainable development.

#### Housing site H32

David Fenner (0593/01/002): Objects to more housing within the area due to traffic generation.

#### Housing site H33

David Fenner (0593/01/002): Objects to more housing within the area due to traffic generation.

Housing site H34

David Fenner (0593/01/002): Objects to more housing within the area due to traffic generation.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**Balbeggie**

Morris Leslie Group (0241/03/001): Seeks a change to the 'Site Specific Developer Requirements' for H13 as follows: deletion of the reference to "phased development linked to expansion of primary school capacity in this or adjacent catchment".

**Bridge of Earn / Oudenarde**

Infrastructure & Services

Edwin & Irene Barclay (0394/01/002) express concerns about the infrastructure of Bridge of Earn to support any further development however no specific changes are sought.

Site – H14

Bobbie Stibbles (0247/01/001) and Edwin & Irene Barclay (0394/01/001): no specific changes are sought however concerns about the site allocation are identified.

D King Properties Ltd (0461/03/002) seeks the following changes are made to the Plan:

- Indicative capacity for Site H14 should be increased from '67-104' units to '105-170 units'.
- Site H14 boundary should be extended to the south to tie in with the new settlement edge established at site H72 and the landscaped edge adjusted accordingly (site ref: H411).
- Bridge of Earn Settlement Map should be amended to reflect the suggested adjusted boundaries for site H14.

Site - H72

D King Properties Ltd (0461/03/001) seeks a change to the Plan to add additional text in the Site Reference Box on page 147 above the Site Specific Developer Requirements stating that: 'Detailed Planning Permission for the development of this site was granted in November 2017 (15/02176/FLM) with work anticipated to commence in early 2018 by Ogilvie Homes.'

Site – H15 (Oudenarde)

Shell UK Limited (0195/01/001) seeks the following changes are made to the Plan:

- Site Plan and Key on Page 146 of the Proposed Plan is amended to show the pipeline consultation zone that covers the south east section of the site.
- Additional bullet point to be added to the Site Specific Developer Requirements on Page 146 stating: 'The site lies within a HSE pipeline consultation zone as a number of oil and gas pipelines cross the site. Any development within these areas should comply with Policy 52.'

## **Luncarty**

John Fowlie (0047/01/001); Moira & Alastair Bulcraig (0185/01/001); Ian & Fiona Heywood (0144/01/001); Alison Peters-Waistell (0288/01/001); Janet Ramsey (0406/01/001); Alisdair Godfrey (0410/01/018); Frank Stevenson (0422/01/002); George Black (0428/01/001); Lorna Nicoll (0503/01/001); Susan Duncan (0527/01/003); Lorna Wallace (0531/01/001); Clare Lee (0565/01/001); David Fenner (0593/01/001); A. Robb (0619/01/001); Mrs I Brown (0637/01/001); Luncarty, Redgorton and Moneydie Community Council (0703/01/002); Bruce Burns (0663/01/003 & 004): Do not seek a specific change but it is interpreted that they wish to see the deletion of MU27 site.

## **Methven**

### New Sites

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/011) seek a change the Plan to identify a new residential allocation (site ref: H418) to the south of the settlement boundary at Methven as phase 1 of a longer term development area.

Mr & Mrs P. Sloan (0655/01/001 & 0655/02/001) have submitted two separate representations to the Plan seeking the following changes to be made:

- Amend the settlement boundary to include an area of existing farmland (0.84ha) to the north of Methven to be included in the settlement boundary as 'white land' suitable for residential use (site ref: H412).
- Amend the settlement boundary to include an area of existing countryside (3.8ha) to the north of Methven to be included in the settlement boundary as 'white land' suitable for residential use (site ref: H221).

## **Perth Airport**

### Settlement Summary

Morris Leslie Group (0241/04/002): Delete: "A more holistic approach to Masterplanning the whole area is desirable in the long-term to ensure compatible uses." Replace with: "A Masterplanning exercise is required to ascertain the appropriate future for the Airport and adjoining land. This document, once finalised, will be approved as supplementary guidance by the Council, and will be an important material consideration in the determination of any future planning applications. The Masterplan will consider the appropriate uses at Perth Airport, additional development that could take place both within the Airport, and on adjoining land, and the infrastructure required to deliver that." Or replace with: "A Development Brief will be prepared for Perth Airport and adjoining land, which will consider the appropriate uses at Perth Airport, additional development that could take place both within the Airport, and on adjoining land, and the infrastructure required to deliver that".

### Employment safeguarded site

Morris Leslie Group (0241/04/001): The Employment Safeguarding zoning should either be identified as a mixed use area, or, if that is not a zoning used in the Plan, then as 'white land'.

### Site allocation MU3

SEPA (0742/01/105): Requires the inclusion of a developer requirement for a FRA.

SEPA (0742/01/106): Recommend that a developer requirement is attached which addresses contamination issues.

### **Scone**

#### Settlement boundary

David Dykes (0086/01/001 & 008); David Gordon (0130/01/005); Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/006); Frances Hobbs (0152/01/005); Neil Myles (0153/01/005); John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/005); Peter & Vanessa Shand (0226/01/005); J D McKerracher (0245/01/006); Scone Community Council (0265/01/006); John W Rodgers (0304/01/006); Mr & Mrs Short (0382/01/003 & 11); Mr & Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/003); Ian Stratton (0480/01/001); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/003); David F Lewington (0486/01/003); Lisa Cardno (0599/01/006); James Thow (0668/01/005); Jennifer Throw (0669/01/005); Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/005); Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/006); Gerald Connolly (0712/01/006); Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/006); Stewart McCowan (0714/01/006); Angela McCowan (0715/01/006); Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/006); Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/006); Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/006); Shona Cowie (0719/01/006); Paul Cowie (0720/01/006); David Roy (0730/01/006); Greer Crighton (0731/01/006); Brian Hood (0732/01/006); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/006); Phillip Crighton (0734/01/006): All wish to change the settlement boundary to the boundary shown in LDP1.

William Stewart (0478/01/001): Would like the settlement boundary to incorporate his garden ground at Newmains Steading (Site Reference: H417).

William Glen & Sons (0564/01/001): Proposes that the settlement boundary is extended to accommodate two sites: one at Bargarvie Farm and the Bargarvie Cottages (Site Reference: H372) and one adjacent to the A94 for a mixed use development (Site ref: MU373).

Scone Estate (PP0614): Would like to see the inclusion of Pictstonhill site in the settlement boundary (Site Reference: H278).

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016); Gordon & Elaine Bannerman (0450/01/001); John & Janet Greaves (0479/01/001): All seek to extend the settlement boundary on the western edge (Site Reference: H371).

#### Site H29:

##### Principle of site

ES Wells (0409/01/001); Gordon & Elaine Bannerman (0450/01/001); Norah Stewart (0471/01/001); William Stewart (0478/01/002); John & Janet Greaves (0479/01/001); Rosalind Vallance (0606/01/001); James Vallance (0612/01/001); Clare & Ian Nicol (0665/01/001): Do not seek a specific change but it is interpreted that they wish to see the deletion of H29 site.

Ian Fairley (0427/01/002): Would like to see a change to the size of the site but does not

stipulate where this change would occur.

Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/009): Site Specific Developer Requirements are updated to reflect the likelihood of an archaeological investigation and/or protection of Scheduled Monuments being required.

#### Change of boundary

Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/006) would like the site boundary changed to reflect the boundary shown in LDP1.

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016); Gordon & Elaine Bannerman (0450/01/001); John & Janet Greaves (0479/01/001): All seek to extend the allocation on the western edge.

#### Density range

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016): Propose that the number of units should be increased to 1000 at H29.

#### Developer requirements

David Dykes (0086/01/009); Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/007); Frances Hobbs (0152/01/006); Neil Myles (0153/01/006); John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/006); Peter & Vanessa Shand (0226/01/006); J D McKerracher (0245/01/007); Scone Community Council (0265/01/007); John W Rodgers (0304/01/007); Mr & Mrs Short (0382/01/009); Mr & Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/001); Moira Andrew & William Hadden (0432/01/003); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/002); David F Lewington (0486/01/001); Jill Belch & Lucy Vanderham (0505/02/001); Andrew & Margaret Manson (0533/01/001); James Nicol (0568/01/001); Lisa Cardno (0599/001/007); James Thow (0668/01/006); Jennifer Throw (0669/01/006); Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/006); Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/007); Gerald Connolly (0712/01/007); Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/007); Stewart McCowan (0714/01/007); Angela McCowan (0715/01/007); Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/007); Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/007); Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/007); Shona Cowie (0719/01/007); Paul Cowie (0720/01/007); David Roy (0730/01/007); Greer Crighton (0731/01/007); Brian Hood (0732/01/007); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/007); Phillip Crighton (0734/01/007); SEPA (0742/01/108): Would like to see the developer requirement regarding flooding that was in LDP1 to be reinstated.

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/015): Would like a 50m buffer as a measure to elevate indirect impacts on ancient woodland. Although this is not specified as a change to the developer requirements, it is interpreted that a change to the developer requirements would meet this recommendation.

#### Site drawing of H29

Ian Stephens (0090/01/003): Would like to change the drawing to show the correct junction information for the CTRL but does not specify where he considers this to be.

David Dykes (0086/01/013); Scone Community Council (0265/01/006); Moira Andrew & William Hadden (0432/01/007); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/002); David F Lewington (0486/01/001); Jill Belch & Lucy Vanderham (0505/01/001); Lisa Cardno (0599/001/013); James Vallance (0612/01/001); Rosalind Vallance (0606/01/002); Greer Crighton (0731/01/013); Brian Hood (0732/01/013); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/013); Phillip Crighton (0734/01/007); Ian & Helen Burnett (0740/01/001): Would like a change to the site drawing to reflect the developer's Masterplan in terms of the open space along the southern

boundary of the site.

#### The Glebe School site OP22

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/016): Would like protection measures to avoid negative edge effects to the area of ancient woodland. Although this is not specified as a change to the developer requirements, it is interpreted that a change to the developer requirements would meet this recommendation.

Mr & Mrs J McLaren (0282/01/001); Jill Guthrie (0477/01/001); Sheena Thom (0224/01/002); Janis Walker (0511/01/001); Douglas A Sutherland (0670/01/001): Do not seek a specific change but it is interpreted that they wish to see the deletion of Op22 site.

Mr & Mrs J McLaren (0282/01/001): Would like to have the site capacity reduced although does not specify the number of units to change to.

Sheena Thom (0224/01/002): Would like further clarity is required regarding the Site Specific Developer Requirements as an 'Affordable housing site'.

#### Angus Road site MU4

SEPA (0742/01/112): Object to development requirements for this site and would like to see a Flood Risk Assessment.

#### **Stanley**

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/017): Would like the ancient woodland to be designated at the south of the settlement boundary and ensure it is not made available for development.

David Fenner (0593/01/002): Does not seek a specific change but it is interpreted that he wishes to see the deletion of H30, H31, H32, H33 & H34 from the plan.

Vilma Dovidaityte (0469/01/001): Does not seek a specific change but it is interpreted that he wishes to see the deletion of H31.

Harris and Sheldon (0518/01/001): Propose an extension to Site H31 and a change of use from greenspace to residential use (Extended Site Reference: H332).

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

#### **Balbeggie**

##### Housing Allocation H13

Morris Leslie Group (0241/03/001): The site specific developer requirements have been written to highlight any identified or potential issues that might be on site or within the settlement. Whilst the school is currently not at capacity, it has a current occupancy of 53 with a capacity of 73 (PKC Schools Occupancy & Capacity Information, CD124). Any larger development within Balbeggie will need to be phased carefully to ensure that the school can cope with any consequent rise in pupil numbers. This is not a requirement unique to Balbeggie or this development but is raised as a potential issue in a number of

different settlements.

The reference to road and access improvements in relation to the Roads Authority is also a standard text for many of the housing allocations within the plan. This is to ensure that any layout is designed in consultation with the Council's Transport Planning team. It is essential that the roads layout and construction is acceptable to the Council as the Roads Authority as this is a prerequisite for the public adoption of the roads. The Council does not consider it generally acceptable for a housing site of 5 or more to be served by private roads due to the potential problems with long term maintenance. Access to the site is required from both roads to ensure connectivity and accessibility through the site and into the village. This site should have two access points and therefore referencing that both are required should be retained. The applicant will be required to demonstrate that the delivery of the road in its entirety is within their control. Furthermore, the development of a core path linkage through the site does not require a reference to phasing. This can be determined at planning application stage. There could be a number of strategies to deliver this requirement and it is unnecessary for the plan to identify them.

In terms of the comments regarding the embargo, this site is currently under the embargo and will not be brought forward until the CTRLR is a committed project. The Plan recognises the issues in relation to congestion and proposes measures to provide solutions to the problem. The road network in the area is capable of accommodating further development which will have to comply with Policy 58: Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements of the Plan. Further discussion on the embargo, the issues surrounding the term "committed" and work on air pollution are all further detailed in the Schedule 4 Issue no: 03 Perth Area Transport Issues.

Scottish Water has been fully engaged within the LDP process and has not raised any issues regarding the sewerage capacity at Balbeggie. It is therefore not noted as a specific developer requirement. Policy 51B: Foul Drainage in the Proposed Plan ensures that all foul drainage from developments will require connection into the public sewerage system. A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of the application process. This will identify if there are issues to be addressed.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

### **Bridge of Earn / Oudenarde**

#### **Infrastructure & Services**

Edwin & Irene Barclay (0394/01/002): TAYplan (CD022) identifies Bridge of Earn as part of the Tier 1 Perth Core Area and as an outlying village to Perth, it is expected to contribute to the housing land requirement in the Perth Core Area. The sites allocated in the Proposed Plan allow for meeting the housing land requirement in the next plan period and beyond, providing a range of long term development opportunities. The scale of development proposed in the Plan is considered to be in line with the TAYplan strategy. Please see the schedule 4 on Issue 01A for further consideration of the housing land strategy issue.

The implications of the level of growth on the capacity of local infrastructure are discussed in the Infrastructure Study for the Perth Core Villages (CD048). The study compiles a range of datasets which are used to inform the preparation of the Local Development Plan and analyses the information at a settlement level. The study highlights the strengths and

weaknesses of local infrastructure and refers to the improvements that can be facilitated through new development. Specifically addressing the point regarding medical services in the village, as noted in the infrastructure study (p. 3-4) it has been recognised that the GP surgery is close to capacity and there is a need for new/extended GP premises in the area, which NHS Tayside and the Council are actively exploring. The study also highlights that the development at Oudenarde will include community facilities to serve Oudenarde and the wider area. As outlined in the Infrastructure Study, Bridge of Earn currently has a good range of services and facilities including: two schools (as well as private school accommodation), a post office, pharmacy, a community hub, village hall accommodation, small convenience store, and a range of cafes, personal services, restaurants and public houses.

Whilst it is recognised that there may be some pressures from new development on existing infrastructure and services, the Council is working with a range of stakeholders to ensure that any impacts on services and amenities from new development are suitably addressed and opportunities for enhanced services are realised.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Site – H14

D King Properties Ltd (0461/03/002): The southern boundary of Site H14 has been drawn to avoid development taking place on the elevated ground to the south of the site. Developing this elevated section of the field would result in a prominent and visually obtrusive development which would detract from the setting of the village edge, particularly from the south. As such the proposed site extension is not supported. The approved proposals as part of planning application ref: 15/02176/FLM for Site H72 (CD146) - which is now under construction – is to establish a continuous landscaped area along the southern boundaries of sites H72 and H14 to produce a more defined and defensible settlement edge. The boundary and landscaping for site H14 is considered to be consistent with and capable of connecting in to the approved landscaping proposals as part of planning application ref: 15/02176/FLM (CD147). This is reflected in the developer requirement for the site relating specifically to landscaping which states: 'A landscape framework is required. Development to be contained north of the ridge line and a suitable boundary treatment to create village edge, enhance biodiversity and create new habitats.' The site is therefore not required to be extended to ensure the landscaped edge is implemented. In addition, an extended H14 site has not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation.

In relation to housing capacity numbers the Council does not propose extending the site and the medium housing density calculation for the site (as identified in the Housing Background Paper (CD018)) is considered to be suitable for this edge of settlement site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However should the Reporter be minded to accept the modification, the Council would request that the developer prepare a detailed topographical survey alongside detailed layout designs to enable an assessment of the impact that an extended site would have on the wider setting of the village, particularly in relation to the elevated part of the field. This request is only sought if the Reporter is minded to accept the modification to extend site H14.

Bobbie Stibbles (0247/01/001); Edwin & Irene Barclay (0394/01/001): Specific concerns regarding flooding and drainage associated with Site H14 will be addressed through a

Drainage Impact Assessment and associated site layout to be further considered at the planning application stage. The requirement for the developer to undertake a DIA is ensured through a site specific developer requirement. In relation to the impact on the vehicle and pedestrian network, it has already been considered above that Bridge of Earn as a Perth Core village is expected to accommodate additional growth over the plan period and beyond, and therefore an infrastructure study has been prepared to enable the Council to identify what the existing level of services are and what impacts further growth would have on the village. It is considered that the development of site H14 will not give rise to a significant adverse impact on the vehicle or pedestrian network and details regarding access, pedestrian links etc, will be addressed at the planning application stage. Similarly, detailed considerations relating to car parking for the site will be addressed at the planning application stage and commensurate levels of parking for the site based on the number of houses will be expected as part of any proposal.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Site – H72

D King Properties Ltd (0461/03/001): It is not considered necessary to identify the details of the planning permission associated with site H72 (ref: 15/02176/FLM) as a specific developer requirement. The site is already under construction and any consideration of the site as part of any future planning application would take in to account any relevant planning history for the site as part of the decision making process without the need for a specific developer requirement.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Site – H15 (Oudenarde)

Shell UK Limited (0195/01/001): The Bridge of Earn/Oudenarde settlement map (p. 144) already shows the route of the pipeline consultation zone. The individual site drawings (including the drawing for Site H15 (p. 146)) have not spatially shown all relevant constraints as this would result in an overly complex and cluttered map. This does not mean that the constraints will not be considered, the policy framework and site specific requirements contained in the Plan will ensure that necessary considerations will be given due cognisance from initial site design to the planning application stage. It is important to note that the site drawing for H15 has been informed by the approved masterplan (CD148-9), as amended, for the site. In addition, Policy 52 (Health and Safety Consultation Zones) provides policy coverage for the issue of pipeline consultation zones and will ensure that any planning application for Site H15, and other sites where this is a requirement, will be consulted with the necessary authorities.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

TACTRAN (0057/01/21); Network Rail (0509/01/007): comments noted.

### **Luncarty**

#### Luncarty South MU27

John Fowle (0047/01/001); Moira & Alastair Bulcraig (0185/01/001); Ian & Fiona Heywood (0144/01/001); Alison Peters-Waistell (0288/01/001); Janet Ramsey (0406/01/001);

Alisdair Godfrey (0410/01/018); Frank Stevenson (0422/01/002); George Black (0428/01/001); Lorna Nicoll (0503/01/001); Susan Duncan (0527/01/003); Lorna Wallace (0531/01/001); Clare Lee (0565/01/001); David Fenner (0593/01/001); A. Robb (0619/01/001); Mrs I Brown (0637/01/001); Luncarty, Redgorton and Moneydie Community Council (0703/01/002); Bruce Burns (0663/01/003 & 004): Luncarty South is a site that is already allocated in the current adopted LDP. Furthermore, it has an approved planning in principle permission on it for 650 units (17/00847/IPM DM Report, CD238), with the required Masterplan and phasing plan approved (CD268). As such, the principle of development on this site is no longer in question and a change of designation to Green Belt is therefore not possible at this point in the process. As part of the planning application process, a Planning Application Notice was issued and a public consultation held on the design of the site. In addition, the site underwent a full Environmental Impact Assessment which highlights any environmental constraints and provides details on mitigation of these constraints. A Section 75 is in the process of being agreed for the site that will ensure these issues are legally covered.

Many of the concerns raised regarding the site have been addressed through the planning application process. The issues presented regarding access to the site, within the site and connectivity into the settlement have had considerable internal discussion. Condition Number 3 states only a maximum of 200 dwellings can be occupied before 2024 and requires that a scheme for new road infrastructure solutions must be identified to ensure enhancement of connectivity and integration with Luncarty and the wider area. In terms of the impact this development has on the wider network, it is anticipated that this long term phasing should allow for improvements to be implemented to the road network to accommodate the development. There is a cycle route that runs through the site and into Perth. The Active Travel Strategy for Perth and Kinross proposals should further assist in supporting alternative forms of travel (CD239). Condition 7 further ensures that all existing rights of way and core paths within or adjacent to the development shall be protected. In terms of concerns regarding construction disruption, Condition 23 ensures a Construction Traffic Management Scheme is submitted prior to commencement of works and Condition 9 requires a noise assessment.

Whilst it is acknowledged that this is a large site that will expand Luncarty considerably, it must be remembered that this a long term development and the build out rate for it will extend well beyond the Plan period of 2028. The design and layout of the site will be further established during the full application process. The visual quality of developments is an important planning consideration and Proposed LDP2 policy provisions, particularly those relating placemaking, will appropriately inform proposals coming forward. The density of the site has been reviewed in line with all sites allocated in the LDP to provide a density range. It was calculated on the areas of developable land using medium density 16-25 for 30% of the developable area and low density 15 for 30% of site. The other 40% of the site is required for Employment Land and landscaping, specifically the buffer required adjacent to the River Tay (Perth & Kinross Proposed Local Development Plan 2: Housing Background Paper, CD018). Further information regarding this process is discussed in 01B: Placemaking Schedule 4. Luncarty is protected from coalescence with Perth by clear settlement boundaries and the existing Green Belt that is located to the south of Luncarty.

Concerns raised over existing village facilities are acknowledged. As part of the process, however, Education and the NHS are consulted to ensure that capacity issues are identified at an early stage in the process. Whilst there will be a long term impact on certain services, the development of this site a long term and will be phased. The primary

school is currently at 70% capacity and there are no immediate concerns regarding the impact this development will have on the school roll (CD124). Condition 28 requires a contribution to the primary school provision to deal with long term capacity issues. The current primary school sits adjacent to the park and is capable of expansion. The site is allocated as Mixed Use and has an Employment Allocation. As such, the allocation has the potential to accommodate some small businesses within the development. The allocation is located close to Perth which will serve the wider needs of the residents. It is anticipated that the development will support local shops and services and may encourage new facilities in the longer term.

Conditions have been placed on the development in terms of landscaping, biodiversity and archaeology. Condition 15 specifically states: "The conclusions and recommended action points within the supporting Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and hereby approved shall be fully adhered to, respected and undertaken as part of the construction phase of development." Through the planning process, many of the issues raised have been identified and therefore the Council considers the site allocation to be an appropriate one.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

## **Methven**

### New Sites

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/011); Mr & Mrs P. Sloan (0655/01/001 & 0655/02/001):

In relation to housing land supply, it is already considered that there is sufficient supply across the Council area to satisfy housing demand and therefore no additional windfall or allocated sites are required. Please see the Schedule 4 on Issue 01 for further consideration of the housing land strategy issue.

Dealing specifically with Methven, there is an existing consented housing site to the east of the village which is currently under construction which will allow for a significant expansion of the settlement in line with TAYplan expectations in relation to Methven being a Perth Core village. The Council's Housing Land Audit (2017) (CD050) notes that 31 houses were built from 2013-2017, with 80 houses still to be built with a programme date of 10 houses per year up until 2029-30. As at March 2018, the draft 2018 HLA (CD049) notes that 6 further houses have been built resulting in 74 houses still to be constructed. There is therefore no requirement to identify an additional housing site to provide housing supply over and above the site currently under construction which will provide significant growth in the village over the next 10 or so years.

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/011): The Council and the Reporter for the Examination of the current Local Development Plan saw merit in the development of this small site to the south of Main Street, as part of a longer-term planned growth area. However, as noted above, this is currently not supported due to the significant housing site to the east of the village which is expected to be built out over the next 10 or so years. The development of a masterplan study for Methven, alongside a design-based exercise for this specific site could be a sensible option as part of the next Plan review to consider the wider development options for the village and the potential impacts of the site and other candidate sites. This would enable a review of current completion rates at the site under construction and ensure the smaller site would not prejudice the long term potential for

growth to the south of the village. The proposed site to the south of Main Street has also not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation and therefore the Council would not suggest including the site within the settlement boundary or as an additional housing allocation.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mr & Mrs P. Sloan (0655/01/001 & 0655/02/001): Developing land to the north of Strathview Place would adversely affect the setting of the village, in particular encroaching above the 95m contour line and having an unacceptably prominent location on the hillside above the village. The rest of the village does not extend above this height and the area was not considered suitable for expansion in the Perth Landscape Capacity study (CD047). The proposed site(s) to the north of Strathview Place have also not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation and therefore the Council would not suggest including the site(s) within the settlement boundary or as an additional housing allocation.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

## **Perth Airport**

### Settlement Summary

Morris Leslie Group (0241/04/002): The sentence "A more holistic approach to Masterplanning the whole area is desirable in the long-term to ensure compatible uses" has been worded as an aspiration for the next LDP. The Masterplan approach is aimed to ensure that the design and layout establishes compatible uses. It should also to ensure that supports active travel with safe walking and cycling routes through the settlement. The aim of this wording is not to specify the extent of the area or what is expected. This will be established when undertaking the analysis required for the Masterplan. The wording proposed by the Morris Leslie Group is too specific and makes mention of adjoining areas to the airport. As the develop-ability of these areas has not yet been established, it would be premature to reference this approach in the plan. Furthermore, any strategy will need to establish what infrastructure, allowing from key stakeholder and community engagement through public consultation. The Council considers the current statement to provide an adequate base to initiate the masterplanning preparation for this area.

No modification proposed the Plan.

### Employment safeguarded site

Morris Leslie Group (0241/04/001): The Employment safeguarded site at Perth Airport was established in the adopted LDP. This safeguarding is to ensure that there is an adequate supply of areas that specific types of employment can be located in. By allowing increasing amounts of residential development within this area, there is a reduction in the area that can be provided for activities that are not conducive with residential amenity. Nonetheless, Perth Airport is a complicated area. It was originally World War II airbase which accommodated pilots and has had residential accommodation on site for its entire existence. However, this was primarily temporary accommodation rather than actual homes for families. Over time, different types of business including retail have moved into the settlement, creating a mixture of uses. The predominant usage remains as

employment. The settlement statement acknowledges this issue and states the need for a more holistic approach to Perth Airport in the long term. This approach is considered a better long term solution than the current piecemeal development that this settlement has seen. There was a recent planning application that proposed a change of use from an antiques shop to a residential development to form 14 flats (17/00367/FLL DM Report, CD240). This was initially refused by the Appointed Planning Officer but the decision was then overturned by the Local Review Body (Decision Report, CD171). A longer term approach to ensure that employment uses can still flourish in this location is required. This can be supported by developing a Masterplan that could identify areas that could be retained for employment uses and areas more appropriate for accommodation. This would be preferable to the fragmentary development currently being seen and would allow for compatible uses to be identified in appropriate locations. To designate this area as Mixed Use without this work being undertaken could potentially see a significant area of Employment Land being lost through piecemeal residential development.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

### Site allocation MU3

SEPA (0742/01/105 & 106): MU3 is a Mixed Use allocation in the adopted LDP and now has in principle planning consent (16/01935/IPM DM Report, CD241). As such, the principle of development is no longer in question. Any work in terms of the site capacity and design will now be dealt with through a detailed planning application. Conditions have been placed on this site in terms of foul drainage, SUDS, landscaping and contamination in consultation with SEPA which will address the issues they have raised during this consultation.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

## **Scone**

### Settlement statement

David Dykes (0086/001/010); Malcolm Cameron (0324/01/001); Moira Andrew & William Hadden (0432/01/001 & 002); June Dunn (0442/01/002); Ian Stratton (0480/01/003); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/001): The settlement statement is primarily a short introduction to the settlement in terms of strategy, land use allocations and key infrastructure that is proposed. The Perth Core Villages Infrastructure Report 2017 provides further detailed information about the current status of services and facilities in Scone (CD048). In terms of community improvements, there are a number of potential improvements that the developments at Scone can deliver. Developer contributions have been sought in terms of education, recreational facilities and affordable housing for the Scone North site. Air quality is identified as an issue specifically in terms of Bridgend & Atholl Street in Perth. Scone has not currently been identified as requiring an AQAP. As part of a strategy to combat any additional impact on Perth, an embargo has been placed on further development in the A93/A94 corridors until the CTRL is a committed project. The anticipated date of the embargo ending is now 2020. There is a question over the date that the embargo ends as it is reliant on sources of funding for the CTRL and delivery of the actual infrastructure. There is further discussion on this subject in the Schedule 4 Issue no: 03 Perth Area Transport Issues and the decisions regarding the date that the embargo is lifted will be determined in that report. Scone has not seen unrestricted development. The designated Green Belt policy area and the strategy of allocating long

terms sites is to ensure that Scone does not see unrestrictive development.

No modification proposed to the Plan. However, the Council have no objection to updating the date that the embargo is lifted depending on the outcome of the Tay Cities Deal bid. Schedule 4 Issue no: 03 Perth Area Transport Issues.

### Scone Settlement Boundary

David Dykes (0086/01/001 & 008); David Gordon (0130/01/005); Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/006); Frances Hobbs (0152/01/005); Neil Myles (0153/01/005); John Brian Milarvie (0171/01/005); Peter & Vanessa Shand (0226/01/005); J D McKerracher (0245/01/006); Scone Community Council (0265/01/006); John W Rodgers (0304/01/006); Mr & Mrs Short (0382/01/003 & 11); Mr & Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/003); Ian Stratton (0480/01/001); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/003); David F Lewington (0486/01/003); Lisa Cardno (0599/01/006); James Thow (0668/01/005); Jennifer Throw (0669/01/005); Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/005); Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/006); Gerald Connolly (0712/01/006); Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/006); Stewart McCowan (0714/01/006); Angela McCowan (0715/01/006); Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/006); Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/006); Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/006); Shona Cowie (0719/01/006); Paul Cowie (0720/01/006); David Roy (0730/01/006); Greer Crighton (0731/01/006); Brian Hood (0732/01/006); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/006); Phillip Crighton (0734/01/006): The settlement boundary change at the Scone North H29 site was a minor alteration to allow for better access into the site and to reduce the impact on the residents of Harper's Way. This change was made in response to comments received from the public and was then supported by Council. This revised site boundary was approved planning permission in May 2017 with the consequential changes to the green belt boundary and settlement boundary being a knock on effect (16/02127/IPM DM Report, CD245). It was identified as acceptable as it was less than a 1% change to the overall site area. As this has already been through the full planning process and approved, the LDP is simply reflecting this update.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

William Stewart (0478/01/001): In terms of the proposal change the settlement boundary at Newmains Steading, the boundary does currently cut through the middle of this area of garden ground. The garden is a very large one and could potentially accommodate development if it were white land. This would not be desirable in this location which is a steading conversion, currently remote from the settlement. Nonetheless, all the other large gardens within this steading conversion have their garden grounds within the settlement boundary and for consistency's sake, it might be better to adjust the boundary accordingly.

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

William Glen & Sons (0564/01/001); Scone Estate (0614/01/002): In terms of the suggestions to extend the settlement boundary at Balgarvie Farm and Cottages and the area adjacent to the A94 (Sites H372 & MU373), the settlement boundary is drawn tightly around this location to prevent unplanned development from taking place on the edge of Scone. The inclusion of these sites which would potentially accommodate a significant number of units. Scone has a number of allocations already within the plan and requires no further areas for housing at this present time. White land within the settlement

boundary sometimes enables development in areas that struggle to attract housing but as Scone has a number of planned developments, this is not the case. The white land referred to by Scone Estates has been included within the settlement boundary since the Perth Area Plan in 1996 (CD138). This area was an allocated housing site. The development of this site is almost complete but the base mapping from Ordnance Survey had not been updated to reflect this at the time the maps were published. There is actually only a small area of land that is undeveloped within the settlement boundary which is providing a landscape buffer between the farm and the village. This area also accommodates a play area. The argument in favour of excluding an area of land that is already developed and including the site at Pictonshill instead would be illogical. The Pictonshill proposal was suggested at Pre MIR state and considered to have a significant impact on the landscape setting of Scone and would further cause coalescence between Scone and Perth. It is also within the Green Belt. It is therefore not identified as a housing allocation within the Plan.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

Gordon & Elaine Bannerman (0450/01/001); John & Janet Greaves (0479/01/001); A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016): The "Enhanced Western Gateway" at the north west edge of the settlement has been proposed by A&J Stephen Ltd as a solution to the access constraints in this area of Scone (CD243). The resulting proposal would allow for the road to be re-engineered to provide a wider road and remove the current tight corner on the route out the Old Scone. It would also provide the settlement with a new entrance, by providing a village green with housing facing onto it. Nonetheless, although this was one proposal at the H29 PAN events, this was not taken forward in the planning application for Scone North. There is no requirement for further housing within Scone at this time but to address the open space access issues, this proposal could be brought forward in the future.

No modification to the Proposed Plan.

#### Scone North Housing Site Allocation H29:

##### Principle of site

Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/009); ES Wells (0409/01/001); Ian Fairley (0427/01/002); Gordon & Elaine Bannerman (0450/01/001); Norah Stewart (0471/01/001); CM Evans (0474/01/002); William Stewart (0478/01/002); John & Janet Greaves (0479/01/001); Rosalind Vallance (0606/01/001); James Vallance (0612/01/001); Clare & Ian Nicol (0665/01/001): Scone North is a site that is already allocated in the current adopted LDP and has been through the Examination process (Examination Report, CD015). Furthermore, it has an approved planning in principle permission on it for 700 units, of which only 100 of which can be constructed before the CTRL is a committed project. There is an approved Masterplan and phasing plan (CD172). As such, the principle of development on this site is no longer in question. As part of the planning application process, a Planning Application Notice was issued and a public consultation held on the design of the site. In addition, the site underwent a full Environmental Impact Assessment which highlighted any environmental constraints and provided details on mitigation of these constraints. A Section 75 has been agreed for the site that will ensure these issues are legally covered (CD266). In terms of some of the specific issues addressed concerning this site, both biodiversity and archaeology have been duly addressed through the conditions placed on this site (16/02127/IPM DM Report, CD245). Conditions 12 to 14 specifically place restrictions on the timing of development and the

protection of habitats and species. Condition 36 requires the implementation of a programme of archaeological work before development commences.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

#### Change of boundary

Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/007): The site boundary change at the Scone North H29 site was a minor alteration to allow for better access into the site and to reduce the impact on the residents of Harper's Way. This revised site boundary was approved planning permission in May 2017 with the consequential changes to the green belt boundary and settlement boundary being a knock on effect. It was identified as acceptable as it was less than a 1% change to the overall site area. As this has already been through the full planning process and approved, the LDP is simply reflecting this update.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

Gordon & Elaine Bannerman (0450/01/001); John & Janet Greaves (0479/01/001); A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016): The "Enhanced Western Gateway" at the north west tip of the settlement has been proposed by A&J Stephen Ltd as a solution to the access constraints in this area of Scone (CD243). The resulting proposal would allow for the road to be re-engineered to provide a wider road and remove the current tight corner on the route out the Old Scone. It would also provide the settlement with a new entrance, by providing a village green with housing facing onto it. Nonetheless, although this was one proposal at the H29 PAN events, this was not taken forward in the planning application for Scone North. There is no requirement for further housing within Scone at this time but to address the open space access issues, this proposal could be brought forward in the future.

No modification to the Proposed Plan.

#### Density range

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/016): In terms of the number of units allocated to Scone North, this is reflective of the settlement context. Comparing the density range for the site with Bertha Park is not appropriate as the two sites are very different. Bertha Park represents a new urban village within Perth. It will have a range of services and infrastructure developed alongside the actual housing for the new residents of the area. Scone North is linked very closely to an existing settlement with an established built form. Scone identifies as a village although it is located close to Perth. The density range is therefore reflective of the village context within which this allocation is located. It would therefore be unsuitable to compare the housing numbers that can be delivered on each of these sites. Furthermore, only 55% of the site is identified as developable due to constraints regarding the CTLR and associated landscaping requirements (detailed in Housing Background Paper, CD018).

No modification proposed to the Plan.

#### Developer requirements

David Dykes (0086/01/009); Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/007); Frances Hobbs (0152/01/006); Neil Myles (0153/01/006); John Brian Milavie (0171/01/006); Peter &

Vanessa Shand (0226/01/006); J D McKerracher (0245/01/007); Scone Community Council (0265/01/007); John W Rodgers (0304/01/007); Mr & Mrs Short (0382/01/009); Mr & Mrs Stewart Reith (0389/01/001); Moira Andrew & William Hadden (0432/01/003); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/002); David F Lewington (0486/01/001); Jill Belch & Lucy Vanderham (0505/02/001); Andrew & Margaret Manson (0533/01/001); James Nicol (0568/01/001); Lisa Cardno (0599/001/007); James Thow (0668/01/006); Jennifer Throw (0669/01/006); Martin RW Rhodes (0675/01/006); Hazel MacKinnon (0705/01/007); Gerald Connolly (0712/01/007); Eric Ogilvy (0713/01/007); Stewart McCowan (0714/01/007); Angela McCowan (0715/01/007); Gladys Ogilvy (0716/01/007); Graham Ogilvie (0717/01/007); Tracy Ogilvie (0718/01/007); Shona Cowie (0719/01/007); Paul Cowie (0720/01/007); David Roy (0730/01/007); Greer Crichton (0731/01/007); Brian Hood (0732/01/007); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/007); Phillip Crichton (0734/01/007); SEPA (0742/01/108): The developer requirements were updated to reflect the fact that the site now had planning permission and had already been through the full EIA process as well as having flooding and drainage surveys.

No modification proposed to the Plan. Nonetheless, if the Reporter is minded to do so, the Council have no objection to reinstating the flooding and drainage requirements as it will have no impact on any other part of the plan.

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/015); Ian Stratton (0480/01/003): In terms of the issue regarding low carbon energy buildings, there are specific requirements that each developer is obliged to meet in terms of achieving low carbon standards. These are monitored through the planning application and building standards process. Conditions 4 & 5 in the Planning Report provide extensive criteria that must be adhered to regarding sustainability (16/02127/IPM DM Report, CD245). In terms of Woodlands Trust's comments regarding Ancient Woodland, Condition 8 requires a detailed site investigation in consultation with SNH to be undertaken prior to the submission of any detailed application. This aims to clarify any remaining AWI characteristics are not compromised as a result of the proposed development.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

#### Site drawing of H29

David Dykes (0086/01/013); Ian Stephens (0090/01/003); Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/013); Scone Community Council (0265/01/006); Moira Andrew & William Hadden (0432/01/007); Jeffery Rowlingson (0485/01/002); David F Lewington (0486/01/001); Jill Belch & Lucy Vanderham (0505/01/001); Andrew & Margaret Manson (0533/01/001); Lisa Cardno (0599/001/013); James Vallance (0612/01/001); Rosalind Vallance (0606/01/002); Greer Crichton (0731/01/013); Brian Hood (0732/01/013); Gaynor Hood (0733/01/013); Phillip Crichton (0734/01/007); Ian & Helen Burnett (0740/01/001): The site drawing is only indicative; it is providing a visual representation of the how the site will be developed in terms of access points and developable areas. It also provides an indication of the constraints that exist on the site. As such, it is meant to be loosely drawn and will not have exact measurements of land or details as to how access is addressed. The Masterplan submitted as part of the planning application was used to inform this drawing.

No modification proposed to the Plan. However, the Council have no objection to updating the drawing as long as this has no impact on any of the other drawings in terms of the key. A suggested replacement diagram has been provided (CD244).

### Access to the site

David Gordon (0130/01/004); Mr & Mrs Fleming (0150/01/007); Ian Fairley (0427/01/002): The allocation of Scone North as a site has undergone a number of rounds of consultation. The site was proposed and allocated in the adopted LDP. It went to Examination and was agreed at Council as an allocated site. It then underwent a planning application that was granted consent in May 2017. Road connections have been looked at in considerable detail and approaches to the CTRLR being sited within the development have been discussed. A Transport Assessment was submitted as part of the planning application (CD247). The site can be connected to the road system at both edges and is well connected in terms of pedestrian and cyclist access through sections of the settlement edge. Local residents have been consulted over the design and layout and through the detailed phases, further work will be undertaken. Conditions 21-23 in the Planning Report specially require a Construction Traffic Management Plan, a further Transport Assessment that provides more detail regarding the phasing of the development and a Green Travel Plan before development can take place (16/02127/IPM DM Report, CD245).

No modification proposed to the Plan.

### Embargo on development of the site

June Dunn (0442/01/001): The embargo applies to Scone North as it does to a number of sites within the area. However, the Reporter at the LDP1 Examination allowed for 100 units to be brought forward before the end of the embargo to give the developer assurance that this site would be delivered. As there was no legal reason to prevent this decision and no new evidence was brought forward to reconsider, the Council are bound to accept this decision. Therefore, 100 houses can be approved before the CTRLR is a committed project as approved by full Council when the plan was adopted. This is reflected in Condition 25: "No more than 100 residential units are permitted to be occupied until the Cross Tay Link Road (CTRLR) as proposed by Perth and Kinross Council as part of its 'Perth Transport Futures Project' transport strategy is agreed by the Planning Authority to constitute a 'committed project', in consultation with Transport Scotland" (16/02127/IPM DM Report, CD245).

No modification proposed to the Plan.

### The Glebe School site OP22

Sheena Thom (0224/01/002); Mr & Mrs J McLaren (0282/01/001); Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/016); Jill Guthrie (0477/01/001); Janis Walker (0511/01/001); Douglas A Sutherland (0670/01/001): This site is already in the adopted LDP 2014 and therefore the principle of the site is already agreed. Furthermore, this is a brownfield site that has already had development on it. Many of the concerns raised have been shown on the indicative drawing as constraints or opportunities. The site is currently being designed and consultation events are underway to engage with the local community as to how they wish the site to be approached. Two access points have been identified into the site and this is anticipated to reduce the impact on Abbey Road. Pedestrian access is highlighted as a key part of the site design as well as the retention of the football pitch and the mature trees in the Proposed Plan. The ancient woodland adjacent to the site is out with the site boundary although further work will need to be carried out in terms of identifying the

impacts of an access point through the woodland. This will be part of the design process currently underway. The design of the site will determine the capacity. The density range is to allow for flexibility in terms of the design approach. The indicative drawing provides a framework within which the design should fit. Whilst tenure is not a specific issue in terms of LDP allocations, there is also additional work being undertaken within the Housing Service to identify the local needs in terms of the type of affordable housing that is required within Scone.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

#### Angus Road site MU4

SEPA (0742/01/112): If the Reporter is minded to do so, the Council have no objection to listing an FRA as a developer requirement as it will have no impact on any other part of the plan.

#### **Stanley**

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/017); Vilma Dovidaityte (0469/01/002); Harris and Sheldon (0518/01/001); David Fenner (0593/01/002): Stanley has 5 housing allocations that are already allocation in the adopted LDP. These sites have been brought forward in a planning application as a Masterplan that establishes the overall principle of development on each site and the infrastructure requirements that need to be met in order for Stanley to incorporate the overall housing numbers (CD173). This has now received approval (17/00088/IPM DM Report, CD247) and a Section 75 agreement has now been agreed (CD268). As such, key services such as the school, recreational facilities and public transport have been identified for developer contributions that will address some of the concerns raised. In terms of the medical centre, the NHS is consulted and aware of the proposed housing developments. In terms of water and sewerage capacity, Scottish Water is involved early on in discussions regarding settlements and has not raised any concerns regarding Stanley. As this development will be phased over the long term, it should be noted that there will be no rapid change to the demographics of the village and that the timing of the development should allow for changes to be addressed.

In terms of specific concerns regarding Housing Site H31, the indicative landscaping is identified to ensure there is appropriate breathing space between the site and the River Tay. The indicative drawing for H31 is reflective of the approved Masterplan which clearly demonstrates this area for landscaping (Masterplan drawing, CD248). Issues regarding sunlight and loss of privacy and relationship to nearby land uses are issues that will be dealt with at full planning application when the site has a detailed layout and housing proposal. They are not anticipated to be a monumental problem, however. Details in terms of construction traffic will also require to be submitted before development can commence. A Transport Assessment was also submitted as part of the Planning in Principle Application which analyses traffic generation (CD247). Flooding, drainage and air quality are likewise assessed through the planning application.

No modification proposed to the Plan.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

