

Issue 37	Highland Area – Settlements without Proposals	
Development plan reference:	Butterstone, page152 Camserney, page 153 Croftinloan, page 174 Fearnan, page 191 Grandtully, page 200 Kinloch Rannoch, page 219 Strathtay, page 200	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Graham Forsyth (0104) Glen Lyon and Loch Tay Community Council (0269) Frances Donovan (0298) Mr Alex Glynn (0308) Mrs Glynn (0309) Mr Glynn (0310) Mr John & Mrs Lesley Raeburn (0315) Fearnan Village Association (0345)		Scottish National Heritage (SNH) (0353) Angela Sweeney (0371) Peter Hounam (0390) ED Capital (0547) Butterstone Estate (0556) P Keir Doe (0598/09) A&J Stephen Limited (0622) Nick & Rosalind Grant (0629) Mr M Henderson (0673)
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Development sites in Highland area non-tiered settlements which do not have specific allocations	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<u>Butterstone – Settlement Boundary Amendment</u>  Butterstone Estate (0556/01/001): Propose an amendment to the settlement boundary.  The sites within the proposed settlement expansion will provide residential opportunities for the local community longer term, in an area where affordable housing is in short supply and high demand. The affordable housing allocation can be provided on site. The sites are not situated on prime agricultural land and are directly adjacent to the Butterstone village. The topography is such that the landscaping and trees offer a backdrop to the potential development reducing the visual impact.  Field one is currently the playing fields for the New School. The proposed amendment to the settlement boundary will offer the opportunity to cross fund additional facilities for the school; the possibility of development on the playing fields is potentially pivotal to ensure the long-term viability of the school. The school is the largest employer in the area employing 40 full time and part time staff.  The sites will be accessed from the existing vehicular routes. The proposed development will respect the setting, and existing scale and pattern of development in the village and provide scope for additional landscaping. Trees can remain intact. The site does not flood.  The proposed site would windfall and would make an important contribution to housing		

land supply in line with the Councils Housing Background Paper (CD018).

The site is within the Lunan Valley Area. The phosphorous outfall can be mitigated through a technical solution. The required mitigation of 125% in improvement can be demonstrated through the upgrade of the existing water treatment plant for the New School.

#### Camserney – Settlement Boundary Amendment

M Henderson (0673/01/001): Propose an amendment to the settlement boundary.

The proposed site is immediately adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. The site is on an elevated plain, is well defined, and forms a natural and logical extension. It is easily accessed by the existing drive which forms the eastern boundary. Boundaries in the immediate area are a mix of stone dyking and post and wire fences with native species hedging. The site boundaries are timber post with wire and tree planting. The north and west boundaries are defined by the boundaries of adjacent domestic properties. The south boundary is set out by a fence, trees and bushes forming a strong natural extension of Camserney. The settlement pattern will be preserved by the open pasture to the south which maintains the gap between Camserney and the road to Aberfeldy / Tummel Bridge. The plot size compares favourably with the others in Camserney.

Inclusion of this site will take into consideration the “character and amenity of the place” in line with adopted Plan policy PM1, and will respect the site topography by providing a more natural response than existing.

This site is likely to be used for domestic purposes and the likely principle of the development would be to provide a home for a locally based family.

This extension to Camserney will not detract from existing amenity spaces nor encroach on private amenity spaces. Under adopted Plan policy RD3 this site would extend the existing grouping of properties without detracting from the form of the existing loose cluster of divergent forms and would likely be supported were it not for the fact it would extend the present settlement boundary.

#### Croftinloan – Change to Open Space Designation

P Keir Doe (0598/09/001): Object to the inclusion of the site at Croftinloan as open space. The site should be white land which would facilitate the construction of a small number of houses.

There exists a robust and natural landscape framework to the site. It is in the centre of the village and is bounded by trees to north, south and east. There are new build houses on the northern and western boundaries. The site is currently agricultural but is of limited use due to its size, shape and proximity to houses. There is an existing access road.

The site is ideally suited to small-scale infill residential development. The Plan encourages such developments in Highland Perthshire settlements. The site has been incorrectly designated as open space; it has no value to the community for recreational or amenity purposes. The site is better suited to residential use. This would be in line with the Council's objective of increasing population within Highland Perthshire settlements.

## Fearnan – Settlement Boundary Amendment and New Sites

Glen Lyon and Loch Tay Community Council (0269/01/001); Frances Donovan (0298/01/001); Alex Glynn (0308/01/001); Mrs Glynn (0309/01/001); Mr Glynn (0310/01/001); Mr John & Mrs Lesley Raeburn (0315/01/001); Fearnan Village Association (0345/01/001); Angela Sweeney (0371/01/001); Nick & Rosalind Grant (0629/01/001): Support the existing settlement boundary and the exclusion of sites H115, H116 and H117 from the Plan for some or all of the following reasons:

- a) There is scope for infill development which can take place without damaging the nature of the village centred round an old rigg system.
- b) No economic or social benefit has been demonstrated by any of the potential development sites which could double the scale of the village in the absence of suitable infrastructure – there is restricted public transport, low employment opportunities, a higher than average age profile, properties are slow to sell and approved developments are on hold due to market conditions.
- c) Additional development is contrary to the TAYplan spatial strategy of directing growth to principal settlements.
- d) No changes to the existing settlement boundary are required or necessary.
- e) Any further relaxation of the bar to development on the south side of the A827 adjacent to the loch should be opposed to protect the natural environment of Loch Tay.

Nick & Rosalind Grant (0629/01/001): The existing green space should be extended to all of the land between the A827, Quarry Lane and the Brae to protect the historic rigg and prevent any further development.

A&J Stephen Limited (0622/01/007): Object to the non-inclusion of site H117 for housing.

Fearnan is not a principal settlement but TAYplan allows LDPs to provide for some development in such settlements where this can be accommodated and supported by the settlement and in rural areas if such development meets local needs. The site was included within the Main Issues Report for LPD1 (CD165, page 107) as being capable of some development. The Proposed Plan allocation was directed to another site which was subsequently rejected by the Examination Reporter leaving Fearnan with no appropriate residential proposals. Site H117 is the most logical direction for appropriate and deliverable settlement extension to facilitate local need.

Individual house plots are proposed with opportunity for home working which will allow a reduction in traffic movements. The site lies on the A827 bus route; bus stops and local facilities are within easy walking distance. New footway linkages can be created.

The site rises to the north but a tree belt contains the proposed extent of development. The exiting perimeter tree belts will form green corridors which link the village with the countryside beyond. Development of the site would complete the form of the settlement by creating a visually contained western expansion.

The proposal conforms with Proposed Plan Policy 1: Placemaking. Site H117 relates to

the settlement in proximity and form, is at an appropriate scale, can be developed in the style of long rigs, provides range and choice within this rural area and is deliverable.

There are no physical or technical constraints to development and no adverse impacts envisaged on the Loch Tay SAC. Fearnan is a marketable location and the site is owned by a single local developer with intent to progress subject to planning permission. There are no other competing housing allocations within Fearnan.

ED Capital (0547/01/001): Object to the non-inclusion of site H115 and / or site H116 for housing.

Both sites are immediately adjacent to the existing settlement, are relatively flat, are currently non-prime agricultural land, and are well contained in landscape terms. Access can be achieved. There is an over reliance on fossil fuel in Highland Perthshire with low compliance with the Energy Efficiency Standard for Social Housing. Opportunities would be explored on these sites for energy and fuel-efficient developments. There are no known constraints and the landowners are keen to develop. Both sites are effective in terms of the Planning Advice Note 2/2010 (CD040) criteria of effectiveness. It is considered there will be market demand given the attractive rural location and the proximity to Aberfeldy.

The landowners consider that development of just one of the sites would perhaps be more commensurate with the scale, pattern and harmony of the settlement. Alternatively, an extension to the settlement boundary would facilitate development in the absence of an allocation. Neither site would result in the suburbanisation of the countryside but would be a logical rounding off of the settlement. Fearnan is not remote or lacking in connectivity; a there is a regular bus service.

The land was originally included as a housing allocation in the early stages of LDP1 but it was not promoted by the then owners. The sites are now under different ownership. The sites have been promoted at Call for Sites and MIR stages for LDP2.

Housing development at any of the sites proposed at Fearnan would be acceptable under TAYplan Policy 1C (CD022, page 8) which allows for development outside of principal settlements.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that over two thirds of the properties in Fearnan are second or holiday homes meaning that local residents are often unable to afford the high market prices. The development of affordable housing in rural areas should be better translated through the LDP as a priority for the Council. The Loch Tay and its environs is an important tourist destination. Wages in the tourism industry are generally low and so workers too are often priced out of the buying market and are forced into private rent. In Kenmore a housing site is identified because of a specific need for additional housing for local and key workers. Similarly in Fearnan the sites proposed could meet housing needs for local people and young families who want to stay in the area, and those working in the tourism industry.

#### Fearnan – Habitats Regulations Appraisal

SNH (0353/04/001): Following the completion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) SNH have updated their holding representation to now recommend amendments to the Proposed Plan in line with the outcomes of the HRA and Appropriate Assessment. In the interest of good practice the Settlement Summary (page 191) should reflect the

outcome of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (CD056, pages 102-103, Table 5.22).

#### Grandtully – New Site

Peter Hounam (0390/01/001): The Plan fails to recognise the way in which Grandtully has changed over the last 10 years. Part of the village is designated a conservation area but Grandtully is now a significant destination with a thriving community and hub of small businesses and this should be supported by the Council.

The recently approved Ballintaggart Hotel and restaurant has little provision for on-site car parking. This will add pressure to the parking for existing businesses at peak seasons. The allocation of a site for employment uses would allow for the provision of small units for business expansion and start-ups and could provide for much needed overspill car parking for visitors and businesses. Two options for sites for employment land are proposed.

The Lagoonan Road site would occupy part of a field; it is a level area where small-scale construction would have minimal visual impact. The site is accessible via an adopted road and is bounded by the old railway cutting to the north, the existing farm road to the east, the A827 to the west, and open farm land to the south.

The alternative site to the east of the village could provide proper facilities for the rafting firms that use the riverbank as their exit point from the river.

The landowner and the tenant farmer are aware of this proposal.

There is a general lack of employment land in Highland Perthshire. The Council has been lax in building small business units and the earmarking of suitable sites for employment uses is the minimum the Council should be doing.

#### Kinloch Rannoch – Habitats Regulations Appraisal

SNH (0353/04/001): Following the completion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) SNH have updated their holding representation to now recommend amendments to the Proposed Plan in line with the outcomes of the HRA and Appropriate Assessment. In the interest of good practice the Settlement Summary (page 219) should reflect the outcome of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (CD056, page 108, Table 5.23).

#### Strathtay

Graham Forsyth (0104/01/001): Sensitive development should be encouraged to ensure that the village is allowed to evolve sustainably. A range of affordable housing should be developed to encourage families to live there.

### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

#### Butterstone – Settlement Boundary Amendment

Butterstone Estate (0556/01/001): The settlement boundary should be amended to allow for an extension on the adjoining playing fields and agricultural land.

#### Camserney – Settlement Boundary Amendment

M Henderson (0673/01/001): The settlement boundary should be amended to allow for an

extension to the south.

#### Croftinloan – Change to Open Space Designation

P Keir Doe (0598/09/001): Remove the open space designation from the site at Croftinloan and leave as white land.

#### Fearnan – Settlement Boundary Amendment and New Sites

Nick & Rosalind Grant (0629/01/001): The existing green space should be extended to all of the land between the A827, Quarry Lane and the Brae.

A&J Stephen Limited (0622/01/007): Site H117 should be allocated for housing; 22 houses within the first plan period (Phase 1) and 16 houses in the second plan period (Phase 2).

ED Capital (0547/01/001): The settlement boundary should be extended north and west, or site H115 and / or H116 should be allocated for housing.

#### Fearnan – Habitats Regulations Appraisal

SNH (0353/04/001): Seeks the inclusion of the following suggested mitigation measure in the Settlement Summary (page 191) after ‘...sustain the existing community.’ –

‘Fearnan lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy 45 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this area.’

#### Grandtully – New Site

Peter Hounam (0390/01/001): A new site should be allocated for employment uses.

#### Kinloch Rannoch - Habitats Regulations Appraisal

SNH (0353/04/001): Seeks the inclusion of the following suggested mitigation measure in the Settlement Summary (page 219) after ‘...scope for limited infill development.’ –

‘Kinloch Rannoch lies within the River Tay Catchment Area; Policy 45 sets out the relevant criteria for development in this area.’

#### Strathtay

Graham Forsyth (0104/01/001): More land should be allocated for development.

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

As discussed under Issue 1: A Successful, Sustainable Place, no additional land is required to meet the housing land requirement in the Highland Housing Market Area. TAYplan Policy 1: Location Priorities (CD022, page 8) directs LDPs to focus the majority of development in principal settlements. In line with the Strategic Development Plan, the majority of the housing land requirement in the Highland Housing Market Area will be met within the principal settlements of Aberfeldy and Pitlochry. There is no need to allocate



additional land for housing in any of the settlements suggested in representations on the grounds of meeting the housing land requirement.

TAYplan Policy 1C does allow for some development in non-principal settlements providing that it can be accommodated and supported by the settlement, and the countryside; that it genuinely contributes to the outcomes of TAYplan; and it meets specific local needs or does not undermine regeneration efforts of the cities or respective settlement. On this basis additional housing land allocations in Ballinluig, Kenmore and Murthly have been carried forward from the adopted LDP. The responses below will therefore focus on whether further allocations in the non-principal settlements which have been suggested in representations can be justified under TAYplan Policy 1C.

#### Butterstone – Settlement Boundary Amendment

Butterstone Estate (0556/01/001): It is not entirely clear in the representation whether the respondent is only seeking an amendment to the settlement boundary to include site H363 (MD027), or whether they also wish the site to be specifically allocated for housing. Either way the potential impact is considered to be the same; if the site is included within the settlement boundary this would suggest that it has development potential.

The northernmost part of site H363 was put forward as a housing site to the last Plan and was considered at Examination. Butterstone falls within the Lunan Lochs Catchment Area. In light of this the settlement boundary was tightly drawn in order to protect and enhance the nature conservation and landscape interests of the Catchment Area. The previous Examination Reporter agreed that this was an appropriate approach to take (CD015, page 653, paragraph 4).

Policy EP6: Lunan Valley Catchment Area in the adopted Plan (CD014, pages 54-55) presumes against built development except in certain limited circumstances. This general presumption against development has, however, been deleted from Policy 43: Lunan Lochs Catchment Area of the Proposed LDP. This revised policy wording is supported by SEPA (representation no. 0742/01/011). The main requirement under Policy 43 now is the regulation of total phosphorous discharge from built development. The respondent has provided a phosphorous mitigation calculation with their representation; mitigation for the new houses proposed will be provided by upgrading the existing septic tank for the Butterstone New School to a secondary treatment plant, but this is unlikely to be publicly maintained. It is suggested that this will result in mitigation in excess of what is required for the development. Unlike the last Examination, the location of Butterstone within the Lunan Lochs Catchment Area will therefore not in itself prohibit development.

An indicative layout has been submitted with the representation which suggests that a total of 15 new houses could be built on site H363. Butterstone is a small settlement and it is acknowledged that additional development can help to sustain existing services and facilities in small communities like this. The expansion proposed, however, could potentially double both the size of the village (excluding the tourist accommodation to the north) and the population. In terms of TAYplan Policy 1C (CD022, page 8), it is not considered that either the settlement of Butterstone or the surrounding countryside can accommodate this scale of expansion.

Butterstone is located 4 miles east of Dunkeld and 8 miles west of Blairgowrie. Whilst it is not the most remote of the Highland Perthshire villages the development of potentially 15 additional households who will, in all likelihood, need to travel by car to access most of the

services and facilities they need is not in line with TAYplan Policy 1 (CD022, page 8) and the need to avoid unsustainable patterns of travel.

It is noted that the proposed amendment to the settlement boundary will offer the opportunity to cross fund additional facilities for the school and that the possibility of development is potentially pivotal to ensure the long-term viability of the school. Butterstone New School is an independent residential school for young people who find mainstream education difficult to access. It is located just outwith the settlement boundary to the north of Butterstone village. Whilst it is recognised that the school provides an important facility, it is not considered that the potential benefit to the school can outweigh the likely adverse impact on the existing village of this scale of development.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Camserney – Settlement Boundary Amendment

M Henderson (0673/01/001): At the previous Examination the Reporter extended the settlement boundary at Camserney to include a site immediately to the north of site H424 (CD015, page 653, paragraph 5 & MD030). There is concern that there now appears to be a gradual eating away at the settlement boundary in this part of Camserney. A feature of Camserney is that it is set back off the main road B846 (Camserney settlement map, MD029); amending the settlement boundary again here could set a precedent for the further future infilling of the area right down to the road.

Camserney is a small dispersed settlement with very limited facilities. There is not, therefore, justification for allowing the potential for more houses on the grounds that additional development can help to sustain existing services and facilities in small communities.

There is already scope within the existing settlement boundary for infill development in Camserney and it is therefore considered that the existing boundary is appropriate and should be retained.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Croftinloan – Change to Open Space Designation

P Keir Doe (0598/09/001): The respondent seeks the removal of the existing open space designation at site H364 (MD032) rather than a housing allocation but does indicate an intention to develop the site for housing.

Croftinloan shares a settlement boundary with Donavoured, East Haugh and Ballyoukan. The series of green spaces and wedges within and between them are a key feature of this group of small settlements and their retention is considered important in maintaining the character and setting of the area. The green spaces around Croftinloan have been designated since at least 2000, in the now superseded Highland Area Local Plan (CD169, page 73). Site H364 is a small paddock area largely surrounded by well-established mixed woodland. It is clear that this space has formed part of a wider network of open space within the group of settlements for the last 20 years. Although it is not recreational land as such, the Council does consider that it has amenity value and it is therefore appropriate for it to be included within the designation under Policy 14: Open Space Retention and Provision.



Site H364 is located within the grounds of the former Croftinloan School which closed in 2000. Since then there have been numerous permissions for houses within the grounds of the former school (as referenced in the delegated report for planning application 12/00877/FLL, CD367). Given the extent of the development which has already been consented in recent years, there is a concern as to whether further development can be accommodated in Croftinloan without changing the character and dispersed pattern of development within this group of settlements. The Council therefore considers that the open space designation in Croftinloan should be retained in its entirety.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Fearnan – Settlement Boundary Amendment and New Sites

Nick & Rosalind Grant (0629/01/001): The open space designation for Fearnan in the LDP seeks to protect, and prevent the development of, those areas which serve an open space function, either as recreational or amenity space. The designation in Fearnan protects the important traditional rigg layout from development but it is not considered appropriate to extend this to form a blanket designation for all of the land between the A827, Quarry Lane and the Brae as this area includes non-open space uses (Fearnan settlement map, MD036).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

A&J Stephen Limited (0622/01/007); ED Capital (0547/01/001): Site H117 (MD039) and the eastern part of site H115 in Fearnan were considered at the Examination for LDP1. Part of site H115 (MD037) had been allocated in the Proposed Plan (Site H41, CD053, page 180) by the Council but both this site, and site H117, were rejected by the Examination Reporter amidst considerable objection from the local community. In relation to both sites the Examination Reporter concluded that 'in accordance with the TAYplan hierarchical settlement approach, the Proposed Plan concentrates the majority of the new housing development in the principal settlements of Highland Perthshire. Fearnan is a fairly remote rural settlement, located 10 miles south-west of Aberfeldy, with few employment opportunities and the development of...additional...houses in this location would not be consistent with the Proposed Plan's vision for sustainable economic growth.' (CD015, pages 631-632, paragraph 3). The Reporter considered that there was insufficient justification for the development or designation of either site for housing (CD015, page 632, paragraphs 3 and 6).

Once again there has been objection from the local community to the sites which have been put forward for development in Fearnan for LDP2, including representations from the Village Association (representation 0345/01/001) and Community Council (representation 0269/01/001).

It is clear from the conclusions that the previous Examination Reporter considered that additional large scale development in Fearnan (relative to the size of the village) would not be appropriate. Fearnan is in a fairly remote rural location. Whilst there are bus services these are infrequent and only run to Aberfeldy (CD366). It is therefore reasonable to assume that many residents will still need or choose to travel by private car to meet many of their needs. Significant additional development would not therefore be in line with the Plan's vision for a Successful, Sustainable, and Low-Carbon Place, nor would it accord with TAYplan Policy 1, (CD022, page 8) and the need to avoid unsustainable patterns of

travel.

The purchase of mainstream houses as second or holiday homes is acknowledged as an issue across the Highland Perthshire area, not only in Fearnan. Unfortunately the Council is unable through the planning system to prevent houses becoming second or holiday homes. The low wages in the tourism industry and the resulting difficulties that those reliant on this industry have in being able to afford higher house prices are also acknowledged but again, this is an issue which affects many parts of the Highland area.

Comparison is drawn in the representation by ED Capital to the allocation of a housing site in Kenmore to address the specific need for additional housing for local and key workers in the area. The need for additional housing in Kenmore has arisen as a result of the existing tourism development at Mains of Taymouth Country Estate and development at Taymouth Castle. Approximately half of the area included within the Kenmore settlement boundary is in tourism use. The situation in Fearnan is different; there is no large scale tourism use located within the village that would justify a housing allocation similar to that in Kenmore. It is appropriate for the LDP to allow development opportunities within small settlements to meet the needs of local people but it is considered in Fearnan local needs are more appropriately addressed through small scale infill development, which the existing settlement boundary would allow, rather than the allocation of a large site.

Specifically in relation to site H115, the previous Examination Reporter concluded (in relation to the eastern part of the site) that it 'lies on a plateau at the northern end of the village with an open aspect to the north and west. A housing development on this site would bear little relation to the existing character and form of the settlement' (CD015, page 631, paragraph 2). Nothing has changed which would lead the Council to reach a different conclusion as to the suitability of this site for housing development.

Specifically in relation to site H116 (MD038), this site was included in the Main Issues Report for LDP1 (CD165, page 107) but was not taken forward to Proposed Plan stage. Housing development on this site, particularly at the westernmost edge, would be highly visible from the A827 entering Fearnan and would be likely to project above the existing ridgeline.

Site H115 and H116 are under the same ownership and the respondent suggests that, as an alternative to a site allocation, the settlement boundary could instead be amended. Either way the potential impact is considered to be the same; if the site or sites are included within the settlement boundary this would suggest that they have development potential, but without the additional controls which can be put in place through site specific developer requirements. The respondent also suggests that the development of just one of the sites would be 'more commensurate with the scale, pattern and harmony of the settlement' but no indication has been given as to which site they would prefer to see come forward.

Specifically in relation to site H117, the respondent notes that the extent of the development site is contained by a tree belt and that this would be a visually contained western expansion which is not envisaged to have any adverse impact on the Loch Tay SAC. The previous Examination Reporter, however, concluded that site H117 'would have a considerable visual impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the potential for significant effects on the River Tay Special Area of Conservation' (CD015, page 632, paragraph 6). It is maintained that extending the built up area further westwards along the A827 does have the potential to have an adverse visual impact on

the existing character and form of the village.

Fearnan is a small, fairly remote Highland Perthshire village. Two of the sites being put forward have already been ruled out at Examination. The third is not considered to be any more suitable as an allocation; ultimately the development of any of the sites would potentially have an adverse impact on the existing character, setting and form, and would create too large an extension to the settlement. The settlement boundary of Fearnan already offers the potential to accommodate some further small scale infill development and this is considered the most appropriate way in which to address local housing needs in the village.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Fearnan - Habitats Regulations Appraisal

SNH (0353/04/001): It is considered that amending the Plan to incorporate the mitigation measure as set out in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (CD056) of the Proposed Plan, and detailed in the 'Modifications Sought' section would provide greater clarity and transparency for applicants as to which settlements and in what circumstances the provisions of the Plan's Policy 36A: International Nature Conservation Sites will apply, and would also set out what will be expected of them in making their planning application.

#### Grandtully – New Site

Peter Hounam (0390/01/001): Unlike the housing land requirement, the calculation of the need and demand for employment land is not straightforward. The annual employment land audit sets out the amount of employment land available in each area and also how much land has been taken up for employment uses. At 2017 there was 10.05ha of employment land available in the Highland Area (CD365, page 13) although this has since reduced to 8.45ha following the removal of the allocation E14 at Inver for flood risk reasons. No land, within designated sites, was taken up for employment uses in the Highland area in the 5 year period to 2017 (CD365, page 13). Within the Highland area new employment uses tend to be unique and linked to natural features or resources. Many of these have traditionally emerged on land outwith the designated sites.

It is acknowledged that the existing supply of employment land in the Highland Area is within the principal settlements of Aberfeldy, Dunkeld and Pitlochry. TAYplan Policy 1: Locational Priorities (CD022, page 8) does not just apply to housing land supply but also to the supply of land for new employment uses. In line with TAYplan Policy 1, employment land supply in the Highland Perthshire area is directed towards Aberfeldy which is one of the largest and least constrained of the principal settlements in the Highland area.

Policy 8: Rural Businesses and Diversification does allow for the creation of new rural businesses within or adjacent to existing settlements. Both the sites suggested are adjacent to the existing settlement boundary at Grandtully. Site E366 (MD041), however, is the corner of an open field with no existing boundary that could create a new defensible edge to the settlement. Site E367 (MD042) at Lageonan Road would be more contained and less visually intrusive, but the scale and type of employment use is likely to be restricted by the narrow access into the site.

Whilst the respondent states that the landowner and tenant farmer are aware that these sites have been put forward for development, no indication is given in the representation

as to whether they support the suggestion. As such the availability and viability of the sites is unknown. Nor does there appear to be any specific proposals or any indication whether there would be demand for either site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Kinloch Rannoch - Habitats Regulations Appraisal

SNH (0353/04/001): It is considered that amending the Plan to incorporate the mitigation measure as set out in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (CD056) of the Proposed Plan, and detailed in the 'Modifications Sought' section would provide greater clarity and transparency for applicants as to which settlements and in what circumstances the provisions of the Plan's Policy 36A: International Nature Conservation Sites will apply, and would also set out what will be expected of them in making their planning application.

#### Strathtay

Graham Forsyth (0104/01/001): No particular sites or areas are identified for additional development within Strathtay in the representation. The village of Strathtay, and parts of neighbouring Grandtully, fall within a Conservation Area. Whilst it is important to allow villages to grow and evolve, this should not be at the expense of the historic environment. The settlement boundary at Strathtay has therefore been drawn to allow for some additional development, but to limit this to small-scale infill opportunities. Policy 20 requires affordable housing to be provided on sites of 5 units or more.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

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

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