

Issue 45	Strathmore and the Glens Area –Alyth & New Alyth															
Development plan reference:	H252 – Annfield Place, page 111 H60 – Albert Street and St Ninian`s Road, page 110 H59 – Glenree, page 109 H61 – New Alyth, page 112	Reporter:														
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):																
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Gavin & Carmen Tripney (0029)</td> <td>Miss Nicola Campbell (0358)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alison Bowman (0129)</td> <td>Tom & Lucy Boylan (0398)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Graham C Carr (0236)</td> <td>Bellway Homes Limited (0559)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Susan & George Allan (0249)</td> <td>P. Keir Doe (0598/01)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272)</td> <td>A & J Stephen Limited (0622)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gordon & Irene Needs (0289)</td> <td>William Emond (0679)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Peter & Patricia Murphy (0323)</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			Gavin & Carmen Tripney (0029)	Miss Nicola Campbell (0358)	Alison Bowman (0129)	Tom & Lucy Boylan (0398)	Graham C Carr (0236)	Bellway Homes Limited (0559)	Susan & George Allan (0249)	P. Keir Doe (0598/01)	Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272)	A & J Stephen Limited (0622)	Gordon & Irene Needs (0289)	William Emond (0679)	Peter & Patricia Murphy (0323)	
Gavin & Carmen Tripney (0029)	Miss Nicola Campbell (0358)															
Alison Bowman (0129)	Tom & Lucy Boylan (0398)															
Graham C Carr (0236)	Bellway Homes Limited (0559)															
Susan & George Allan (0249)	P. Keir Doe (0598/01)															
Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272)	A & J Stephen Limited (0622)															
Gordon & Irene Needs (0289)	William Emond (0679)															
Peter & Patricia Murphy (0323)																
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Settlement summary and allocated sites in Alyth & New Alyth															
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):																
<p>Alyth</p> <p><u>H252 Annfield Place</u></p> <p>Gavin & Carmen Tripney (0029/01/002); Graham C Carr (0236/01/001); Susan & George Allan (0249/01/001); Tom & Lucy Boylan (0398/01/001): Object to the allocation based on one or more of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is already enough housing provision in Alyth; the scale of the proposal is too large for a tier 3 settlement. • The site would be an unnatural extension to the town. It would spoil the sense of openness and alter the settlement`s rural character. • The site is subject to flood risk. It was affected badly during the flash flood in 2015. • Concerns over traffic impact and proposed access to the site. • Loss of agricultural land and separation of agricultural buildings from the rest of the farm • The argument that under-utilised frontages along Airlie Street could be improved does not justify the scale of development proposed. • Landscaping as shown in the Plan looks inadequate as a boundary between existing and new houses. • Potential damage to soil pipes underneath the site. • Alyth lacks employment opportunities. Further development would lead to more commuting and suburbanization. • Loss of wildlife habitats. • Loss of views. <p>Susan & George Allan (0249/01/001): The site has constraints which were listed as</p>																

reasons for not taking forward other sites at the MIR stage (e.g. access difficulties, flood risk). If the housing land requirement justifies allocating further sites in Alyth, H253 would be a better option (MD006) (CD079; pages 38-47).

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/003): A large part of the site is at high risk from surface water flooding which casts doubt on its deliverability. Both the Council's Flooding Team and the Reporter during the previous Examination expressed concerns with regards to this (CD015; page 845). To meet housing land requirement in the Strathmore HMA, additional sites should be allocated instead of or in addition to H252. The respondent suggests allocating an additional site in Meigle (see Issue 48 Strathmore Area – Settlements with Proposals).

Peter & Patricia Murphy (0323/01/001): Objects to the proposed access through Annfield Place which is not an adopted road and it is not suitable to accommodate the additional traffic from the development. Airlie Street itself has traffic issues and the site should only be allocated if an alternative access is proposed that avoids Airlie Street.

William Emond (0679/01/001): The proposed access through Annfield Place is inappropriate, it is too narrow for larger vehicles and turning onto Airlie Street is dangerous. The respondent believes that sections of the road are owned by householders along Annfield Place who have been maintaining the road so far. An alternative access could be provided on the eastern boundary of the site. A new road could connect Meigle Road Roundabout to either Isla Road or Airlie Street providing access to the site.

Alison Bowman (0129/01/002): There should be an additional pedestrian link from the site to Meigle Road around the back of the houses. An alternative vehicular access should be provided as well, access through Annfield place is very narrow and would affect houses along the road.

H60 Albert Street and St Ninian`s Road

Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/003): Recommends highlighting the likelihood of an archaeological investigation being required.

H59 Glenree

Nicola Campbell (0358/01/001): Objects to development at this location and believes that planning consent has been given for the site. Another site further south ended up abandoned due to unsuitable ground conditions. If houses are going to be built they should be low rise and situated in a greater distance from existing back gardens. It would be disappointing to lose the current views over the hill.

New Alyth

Settlement boundary

P. Keir Doe (0598/01/001): The land to the east of New Alyth should be included within the settlement boundary (MD008). The site is currently overgrown and unused and would be suitable for accommodating four residential units. The extension would allow for a more logical settlement edge with a stone dyke marking the eastern boundary. The area could be developed in a short timescale and would support the sustainable growth of the settlement in line with SPP (CD004) and TAYplan (CD022; pages 8-9) objectives. This

small scale site would be a more viable option than the existing allocation with a larger capacity of 20 units.

H61 New Alyth

Gordon & Irene Needs (0289/01/001): Objects to proposal as it distracts from the views and compromise the privacy of neighbouring property.

P. Keir Doe (0598/01/001): This is a relatively large allocation for New Alyth and no interest has been shown so far to develop the site. A more modest development as suggested above would be more appropriate for the settlement.

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/013): The respondent welcomes the allocation of site H61 in the Proposed Plan. TAYplan (CD022; pages 8-9) allows for some development in non-principle settlements to sustain rural communities while preserving the countryside. New Alyth benefits from a range of facilities which can be found in Alyth and good transport links to other settlements. The site is controlled by a single developer with intent to progress it subject to planning application.

The western boundary of the site however is somewhat artificial. For a more logical settlement edge, the site should be extended to the existing track and tree belt which has been implemented as the boundary planting for future development (MD007). The proposed density is notably low (7 units/ha) compared to the surrounding area and other housing sites in Alyth (average of 20 units/ha). There are no physical constraints which would dictate this density below the local norm. With the extension and the average density of 20 units/ ha, the upper limit of the site should be set to 82 units.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Alyth

H252 – Annfield Place

Gavin & Carmen Tripney (0029/01/002); Graham C Carr (PP0236/1/001): Delete the site.

Susan & George Allan (0249/01/001): Delete the site and pull back settlement boundary to exclude the area. Allocate site H253 instead if necessary.

Tom & Lucy Boylan (0398/01/001): Delete the site or provide alternative vehicular access through Tay Road and Isla Road.

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/003): No specific modification was sought however the respondent suggested the site is not effective and additional sites should be allocated instead of or in addition to H252.

Peter & Patricia Murphy (0323/01/001): Provide alternative access instead of Annfield Place which directs traffic away from Airlie Street.

William Emond (0679/01/001): Provide alternative vehicular access, potentially through a new road from Meigle Road roundabout.

Alison Bowman (0129/01/002): Form an additional pedestrian link from the site to Meigle

Road and consider an alternative vehicular access.

H60 Albert Street and St Ninian`s Road

Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/003): Highlight the likelihood of an archaeological investigation being required at the Site Specific Developer Requirements section for the site.

H59 Glenree

Nicola Campbell (0358/01/001): Delete the site.

New Alyth

Settlement Boundary

P. Keir Doe (0598/01/001): Include the land to the east of New Alyth to the settlement boundary.

H61 New Alyth

Gordon & Irene Needs (0289/01/001); P. Keir Doe (0598/01/001): Delete the site.

A & J Stephen Limited (0622/01/013): Extend the site as shown on drawing and raise capacity to a maximum of 82 units.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

Alyth

H252 – Annfield Place

Gavin & Carmen Tripney (0029/01/002); Graham C Carr (0236/01/001); Susan & George Allan (0249/01/001); Tom & Lucy Boylan (0398/01/001); Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/003), Alison Bowman (0129/01/002); William Emond (0679/01/001); Peter & Patricia Murphy (0323/01/001):

Alyth is identified in TAYplan (CD022; pages 8-9) as a tier 3 principal settlement which is expected to accommodate some modest growth within the LDP area. H252 is the only new housing allocation proposed in the settlement and it is considered to be in line with TAYplan Strategy. To comments regarding the housing numbers and the scale of development in Alyth, Issue 01 (A Successful, Sustainable Place) provides a detailed response.

Site H252 was included in the settlement boundary in the Adopted Local Development (CD014; page 279) Plan as it is considered to be a logical rounding off on the south east side of Alyth. It is surrounded by residential development on three sides and situated within easy reach of local facilities. H252 was not allocated in the Adopted LDP as a housing site due to the lack of Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). Since then an FRA (CD198) has been undertaken in June 2015 which indicated that less than 25% of the site is subject to flood risk and the wider site is suitable for development. Following the July 2015 flood events in Alyth, the Council`s Flooding Team recommended a topographical study to

be undertaken in order to determine whether the overland flood route could affect the site. A Topography study, an up to date FRA and a Drainage Impact Assessment are listed in the developer requirements section to mitigate any potential negative impact caused by flooding.

The Plan highlights two potential accesses to the site. The proposed access from Annfield Place would require improvement however the width of the street (approximately 5.7m at the narrowest point) is considered to be sufficient. Although it is currently a private road it could be adopted by the Council once it is brought up to standard by the developer. The second access from Airlie Street could be safely provided between a garage and farm building to the NW corner of the site. Another alternative which is not currently proposed is forming access through Mornity Steading. The landowner's agent confirmed that the farm buildings at Mornity Steading are currently in use however ultimately the whole area, other than the existing farmhouse could be redeveloped (CD199). It is not considered necessary to amend the Plan and propose alternative ways of accessing the site at this stage. The planning application stage will provide opportunity to assess the proposed access in detail and ensure that the traffic impact of the development is acceptable. In term of pedestrian links, the development is required to make connections to Core Paths in the area and facilitate movement through a permeable layout. Unfortunately, the tight line of houses along the southern edge of the site does not allow for a direct pedestrian access onto Meigle road as requested by a respondent.

The enhancement of biodiversity is included in the site specific developer requirements. The site is currently farmland and development has potential to create a greater variety of habitats through the provision of public and private open spaces. The landscaping shown on site drawings is only indicative and it is ensured through the planning application process that design of new development does not compromise the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. The loss of views however is not a material consideration. As for the clay pipes underground, if any issues arise at the construction stage they would be brought to the attention of the Local Authority and addressed immediately.

Site H253 (MD006) (CD079; pages 38-47) which was suggested as an alternative to H252 is a larger site on the western side of Alyth. It has some minor constrains (some surface water flood risk and archaeological interests on site) and could impact the settings of the cemetery. It is in close proximity to Alyth Health Centre as well as local open spaces and vehicular access to the site could be provided from Airlie Street and New Alyth Road. While the proposal was submitted during pre-MIR call for sites stage the Council did not take it forward into either the MIR or the Proposed Plan. The site has therefore not had the benefit of full public consultation. In terms of its long term potential, it may be considered for allocation in the Plan in the future however currently the housing land requirement is met in the Strathmore Area through other sites.

Bellway Homes Limited suggests that the housing requirement could be met by allocating a site in Meigle in addition or instead of H252. The alternative site is discussed under Issue 48 (Strathmore Area – Settlements with Proposals).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

H60 Albert Street and St Ninian`s Road

Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/003): The site is considered to have archaeological potential because it lies to the north of a prehistoric archaeological ring

ditch. Although there is not a site specific requirement, every planning application is assessed against the policies in the Plan. Policy 26: Scheduled Monuments and Non-Designated Archaeology in the Proposed Plan would therefore be applied to this site as part of the planning application process. Planning permission (15/01177/FLL) has been granted for the site with the condition that `no development shall take place within the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant agreed by Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust` (CD197; Condition 1).

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

H59 Glenree

Nicola Campbell (0358/01/001): H59 has been allocated in the Adopted Plan as a natural extension to the consented housing site immediately to its south (CD196) (07/01505/FUL). It appears that no houses have been built so far on that site however works have started and the consent remains alive. A pre-application discussion has taken place last year considering the development of the site under a new masterplan subject to planning consent.

Site H59 does not have planning consent and there has not been any planning application submitted for the site to date. The Proposed Action Programme (CD099; page 25) produced on 14th September 2018 states that Mansell Homes is interested in developing the site once the development to its south is completed. For any proposal, the details of design including house types and layout would be assessed at the planning application stage against the policies of the Local Development Plan. While the loss of views is not a material planning consideration it will be ensured through the planning application process that new development does not compromise the privacy of existing households and fits in with the existing landscape.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

New Alyth

Settlement Boundary

P. Keir Doe (0598/01/001): The current boundary around the settlement is considered to be robust, following the line of New Alyth Road and the burn. The proposed site although not farmed, is not visually intrusive or derelict either. SEPA maps indicate high probability surface water flooding from the burn to the north of the site which could potentially affect the area. Site H61 which is allocated for housing in New Alyth allows for a moderate expansion to the settlement and releasing further development opportunities through the Plan is not considered necessary.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

H61 New Alyth

Gordon & Irene Needs (0289/01/001); P. Keir Doe (0598/01/001); A & J Stephen Limited

(0622/01/013): When allocating the site the Council took account of the fact that although New Alyth is not a tiered settlement, it is adjacent to Alyth and benefits from its facilities and transport links. Therefore a small scale development was considered appropriate with low density to reflect its position on the edge of the settlement. Site H61 has been carried forward from the Adopted LDP (CD014; page 279) and is considered a sensitive addition to New Alyth. Developer requirements include screen planting to define the new edge of the settlement and contributions to the improvement of the existing play area. Due to this requirement, it was assumed that 70% of the site was developable. With low density range, this gives 24 units as a maximum.

While the loss of views is not a material planning consideration it will be ensured through the planning application process that new development does not compromise the privacy of existing households. The Proposed Action Programme (CD099; page 26) produced on 14th September 2018 as well as the representation received from A& J Stephen Ltd in response to the consultation confirms the developer's interest in the site.

The developer has requested the enlargement of the site area and increasing the density for the site. This option has previously been assessed (CD079; pages 276-285) however it was considered contrary to TAYplan strategy and was not taken forward. It is acknowledged that the current boundary of the site is somewhat artificial however it was drawn with the intention to limit the scale of the development. The requirement for new boundary planting is aimed at establishing a new, robust settlement edge and should be implemented along the boundary of the allocated housing site.

Increasing the area of the site as well as the density would result in a significantly larger number of houses than currently proposed. There are sufficient sites identified closer to Alyth town centre which are a short walk away from local services and facilities and contribute to the sustainable growth of the settlement in line with TAYplan objectives.

It should be noted that while the site capacity range has been calculated correctly, the Council is aware that there is a technical error with the stated figure for the site size of H61. The Proposed Plan has identified that the site is 3.4ha however following further analysis the correct area of the site is 2.3ha (including landscaping). Using the correct site area, the Housing Background Paper (CD018; page 30) states that due to the landscaping requirement, 70% of the 2.3ha was considered developable. With low density, this resulted in 24 unit capacity. With the additional area requested by A&J Stephen, the site would measure 3.1ha. Using the same calculation, 70% of this would be considered developable which would result in a low density capacity of up to 33 units. With medium density, the larger site's capacity range would be 35-54 units.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter is minded to accept the modification the Council would be comfortable with making the boundary change to achieve a more robust settlement edge (MD007). With retaining low density for the site this would result in increased capacity of up to 33 units. In either case, the site size as it appears in the Plan should be amended to reflect the actual size of the allocation.

The Council does not support increasing the density for the site as requested by the respondent as it is considered to be contrary to TAYplan strategy. If despite of this, the Reporter was to accept the modification, the capacity range should be 35-54 units and the number of units should be limited to 30 within the LDP2 period.

Reporter's conclusions:

Reporter's recommendations: