

Issue 46	Strathmore and the Glens Area – Blairgowrie and Rattray	
Development plan reference:	E31 - Welton Road & MU330 Eastern Expansion, page134-136 MU5 - Western Blairgowrie, page137 H341 - Westfields of Rattray, page 139 H258 -Golf Course Road, page 141 H63 - Glenalmond Road Rattray, page 138 H64 - Blairgowrie South, page 140	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<div>Dr Christopher McCleery (0011) Hazel Harris (0015) Brian Rickwood (0035) Mr Stuart Nichol (0041) J&amp;J Atherton (0088) Nichola McCourty (0089) Margaret Anton (0096) Diane &amp; Allan Cushnie (0103) Mr Michal Wojtowicz (0133) Alan D. Grant (0135) Mr Martin Smith (0146) Scott Banks (0157) Heather Russell (0170) Ardblair Medical Practice (0172) Robert M Robertson (0177) Irene MacGregor (0188) Mr Bernard Walton (0202) Karen &amp; Allan Smith (0204) Alistair &amp; Fiona Gall (0216) Mr Mark Hilditch (0248) Mr Iain Robertson (0258) Bill &amp; Joyce MacGregor (0262) Maureen Brass (0266) Colin Thom (0295) G McPherson (0306) Jean Squires (0340) Mr Ally Donald (0341) Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) (0353) Graeme Findlay (0359) Renate Millington (0372)</div> <div>Mr R Shepard (0385) Mr Ian Richards (0387) Kristin Barrett (0423) Woodland Trust Scotland (0462) Mrs Debbie Strachan (0497) Mr Scott Strachan (0498) Mrs Jenni Peters (0502) JB Scott (0521) Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) (0546) Avril &amp; George Anton (0554) Galbraith Group (0555) Bellway Homes Limited (0559) John &amp; Sylvia Mather (0575) P. Keir Doe (0598/05) Mr &amp; Mrs Scott (0598/11) Alan Young (0603) Farmcare (0604) Mrs Jacqueline Edwards (0620) Mr Peter Banbury (0621) Ms Zoe Grassie (0635) Mrs M Stewart (0639) Mr Andrew Cowan (0640) Gordon Nicholson (0653) Mr C &amp; Mrs F McCarthy (0659) WT &amp; MH Ramsay (0661) J Fleming (0664) Alexander George Ramsay Main (0672) John G &amp; Andrean Deidre McVean (0674) Mr Ross Millar (0708) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) (0742)</div>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Settlement summary and allocated sites in Blairgowrie and Rattray	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		

## General

### *Infrastructure*

Dr Christopher McCleery (0011/01/001 & 0011/02/001); Margaret Anton (0096/01/002); Hazel Harris (0015/01/001); Nichola McCourty (0089/01/001); Mr Martin Smith (0146/01/001); Ardblair Medical Practice (0172/01/001); Brian Rickwood (0035/01/003); Stuart Nichol (0041/01/005); Mr Ally Donald (0341/01/001); Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/003); John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/003); J Fleming (0664/01/001); Mrs Jacqueline Edwards (0620/01/001); Alan Young (0603/01/001); Irene MacGregor (0188/01/002); Heather Russell (0170/01/002):

The town's infrastructure does not have the capacity to cope with the level of growth envisaged in the Proposed Plan and/or the Plan does not propose sufficient improvements to offset the impact of proposed development. The comments included concerns over one or more of the followings:

- road capacity and parking issues (e.g. river crossing)
- lack of active transport provision (cycling, walking)
- capacity of schools & healthcare facilities
- lack of employment opportunities
- environmental impact - the loss of open space and biodiversity
- capacity of leisure and recreational facilities
- capacity of emergency services

A number of the above respondents also expressed concerns over the changing character of Blairgowrie & Rattray and some fear that it could become a dormitory commuter town.

Brian Rickwood (0035/01/003): There is no evidence to establish the link between population growth and the economic development of the town. Blairgowrie is already competing with Perth and Dundee. The 2016 Charrette (RD055) produced a number of ideas for improving the shopping experience in the town.

Alexander George Ramsay Main (0672/01/001): There is no provision made for the establishment of new employers in the area or the re-instatement of the nearby railway lines. There are no plans for another crossing over the River Erich. The Plan does not mention the cumulative environmental impact of expansion or that housing numbers should be limited.

Stuart Nichol (0041/01/005): In relation to the Infrastructure Study for Blairgowrie & Rattray (CD203) states the assessment underestimates the impact of the Plan. While the town's expansion is welcome, traffic assessment should be carried out for the whole town and parking provision should be reassessed. Blairgowrie should be connected to the national cycle network. Developing an economic strategy and appointing a dedicated officer to deliver economic incentives would facilitate the occupation of employment sites such as E31. Furthermore, more sites should be allocated for tourism related activities. The field by the Holiday Park for instance may be appropriate for such uses.

Robert M Robertson (0177/01/002): In relation to the Infrastructure Study for Blairgowrie & Rattray (CD203) states that the local path networks should be protected from development. Disagrees that road capacity could support future development; micro-simulation traffic model should be updated as traffic has increased in the western side of the town since 2014. Longer hours for free town centre parking would support tourism and

town centre retailers. Questions the assumptions that GP surgeries and Blairgowrie High School has capacity to accommodate growth.

### *Settlement Boundary*

Mr & Mrs Scott (0598/11/001): The settlement boundary should be extended to include the adjacent field and woodland to Eastwood Estate (MD002). This would be a more logical settlement edge, consistent with the rest of the boundary. The extension would allow for some low density residential development which is in-keeping with the character of the area.

### *Other General Issues*

Alan Young (0603/01/001): The Plan should build on monitoring and the assessment of existing developments. Proposed density, design and materials should fit in with the wider environment and vistas should be maintained. There should be a greater provision of services and open spaces in Blairgowrie.

Mr Ally Donald (0341/01/004): Additional cemetery provision should be located opposite to the existing cemetery instead of Blairgowrie East.

### E31 Welton Road & MU330 Eastern Expansion

#### *Objections to the principle of allocation(s)*

Jean Squires (0340/01/001 & 002); Mrs Debbie Strachan (0497/01/001); Mr Bernard Walton (0202/01/001); Bill & Joyce MacGregor (0262/01/001); John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/001 & 002); Mr Scott Strachan (0498/01/001); Mrs Jenni Peters (0502/01/001); Alan Young (0603/01/002):

Respondents object to the development of MU330 or both E31 and MU330. One or more of the following issues were raised:

- The scale of the proposed development is too large and would alter the character of the area. Some are concerned that the built form and layout may not be compatible with the surrounding area.
- Development would result in the loss of greenfield land/productive farm land - brownfield sites should be prioritised
- Concerns about drainage and flooding
- Impact on existing woodlands and wildlife habitats (e.g. tree line to the north of MU330 and along Parkhead Road)
- Concerns about access and the impact of development on traffic flows and parking provision across town
- Impact on the local infrastructure (e.g. sewage capacity, schools and health facilities)

#### *Objections to the extension of the housing site*

Mr Iain Robertson (0258/01/001); Mr Peter Banbury (0621/01/001); Mr Ross Millar (0708/01/001); JB Scott (0521/01/002):

Object to the extension of MU330 toward the south of Blairgowrie for one or more of the following reasons:

- The southern part of the site would not be walking distance from the town centre and would generate more car journeys

- Development would adversely impact the southern approach to the town
- Development would affect the Rights of Way and wildlife habitats along Parkhead Road
- The enlargement of the site and the extension of the settlement boundary are unnecessary and would raise concerns over capacity of local infrastructure and the environment

#### *Objections to Proposed Access & Link Road*

Mr Mark Hilditch (0248/01/001); Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/001); Scott Banks (0157/01/001); Stuart Nichol (0041/01/002); Mr Bernard Walton (0202/01/001):

David Farquharson Road is not a suitable access to the site as it is constrained by the residential character of the surrounding area. There are different opinions regarding other access options:

- Traffic should be encouraged to use the southern access avoiding the busier part of Coupar Angus Road.
- The access onto Welton Road is more appropriate as it encourages people to drive through the town and stop for shopping.
- The proposed access through Welton Road is leading into the town centre and the road infrastructure of this area could not cope with increased traffic.
- The access via David Farquharson Road would cause damage to a wildlife corridor. An alternative route should be proposed to the employment site from MU330.

Stuart Nichol (0041/01/002): The link road through MU330 onto Coupar Angus road should be built as an initial investment to allow for developing the site in phases.

Alan Young (0603/01/002): The proposed link road is of limited value and it could negatively impact the character of the area and the entrance to the town. The link to Rosemount Farm is not clear in the Plan.

JB Scott (0521/01/002): The new link road leading into the town centre is contrary to the objective of making Blairgowrie more walking and cycling friendly.

Bill & Joyce MacGregor (0262/01/001): The map is misleading as it does not show the true extent of the mature woodland on site and fails to show that the new link road would cut right through it. The proposed road would also cut existing Core Paths posing danger to users. The proposal should include an off-road, pedestrian access to town, potentially along the disused railway line running along the west of the site.

#### *Objections to Proposed Density*

John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/001 & 002); Alan Young (0603/01/002): The proposed density for site MU330 is too high, low density would be more in keeping with the surrounding area's character.

Mr Peter Banbury (0621/01/001): The periphery of towns should be occupied by lower density housing and the proposed extension is not in keeping with this principle. The guidance of 0.2 ha per plot as specified in the 1998 Local Plan (CD058; Policy 57 page 35) should be maintained and individual residential units should be encouraged.

#### *Developer Requirements*

John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/001 & 002): It is positive that ancient monuments have been identified but a full archaeological assessment should be required for both sites to identify any other sites of archaeological interest. The mature woodland at the boundary of E31 and MU330 should be retained and developer requirements listed in the Plan should be met in full before considering the development of the site.

SNH (0353/01/028): To ensure the protection and retention of ancient woodland, developer requirements should be amended from “retention of woodland areas for screening purposes” to “retain and protect existing woodland (AWI LEPO) within the allocation. The new internal road should follow the route of the wayleave. Provide new native tree planting along western edge to link with this wood.”

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/004): 7ha area of LEPO ancient woodland has been identified in the middle of the allocation. In this respect, Woodland Trust recommends additional native tree planting or leaving appropriate space as buffer areas for the ancient woodland on site. Woodland Trust Scotland supports the developer requirement requesting a tree belt which provides screening from the A923 however this should be a *native* tree belt.

SEPA (0742/01/086): Cemeteries can have a detrimental impact on groundwater. Their acceptability, including the potential location and scale of development at a site, can be assessed only following intrusive ground investigation. The findings of the investigation may indicate that the site is not suitable for a cemetery due to an unavoidable impact on groundwater. In the absence of such information, SEPA reserves their position on the acceptability of these proposals.

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): The developer requirement should refer to cemetery addition rather than cemetery expansion.

#### *Other Comments*

Farmcare (0604/01/001): MIR site H256 (MD003) should be allocated for housing within the MU330 mixed use allocation. The two identified large mixed use areas in Blairgowrie & Rattray are ambiguous in terms of meeting specific housing numbers. The allocation would be in line with the land uses promoted under MU330 and could contribute towards meeting housing targets in the Strathmore area.

Mr Ally Donald (0341/01/003): Developers should build social housing first to provide wider access to housing.

Gordon Nicholson (0653/01/001): The landowner supports the proposals.

#### MU5 Western Blairgowrie

J&J Atherton (0088/01& 02/001); Margaret Anton (0096/01/003); Renate Millington (0372/01/001); Mr Alexander George Ramsay Main (0672/01/002); Avril & George Anton (0554/01/001); Irene MacGregor (0188/01/001); Mr Andrew Cowan (0640/01/001):

Respondents object to the development of the site and raised the following issues:

- There is no need for the amount of proposed houses
- Development would impact the town's rural character and increase conurbation
- Concerns about the capacity of local infrastructure to support the development



- Loss of habitats for wildlife including protected species
- Loss of arable land
- Concerns about flooding & drainage
- Concerns about traffic impact & access
- Development would cause overshadowing, noise and light pollution
- Potential impact on tourism – development would spoil views and affect the Cateran and Ardblaire trails and Gallowbank paths which are renowned visitor attractions in the area
- Potential impact on Rae Loch and Marlee Loch due to sewage and rain water runoff
- Concern about the maintenance of open spaces and the wider area in case development stalls

Stuart Nichol (0041/01/004), J&J Atherton (0088/01/001); Irene MacGregor (0188/01/001); Renate Millington (0372/01/001); Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/002); Avril & George Anton (0554/01/001); Mr Andrew Cowan (0640/01/001): All respondents object to the supermarket and some object to the hotel outlined in the planning application (17/00939/IPM).

Margaret Anton (0096/01/003), J&J Atherton (0088/01/001): Question the need for another education facility.

Avril & George Anton (0554/01/001): Educational use would compromise the privacy of surrounding houses and nearby health facility.

Irene MacGregor (0188/01/001): A significant width of landscaping should separate existing houses and the new development.

Alan D. Grant (0135/01/001): There should be a strip of land left unallocated between the site's boundary and the boundary of existing properties to avoid any future conflict over mature trees and hedges which may not be looked at favourably by new residents.

Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/002): The proposed junction at Perth Road and Essendy Road is dangerous. This would have to be improved and a footpath along Essendy Road would be required.

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/003): Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see the Council asking specifically for native woodland expansion for the west of the site.

RSPB (0546/01/020): Remove the bullet point 'Expand woodland on west side of site' from the list of developer requirements. The area immediately to the west of the site supports breeding oystercatchers which may be negatively affected by increased tree cover. The details on landscaping could be assessed in detail at the planning application stage.

Mr Andrew Cowan (0640/01/001): The noise from construction would affect the Cottage Hospital.

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): The respondent raised several points regarding the site drawings and developer requirements for MU5:

- The requirement for a Transport Assessment should mention the infrequency of bus services which makes bus shelters a necessary requirement.
- There should be a commitment to create new footpaths and it could be specified

that there should be a wide band of low level greenery on each side of the paths in order to allow for open views towards the hills

- On the site drawing for MU5, the paths are shown incorrectly, there is no path along the western side of the site. The drawing should show the local footpaths including the Ardblair Trail. The map should also show the 90m contour line which is mentioned in the site specific developer requirements.

### H341 Westfields of Rattray

Stuart Nichol (0041/01/003): The site is not suitable for housing due to road access issues and inadequate links to the town centre by other transport modes. Tourism related activities would be more appropriate on the site and would support economic growth.

Diane & Allan Cushnie (0103/01/001): The main road along the site is narrow, it has a sharp turn and a blind spot onto Hatton Road and there are no pavements along this stretch. There are concerns about the cumulative traffic impact of H341 and H63. There are a number of trees on site not shown in the Plan, which provide habitat for animals and should be protected. The brownfield site is unsuitable for housing and the greenfield site is only included as an incentive for developers. Instead the brownfield site could be used for creating a park or an outdoor centre which provides visitor attraction and employment.

Mr R Shepard (0385/01/001): The landowner supports the allocation of the site and relevant developer requirement.

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/004): Persimmon's interest in the site - as stated in the SEA (CD079; page 286) - does not necessarily prove an intent to develop the site or the site's effectiveness. The SEA scores the site's impact on service infrastructure 'significantly adverse' due to Rattray Primary School being at capacity. Developer contributions to solve this issue cannot be guaranteed at this stage. The housing land requirement in the Strathmore area could be better met by allocating an additional site in Meikle (see Issue 48: Strathmore Settlements with Proposals).

SEPA (0742/01/104): Requests that a Flood Risk Assessment is included as a site specific developer requirement. A potential flood risk has been identified at this site. The requirement will ensure that this is taken into account prior to submitting a planning application and potential developers recognise that the developable area of the site may be constrained by flood risk.

### H258 Golf Course Road

Alistair & Fiona Gall (0216/01/001); Karen & Allan Smith (0204/01/001); Colin Thom (0295/01/001); G McPherson (0306/01/001); WT & MH Ramsay (0661/01/001); John & Sylvia Mather (0575/01/001); Mrs M Stewart (0639/01/001); J Fleming (0664/01/002): Object to development of the greenfield site and the proposed access onto Golf Course Road. The proposed access would increase traffic on the already busy Golf Course Road and potentially the risk to pedestrians. Hazelwood Road and Elm Road already provide access to the site through H64. The site is currently a greenfield site providing habitat for a number of species. Respondents question how development could enhance biodiversity as suggested in the developer requirements. Some of the respondents also raised the following points in addition:

- Concerned about school capacity in the area to cope with additional pupils
- The Riding for the Disabled group currently operates on the site and would have to

relocate.

- Piggy Lane should have been upgraded by the Council
- Other sites such as H64 and MU5 should be fully developed before considering further sites for allocation.
- There are no site specific developer requirements for waste water network investigation or the protection and enhancement of habitats.
- The respondent also sought a modification to the wording of developer requirements. The Council confirms that it intends to address this separately through a non-notifiable modification as set out in (CD375).

Ms Zoe Grassie (0635/01/001): The site is currently used by the Riding for the Disabled Association thanks to the generosity of the land owner. There is growing demand for this service and to access funding for improvements the group needs security of tenure. If the development is to go ahead, the Council should assist with identifying a suitable alternative site or impose conditions on the developer to ensure that the group's activity can continue uninterrupted.

Galbraith Group (0555/01/002): Supports the allocation. The Riding for the Disabled group uses this site on an informal basis. When the land is brought forward for development, it will be assessed whether any other site owned by the landowner could accommodate the group. There should be no further obligation imposed on the current landowner in this regard.

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): The presentation of the maps for H64 and H258 are incomprehensible and require clarification. The indicative site drawings for H64 and H258 are exactly the same, but the site sizes and are completely different. The site drawings should be separate for each site rather than showing both at the same time.

#### H64 Blairgowrie South

John & Sylvia Mather (0575/02/001): Objects to proposal on the same ground as H258 (*see above*).

Nichola McCourty (0089/01/003): In relation to the planning applications (17/00961/AMM) for the site mentions that the proposal would result in the removal of wildlife habitats. Development would put strain on services and increase the need to travel due to the lack of employment opportunities in town. The proposed link road with increased traffic flows would alter the areas character and pose a greater risk to children.

Graeme Findlay (0359/01/001): Objects to the proposal based on its impact on neighbouring houses. Concerned about increased traffic, noise, pollution and losing the level of privacy. Vibration from traffic may impact the structure of the existing houses.

#### H63 Glenalmond Road Rattray

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): The Plan should be more specific about retaining existing greenery on site and footpaths should be created along existing desire lines. The 4th developer requirement should clarify that the new linkage is to be created from the new residential properties to the existing Core Path. Affordable housing units should not be developed in a single patch; they should be split into a number of blocks across the site.

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/002): Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see the



Council asking specifically for native woodland planting for the woodland screen planting already identified as a developer requirement.

### Rosemount Open Space

Mr C & F Mrs McCarthy (0659/01/001): The approach to allocating open space and releasing housing sites has been haphazard in the Rosemount Area. The character of Rosemount stems from one-off residential development which is now prevented by the open space designation. At the same time two housing sites have been allocated here, one which affects the Riding for the Disabled recreational area. During the past reviews of the open Space designation, more and more land around The Struan/Little Struan ended up being designated as open space. The designation does not align with the boundary of a planning permission granted in the past and now includes a section of private garden ground. The boundary should be shifted back to where it was drawn in the 1998 Plan (CD058; Map B) (MD004).

Mr Michal Wojtowicz (0133/01/001): Requests the removal of an area at Belfield, Rosemount from the Open Space designation as it form part of a residential curtilage (MD004). The area is a private orchard in the respondent's ownership, merging into garden ground without any defined boundary between the two. The respondent believes that the removal of this area would not impact on any recreational activity or the character and integrity of the Rosemount area.

Maureen Brass (0266/01/001): Request to modify the open space designation at Rosemount, Oakdene, in order to allow for the potential development of a house (MD004). The development would retain the character of the area and enhance the landscape. It would be a minor alteration to the plan and would not have a detrimental effect on its overall aim and objectives.

Galbraith Group (0555/01/001): Stiellsmuir Farm should not be designated as open space (MD004). The area is privately owned agricultural land and does not contribute to the recreational and amenity land of the wider Rosemount Area.

P. Keir Doe (0598/05/001): A 1.19ha site currently designated as open space to the north of Golf Course Road should be zoned for housing or left as white land within the settlement boundary (MD004). It is an ideal infill site with limited potential for agricultural use. The site does not add any value to the designation however its settings would make it suitable for residential use.

Mr Bernard Walton (0202/01/002): As part of the objection to MU330 suggests that the unused farm land adjacent to Piggy Lane could be developed without affecting agricultural production. The respondent did not provide any further detail on this proposal (e.g. site boundary).

### New Sites

Stuart Nichol (0041/01/005): Suggests the designating the field next to the holiday park for future expansion or similar compatible uses. The respondent did not provide any further detail on this proposal (e.g. site boundary).

Jean Squires (0340/01/001&002): Suggests the allocation of the land next to Davie Park in Rattray, for housing instead of MU330. The respondent did not provide any further detail

on this proposal (e.g. site boundary).

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

#### General

##### *Infrastructure*

Dr Christopher McCleery (0011/01/001 & 0011/02/001); Margaret Anton (0096/01/002); Hazel Harris (0015/01/001); Nichola McCourty (0089/01/001); Mr Martin Smith (0146/01/001); Ardblair Medical Practice (0172/01/001); Brian Rickwood (0035/01/003); Mr Ally Donald (0341/01/001); Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/003); John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/003); J Fleming (0664/01/001); Mrs Jacqueline Edwards (0620/01/001); Alan Young (0603/01/001); Irene MacGregor (0188/01/002); Heather Russell (0170/01/002) Mr Alexander George Ramsay Main (0672/01/001); Stuart Nichol (0041/01/005) Robert M Robertson (0177/01/002):

Although no specific modification was sought to the Proposed Plan, several points were raised concerning the lack of infrastructure capacity to support the scale of growth planned for the settlement.

##### *Settlement Boundary*

Mr & Mrs Scott (0598/11/001): The settlement boundary should be extended around Eastwood Estate.

##### *Other General Issues*

Alan Young (0603/01/001): No specific modification was sought.

Mr Ally Donald (0341/01/004): Relocate the cemetery search area opposite to the existing cemetery (no outline or exact location was provided).

#### E31 Welton Road & MU330 Blairgowrie Eastern Expansion

##### *Objections to the principle of allocation(s)*

The following representations request the deletion of the site(s):

- Jean Squires (0340/01/001 & 002): Delete E31 and MU330.
- Mrs Debbie Strachan (0497/01/001); Mr Scott Strachan (0498/01/001); Mrs Jenni Peters (0502/01/001): Delete MU330.
- Mr Bernard Walton (0202/01/001): Delete MU330 or protect the woodland on NE of site from development.

##### *Objections to the extension of the housing site*

The following representations request the reduction of the site area:

- John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/001 & 002): Amend site MU330 to avoid or reduce the loss of greenfield land. Protect woodland at the boundary of the two sites.
- Mr Iain Robertson (0258/01/001), JB Scott (0521/01/002): Delete southern part of MU330 and restore settlement boundary.
- Mr Peter Banbury (0621/01/001): Delete part of MU330 south to Parkhead Road.

- Mr Ross Millar (0708/01/001): Reduce the expansion to E31 and the north of MU330. Exclude sites of archaeological interest from the development.

#### *Objections to Proposed Access & Link Road*

Mr Mark Hilditch (0248/01/001); Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/001); Scott Banks (0157/01/001); Stuart Nichol (0041/01/002); Mr Bernard Walton (0202/01/001):

Although no specific modification was sought respondents stated that access through David Farquharson Road is not suitable and alternative options should be sought to provide access to the site.

Alan Young (0603/01/002); JB Scott (0521/01/002): No specific modification is sought.

Bill & Joyce MacGregor (0262/01/001): The proposal should include an off-road, pedestrian access to town, potentially along the disused railway line running along the west of the site.

#### *Objections to Proposed Density*

John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/001 & 002); Alan Young (0603/01/002); Mr Peter Banbury (0621/01/001): Reduce density for MU330.

#### *Developer Requirements*

John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/001 & 002): A full archaeological assessment should be required for both sites

SNH (0353/01/028): Amend developer requirements from “retention of woodland areas for screening purposes” to “retain and protect existing woodland (AWI LEPO) within the allocation. The new internal road should follow the route of the wayleave. Provide new native tree planting along western edge to link with this wood.”

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/004): Require additional native tree planting or leaving appropriate space as buffer areas for the ancient woodland on site. The developer requirement regarding the tree belt along the western side of the site should refer to native tree belt.

SEPA (0742/01/086): For site MU330, it should be required that an intrusive ground investigation is undertaken in line with SEPA guidance on assessing the impact of cemeteries on groundwater (LIPS GU32) before any development occurs at the site.

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): The developer requirement should refer to cemetery addition rather than cemetery expansion.

#### *Other Comments*

Farmcare (0604/01/001): Allocate MIR site H256 for housing within the MU330 mixed use allocation.

Mr Ally Donald (0341/01/003): Developers should build social housing first to provide wider access to housing.

### MU5 Western Blairgowrie

J&J Atherton (0088/01&02/001); Renate Millington (0372/01/001); Avril & George Anton (0554/01/001); Margaret Anton (0096/1/003); Mr Andrew Cowan (0640/1/001); Mr Alexander George Ramsay Main (0672/1/002); Irene MacGregor (0188/1/001):

Although no specific modification was sought, several points were raised against development on site and it is interpreted that respondents seek the deletion of MU5 site.

Alan D. Grant (0135/01/001); Irene MacGregor (0188/01/001): Pull back site boundary to leave a strip of land between existing houses and new development (no specific distance was stated).

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/003): Change `woodland expansion` to `native woodland expansion` on west side of site in the developer requirements.

RSPB (0546/01/020): Remove the bullet point `Expand woodland on west side of site` from the list of developer requirements.

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003):

- The requirement for a Transport Assessment should mention the infrequency of bus services which makes bus shelters a necessary requirement.
- There should be a commitment to create new footpaths and it could be specified that there should be a wide band of low level greenery on each side of the paths in order to allow for open views towards the hills
- The site drawing should show the local footpaths including the Ardblair Trail. The map should also show the 90m contour line which is mentioned in the site specific developer requirements.

Stuart Nichol (0041/01/004); Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/002): No specific modification was sought.

### H341 Westfields of Rattray

Stuart Nichol (0041/01/003); Diane & Allan Cushnie (0103/01/001): Change allocation from housing to tourism related uses.

SEPA (0742/01/104): Requests that a Flood Risk Assessment is included as a site specific developer requirement

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/004): No specific modification was sought however the respondent suggested the site is not effective and housing land requirement in the Strathmore HMA could be met by allocating an alternative site in Meigle (see Issue 48).

Mr R Shepard (0385/01/001): Supports the allocation/No change.

### H258 Golf Course Road

Alistair & Fiona Gall (0216/01/001); Karen & Allan Smith (0204/01/001); Colin Thom (0295/01/001); G McPherson (0306/01/001); WT & MH Ramsay (0661/01/001); Mrs M Stewart (0639/01/001): Delete the site.

John & Sylvia Mather (0575/01/001): Delete H258 and H64 or delete proposed access onto Golf Course Road.

J Fleming (0664/01/002): Delete the proposed link road through site H258 and H64. Add site specific developer requirements for Waste Water Network investigation, the protection of habitats and the enhancement of biodiversity.

Ms Zoe Grassie (0635/01/001): The continuous operation of the Riding for the Disabled Association should be supported by the Council either through helping the group to find an alternative site or impose conditions on the developer.

Galbraith Group (0555/01/002): Supports the allocation.

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): The indicative site drawings should be separate for H258 and H63 rather than showing both sites at the same time.

#### H64 Blairgowrie South

Nichola McCourty (0089/01/003); John & Sylvia Mather (0575/02/001); Graeme Findlay (0359/01/001): Delete the site.

#### H63 Glenalmon Road Rattray

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): Mark existing greenery and regularly used paths to be retained on site. Clarify that the new linkage is to be created from the new residential properties to the existing Core Path.

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/002): Change `woodland screen planting` to `native woodland screen planting` in the developer requirements section.

#### Rosemount Open Space

Mr C & Mrs F McCarthy (0659/01/001): The open space boundary around the Little Struan should be redrawn as shown in the 1998 Plan. A Visual Impact Analysis should be undertaken to identify small areas which could contribute to the percentage of windfall developments in the area.

Mr Michal Wojtowicz (0133/01/001): Remove a 0.3 ha area at Belfield from the Open Space designation at Rosemount and leave it as white land within the settlement boundary.

Maureen Brass (0266/01/001): Remove an area around Oakdene, Rosemount from the open Space designation.

Galbraith Group (0555/01/001): Remove Stiellsmuir Farm from the open Space designation and leave it as white land.

P. Keir Doe (0598/05/001): A 1.19ha site currently designated as open space should be zoned for housing or left as white land within the settlement boundary.

Mr Bernard Walton (0202/01/002): Consider the development of the unused farm land adjacent to Piggy Lane instead of MU330 (no further detail provided).



### New sites

Jean Squires (0340/01/001&002): Consider allocating the land next to Davie Park in Rattray, for housing instead of MU330 (no further detail provided).

Stuart Nichol (0041/1/005): Consider designating the field next to the holiday park for future expansion or similar compatible uses (no further detail provided).

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

### General

#### *Infrastructure*

Dr Christopher McCleery (0011/01/001 & 0011/02/001); Margaret Anton (0096/01/002); Hazel Harris (0015/01/001); Nichola McCourty (0089/01/001); Mr Martin Smith (0146/01/001); Ardblair Medical Practice (0172/01/001); Brian Rickwood (0035/01/003); Mr Ally Donald (0341/01/001); Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/003); John G & Andean Deidre McVean (0674/01/003); J Fleming (0664/01/001); Mrs Jacqueline Edwards (0620/01/001); Alan Young (0603/01/001); Irene MacGregor (0188/01/002); Heather Russell (0170/01/002) Mr Alexander George Ramsay Main (0672/01/001); Stuart Nichol (0041/01/005) Robert M Robertson (0177/01/002):

TAYplan (CD022; pages 8-11) identifies Blairgowrie/Rattray as a Tier 2 principal settlement which provides opportunity to contribute to housing and business land provision within the overall LDP area. As a service centre, Blairgowrie & Rattray is expected to allocate the largest share of the housing land requirement in the Strathmore and the Glens 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 (see Issue 1: A Successful, Sustainable Place).

The implications of the level of growth on the capacity of local infrastructure are discussed in the Infrastructure Study for Blairgowrie & Rattray (CD204). The study compiles a range of datasets which are used to inform the preparation of the Local Development Plan and analyses the information at settlement level. The study highlights the strengths and weaknesses of local infrastructure and refers to the improvements that can be facilitated through new development. For the purpose of the examination the study was expanded to respond to issues raised during the Proposed Plan consultation. The report covers seven topics and makes the following key points:

- 1) Community facilities – Residents in Blairgowrie/Rattray have good access to basic community facilities. However, the variety and quality of leisure and recreational facilities need to improve to cater for the growing population. To address this, there are already plans in place for a new replacement Leisure Centre at Blairgowrie High School with £14.7M in the Councils Capital Budget approved in June 2018. Furthermore, 4ha of land is safeguarded within site MU5, for education/play provision which could be suitable for community facilities and a new public park.
- 2) Open space provision - The Proposed Plan safeguards existing open spaces such as playgrounds, playing fields, parks and cemeteries. New development will be required to create new public open space provision and contribute to the

improvement of existing facilities such as the playingfields at Rosemount. Important existing landscape elements such as mature trees, core paths and watercourses need to be maintained and incorporated into the design of new development. To compensate for the loss of existing vegetation and mitigate for noise and visual impact, additional planting is often required.

- 3) Transport – The micro-simulation model was prepared for the settlement in 2009 and was last updated in 2014 (CD206). Based on the model, the Council's Transport Team has concluded that although there are some hotspots across town, with suitable mitigation measures there was sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated development at the time. There are plans to upgrade the traffic model in the upcoming years to reflect changes to junction arrangements around Wellmeadow. The updated model will be used to test the traffic impact of significant development proposals which come forward in the next plan period. To reduce the traffic impact of proposals, two relief roads are proposed for Blairgowrie; one through sites H64 & H258 and another through the Eastern expansion (E31 & MU330). Due to the capacity of the bridge over River Eicht, development is limited in Rattray. Developers are also required to provide new infrastructure for walking and cycling within developments and improve the network of Core Paths within the area where possible.
- 4) Health Care Provision - NHS Tayside did not indicate having capacity issues or a lack of land available for healthcare provision in Blairgowrie & Rattray. Nevertheless, the Council notes the concerns of resident as well as the local surgery in terms of healthcare provision which were expressed during the Proposed Plan consultation. The Council will work with NHS Tayside to monitor housing growth and patent numbers to assess the need for any expansion of current facilities.
- 5) Education - Blairgowrie High School and Rattray Primary School have capacity to support future projected levels of growth (currently at 68 % and 63% occupancy levels). The available capacity of Newhill Primary School (currently at 92% occupancy) may be impacted on through the level of projected growth but this will depend on the speed at which it is completed. The Council will continue to review the build rate of development within the catchment and where appropriate will secure financial contributions towards additional school capacity. Land is secured within MU5 for an additional school facility if necessary.
- 6) Retail & Employment - The Proposed Plan consultation highlighted concerns over local employment opportunities and the proposed growth leading to increased commuting. Through the dedicated employment land and the allocation of mixed use sites which allow for employment generating land uses the Council seeks to encourage new businesses to locate to the area. It should be noted however that the Council has no influence on when businesses decide to take these opportunities or whether they are local or national/international organisations. New residents moving to the area may indeed chose to work in larger centres such as Perth and Dundee, increasing the number of commuters. This could provide incentive to public transport providers to improve services between these settlements. The formation of a local economic strategy as suggested by a respondent could also be a proactive step in moving forward.
- 7) Energy and Water – Under Policy 51B all development within and close to settlements that have public sewerage systems will require connection to the public sewer. Currently, there is capacity at the waste water work within Blairgowrie and Rattray however if all the development within the LDP were to come forward a growth project would be required to accommodate all development. Regular liaison meetings are held with Scottish Water and they are aware a growth project may be

required at some point in the future to accommodate planned growth and are comfortable with this.

In addition to the issues above, the loss of wildlife habitats, prime agricultural land and the town's changing character has also been raised in a number of responses. As evidenced in the 2017 Vacant and Derelict Land Survey Site Register (Scottish Government) (CD181) less than 3ha of brownfield land is available in Blairgowrie and Rattray. One of the two derelict sites, Westfields of Rattray Farm is already allocated for housing in the Proposed Plan. The other site, Erich Mills is within the settlement boundary however its potential for development is currently undetermined. This means that meeting housing requirements will require the allocation of mainly Greenfield land which will inevitably result in the expansion of the settlement. The Plan seeks to guide this process and ensure that it takes into account the existing landscape and the character of the built environment. As noted above, key natural features (including the Ardblair Trail) which are important to the character of the area and provide habitats for wildlife will be retained and incorporated in the design of proposals. New open spaces, landscaping areas and garden grounds provide new habitats and improvement to biodiversity. At the planning application stage it is ensured that surveys are undertaken where necessary regarding the presence of protected species and the impact of construction on habitats is minimised.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### *Settlement Boundary*

Mr & Mrs Scott (0598/11/001): The existing settlement boundary wraps around the clearly defined grounds of Eastwood Estate and is considered to be consistent with other sections of the boundary. The settlement boundary was drawn to include the curtilage of residential dwellings rather than to follow land ownership boundaries. The suggested site sits within a sensitive landscape framework where development could affect several mature trees. The proposed boundary change would leave an additional area as white land within the settlement boundary beyond the respondent's ownership (MD002). This land is also covered with mature native woodland. Sitting on the southern edge of Blairgowrie the site is not situated particularly well in relation to local services and facilities either. It should also be noted that this proposal was not submitted during the earlier LDP2 plan preparation stages at pre MIR or MIR and so has not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### *Other General Issues*

Alan Young (0603/01/001): Both the Plan policies and associated Supplementary Guidance builds on monitoring and case studies from across the Council area as well as the wider national/international context. Policy 1 and the Draft Placemaking Guide (CD041) set out standards for design and include best practice advice on materials, density and vistas. This level of detail on a site specific basis however is not appropriate for the Proposed Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mr Ally Donald (0341/01/004): Although the respondent did not specify the preferred location of the cemetery it is presumed that they refer to the area across Perth Road which

is part of site MU5. This area is allocated for housing in the Proposed Plan and is the subject of an in principle planning application which the Council has resolved to grant subject to signing a S75 legal agreement (17/00939/IPM). The zoning plan (CD201) for the site includes employment uses at this location. The proposed cemetery search area within MU330 was chosen from three possible options (CD125) and was considered the best choice within Blairgowrie. The SEA (CD079; pages 69-79) concluded that it is a secluded, ambient site suitable for cemetery function and as part of the Eastern Expansion there will be an opportunity to improve access to the site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

### E31 Welton Road & MU330 Blairgowrie Eastern Expansion

#### *Objections to Allocation(s)*

Jean Squires (0340/01/001 & 002); Mrs Debbie Strachan (0497/01/001); Mr Scott Strachan (0498/01/001); Mrs Jenni Peters (0502/01/001); Mr Bernard Walton (0202/01/001); Bill & Joyce MacGregor (0262/01/001); John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/001 & 002); Alan Young (0603/01/002); Mr Iain Robertson (0258/01/001); Mr Peter Banbury (0621/01/001); Mr Ross Millar (0708/01/001); JB Scott (0521/01/002):

The Eastern Expansion and Welton Road are adjoining sites to the west of Blairgowrie. The issues raised in relation to E31 and MU330 overlap in many respects, and will be considered together.

The Eastern Expansion includes the adopted housing site H62 (CD014; page 283), a cemetery search area and H256 (MD003) which has been put forward for housing as a new site (CD079; page 113-122). Bringing these areas together under one larger site means that they can be developed under a comprehensive masterplan. The Eastern Expansion would help meeting the increased numbers required to be allocated in the Strathmore area in the current plan period (maximum 300 units) and beyond, providing a flexible, long-term housing land supply of approximately 900 units. The scale of the proposal allows for the delivery of greater infrastructure improvements such as a new link road, education contributions and new open space provision to facilitate the sustainable development of the town.

The individual sites which form part of the Eastern expansion are considered to be suitable for allocation on their own with constraints that can be mitigated through the layout and design of development. Limiting the size of the expansion in this plan period or allocating site H256 as a separate housing site as suggested by Farmcare would however prevent the development of the area under one masterplan and deliver the envisaged benefits to local infrastructure.

Some respondents objected to the expansion due to its visual impact on the southern approach to the town. In order to minimise this impact, any proposal will be required to provide a landscape framework integrating development with the wider countryside and provide a tree belt along the A923 for screening purposes. The southernmost part of the site would be a long walk away from the town centre however regular bus services (59 & 57/ 57A) along Coupar Angus Road provide an alternative to car travel. The development could provide incentive to further improve these services.

In terms of flooding and drainage, several smaller areas across the site are affected by

flooding and both a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment are required for the site. The level of flood risk however is not considered to affect the viability of the site. The issues regarding the loss of greenfield land and the proposal's impact on other local infrastructure (road network, schools and GPs) were addressed at a settlement scale in the first section of this Schedule 4.

The loss of open space was another general concern raised. Under Policy 14, a development of this scale will be required to provide a number of functional public open spaces and contribute to off-site facilities where appropriate (e.g. playing fields at Rosemount). Some responses (0202/01/001; 0621/01/01; 0674/01/001) refer specifically to the existing tree line between site E31 & MU330, the tree line along Parkhead Road and the ancient woodland at the centre of the site. Through Policies 15; 14; 38 and 39 it is ensured that existing Rights of Ways, Core Paths woodlands and wildlife habitats are protected and valuable existing landscaping elements are integrated with the design of the proposal.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter is minded, the indicative site drawing could be amended to highlight the existing tree line between site E31 & MU330 as well as the tree line along Parkhead Road and better reflect the position of the ancient woodland in relation to the link road and the site boundary (CD207). The revised drawing also provides an opportunity for correcting a technical error. On the drawing for MU330 a lighter green colour appears on the southern part of the site instead of grey for 'main developable areas'.

#### *Proposed Access & Link Road*

Mr Mark Hilditch (0248/01/001); Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/001); Scott Banks (0157/01/001); Stuart Nichol (0041/01/002); Mr Bernard Walton (0202/01/001); Alan Young (0603/01/002); Bill & Joyce MacGregor (0262/01/001); JB Scott (0521/01/002):

The scale and layout of the proposal facilitates the development of a link road which takes pressure off of Coupar Angus Road and improves connectivity across the site. It benefits the whole of Blairgowrie by providing an alternative route to and from the town's main employment area and diverting some of the traffic away from the town centre. While the Plan does not require upfront infrastructure delivery, it states that no more than 75 houses should be occupied before the road link to E31 is constructed. A linked phasing programme will help avoid a potential scenario where a large built up area is only served by one main access until all phases are completed. In terms of the impact on woodlands and sites of historic importance, developer requirements ensure that the layout and design of development takes account of these features and minimises any adverse impact on them. It is acknowledged that the link road may cut through a narrow part of the ancient woodland and as suggested above, the indicative site drawing could be amended to better reflect this. It should be noted however that the exact route of the link road would only be determined at the planning application stage.

The new link road between Welton Road and Coupar Angus Road provides the main axis for the development towards the south and north. David Farquharson Road, as shown on the indicative site drawing would function as a secondary access where the layout of the residential area restrictive to speed and the volume of traffic. It is a logical connection that enables existing households access the new employment area and provides new households direct access towards the Rosemount area. The approval of a planning application for the site will be subject to suitable vehicular access and road layout



informed by a Transport Assessment and will be agreed with the Roads Authority. There will also be an opportunity to test the traffic impact of proposals using the micro-simulation traffic model for Blairgowrie once it has been updated.

In terms of the suggestion to require an off-road, pedestrian access to town, the detailed masterplan will provide an opportunity to assess the permeability of the proposed layout and ensure that there is a logical network of streets and paths across the site to facilitate active travel. The disused railway line the respondent refers to runs outwith the site boundary and it is not an existing Core Path. Policy 15: Public Access protects the integrity of disused railway lines in order to facilitate their potential future reuse. The potential of this area however has not been explored therefor it is not considered appropriate to refer to it in the Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### *Proposed Density*

John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/001 & 002); Alan Young (0603/01/002); Mr Peter Banbury (0621/01/001):

The reference to the 1998 Eastern Area Local Plan (CD058; Policy 57 page 35) which required each housing site to be a minimum of 0.3 hectares (Plan stated 0.3ha not 0.2ha as quoted by the respondent) is slightly misleading as this referred largely to infill developments in the core area of Rosemount. This policy was not applied to the new housing allocations in this plan. This approach also proved to be difficult to implement and did not fit every scenario. The emphasis for new greenfield allocations is to make best use of the land with higher densities appropriate to the locality. The masterplan for MU330 will have to take into account various constraints such as flood risk, landscaping and ancient monuments which impact the proposed layout. It is likely that density will vary across the site from high to low. Areas with higher density can accommodate smaller units for downsizing and first time buyers. Larger plots may be appropriate on other parts of the site adjacent to woodlands and by the periphery. The capacity range in the plan was based on 70% of developable area and medium density as an average. Policy 1 requires any proposal to respond sensitively to the surrounding built and natural environment and planning application stage provides an opportunity to assess the detailed design. It is not considered necessary to lower the capacity range in the Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### *Developer Requirements*

Respondents expressed concerns in relation to the protection of woodland areas and ancient monuments on site.

John G & Andrean Deidre McVean (0674/01/001 & 002): Through developer requirements, it is ensured that development protects and enhances the settings of sites of archaeological significance. For both sites, a survey is required to evaluate and mitigate the impact of proposals. At the planning application stage Historic Environment Scotland would be consulted to ensure that proposals are sympathetic to the scheduled monument. As mentioned above mature woodland on site will be retained and the site drawings can be amended to highlight the tree belt between E31 and MU330.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SNH (0353/01/028); Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/004): All development is required to comply with Policy 38B: Trees, Woodland and Development which presumes against the removal of ancient semi-natural woodland. The appropriate mitigation measures proposed to minimise the impact of development on the ancient woodland would depend on the layout and design of the development and would be examined in detail at the planning application stage. This includes matters such as the route and design of the link road as well as the appropriate boundary treatment or landscaping between the woodland and the developed area.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the reporter considered that the modification requested by SNH would make the Plan clearer, the following wording would not be opposed to by the Council:

“Retain and protect as far as practical existing ancient woodland (AWI LEPO) within the allocation. Provide new native tree planting along western edge of the site to link with this wood. Other woodland areas on site should also be retained for screening purposes.”

In terms of the tree belt along the A923, the Council does not consider it necessary to have a requirement for all new trees to be planted to be of native species and therefore does not support this change. The issue is discussed in detail under the ‘Site Allocations’ section of Issue 16 A Natural, Resilient Place.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SEPA (0742/01/086): The existing site specific developer requirement only requires that the developer of site MU330 reserves an area of land for the possible future development of a cemetery. The development of the cemetery would be undertaken by the Council rather than the developer, once all the necessary investigative works had been carried out and independent of the housing development. It is not therefore considered appropriate to require the housing developer to carry out intrusive ground investigation to establish the acceptability of the ground for a cemetery by means of a site specific developer requirement.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): The Plan requires the developer to retain part of the site for expanding the cemetery provision in Blairgowrie. The settlement map marks the area of search where there may be potential for new provision.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the reporter is minded to accept the modification, the Council would be comfortable with changing the wording of the requirement to “retention of part of the site for cemetery provision”.

#### *Other Comments*

Farmcare (0604/01/001): Site H256 has undergone a Strategic Environmental Assessment and forms part of the Eastern Expansion mixed use allocation in the Proposed Plan. As detailed above, the Council’s aim is to facilitate the development of this area under a comprehensive masterplan that takes into account the whole of the site including elements such as the link road. Allocating H256 separately for housing would be counterproductive to this aim and could lead to the fragmentation of the larger site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mr Ally Donald (0341/01/003): Policy 20 requires an affordable housing contribution amounting to an equivalent of 25% of the total units proposed. Affordable housing may be provided in the form of social rented accommodation and will be delivered as part of the overall masterplan. It is not considered necessary to require the completion of these units first.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### MU5 Western Blairgowrie

J&J Atherton (0088/01&02/001); Margaret Anton (0096/01/003); Renate Millington (0372/01/001); Mr Alexander George Ramsay Main (0672/01/002); Avril & George Anton (0554/01/001); Irene MacGregor (0188/01/001); Mr Andrew Cowan (0640/01/001); Stuart Nichol (0041/01/004); Mr Ian Richards (0387/01/002); Alan D. Grant (0135/01/001):

MU5 is considered to be in line with the spatial strategy of TAYplan which requires development to be concentrated in tiered settlements. The site is one of the two larger mixed use allocations in Strathmore and provides a significant contribution to housing and business land in the area. It also provides opportunity to improve local infrastructure through safeguarding land for educational and/or play provision at a central location. The site is carried forward from the adopted LDP (CD014; page 283) and planning permission in principle has recently been granted (subject to signing a Section 75 agreement) for a mixed use development on site.

It is unfortunate that development will result in the loss of agricultural land; however it is not consequential that it would negatively impact the character of the town or the biodiversity potential of the area. Through its layout, development can minimise impact on neighbouring properties and provide a landscape framework which fits in with the surrounding area. The retention of ancient woodland on site and the formation of new open spaces and private gardens could enhance green infrastructure and provide a diversity of habitats for wildlife. The Proposed Plan also protects local footpaths and the Arblair Trail. As shown on the indicative site drawings the existing Core Paths (CD129) within the site are to be retained and new path should be incorporated in the layout of development (e.g. along western edge of the site). In terms of the boundary treatment along new path, this level of detail is not appropriate for the Plan.

Although flooding is not considered to be a major constraint for the site, during the consultation for LDP1, SEPA have stated that a Flood Risk Assessment is required for the site. A Wastewater Network Investigation is also required for the site to determine whether network improvements are necessary. With regards to the current proposal for the site, Scottish Water has confirmed that the existing infrastructure currently has capacity for the scale of the proposed development. In line with the developer requirements, a Transport Assessment was completed for the whole site and the proposal was also tested using the Council's Blairgowrie Traffic Model. The suggestion to mention the infrequency of bus services and include a developer requirement for a bus stop/shelter is not considered appropriate. The accessibility of public transport services is addressed as part of the Transport Assessment for the site and examined in detail at the planning application stage.

It is acknowledged that a development of this scale will have an impact on neighbouring uses. Noise & light pollution, the loss of privacy, overshadowing, traffic generation, access issues and disturbance from construction can be avoided or minimised through the production of a masterplan and the use of planning conditions. The situation and height of existing trees and hedges are also considered at the planning application stage as part of the design in order to minimise any negative impact on new and existing properties.

A number of respondents have commented on elements of the submitted planning application such as the proposed hotel, and supermarket. The Plan calls for 4ha of employment land as part of this mixed use site which is considered desirable in terms of providing opportunity for economic growth. As for the education/play provision element, the Council wishes to see land safeguarded within this allocation in order to allow for potential additional facilities in the future. The details of the proposal, including the layout and design of these facilities, are addressed at the planning application stage.

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/003): The Council does not consider it necessary to have a requirement for all new trees to be planted to be of native species and therefore does not support this change. The issue is discussed in detail under the 'Site Allocations' section of Issue 16 (A Natural, Resilient Place).

RSPB (0546/01/020): The developer requirement regarding the expansion of woodland refers to new woodland and structure planting within the boundary of the site to minimise the impact of development. The area described by RSPB is outwith the boundary of MU5 where this requirement does not apply.

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): Contour lines are not shown on any settlement map or indicative site drawing as this level of detail is not considered necessary in most cases. For MU5 where developer requirements make reference to a 90m contour line, it may be useful to identify this however it would not be consistent with other parts of the Plan. The respondent's points regarding footpaths and bus services have been addressed above within this section.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### H341 Westfields of Rattray

Stuart Nichol (0041/01/003); Diane & Allan Cushnie (0103/01/001):

The site for housing development was first suggested at the MIR stage of the Adopted LDP and was previously included in the settlement boundary of the 2005 Draft Eastern Area Local Plan (CD017; Map 2 page 134) which did not progress due to the introduction of the new type of Local Plans. The reason for not including it in the Adopted Plan was meeting housing targets elsewhere and the opportunity to develop it under Policy RD3: Housing in the Countryside (CD014; page 31). The site was recommended again for inclusion in the Proposed Plan as its development did not prove viable under the restriction of Policy RD3. The Proposed Plan extends the settlement boundary and includes a wider site including brownfield and greenfield land. The redevelopment of brownfield land is encouraged by SPP (CD004; para 40) and is expected to improve the appearance of the site. The greenfield element was included in order to increase the viability of the overall development. The site is approximately 1.6 km away from the town centre and has a bus stop within 400m from its entrance.

The site drawings indicate the extent of the existing woodland on site and there is a requirement to retain important trees, provide additional planting and implement measures to increase biodiversity.

In terms of the traffic concerns, the A93 is a strategic route which has the capacity to accommodate additional traffic. Growth in Rattray is generally limited by the capacity of the bridge over River Erich however the development would be relatively small scale with 68-104 units proposed. Respondents also expressed concerns around road safety and providing access to the site. It is acknowledged that the site is close to the current junction of Hatton Road and Balmoral Road. The Council's Transport Planning Team reviewed the potential access arrangements and suggested that a more detailed assessment will be necessary in order to determine the impact of development on the junction. In line with this, a Transport Statement should be added to the developer requirements.

There has not been any proposal which would suggest that this is a suitable site for tourism related uses. It is also questionable whether it would be financially viable as a tourism proposal, considering the costs associated with the brownfield site. It is not considered justified or necessary to change the proposed site from housing to tourism allocation.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the reporter is minded, the Council would be comfortable with adding a Transport Statement to the site specific developer requirements to ensure that the impact of the development on the nearby junction is fully understood and mitigated.

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/004) questions that Persimmon's interest in the site as previously indicated by the landowner could prove its effectiveness. The Council has contacted Persimmon Homes who stated that they are not looking to develop this site. However this is not in itself a reason to believe that the site could not become effective during the Plan period. It is under the control of a single land owner who supports its release for housing development. In terms of school capacity, according to 2017 figures (CD124), Rattray Primary is currently at 63% capacity and is capable to cope with additional demand. The suggestion to allocating site H272 instead in Meigle is discussed under Issue 48 (Strathmore Area – Settlements with Proposals).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

SEPA (0742/01/104): High and medium probability surface water flood risk is indicated for two small patches around the SE corner of the site. This is not considered to be a significant constraint however the Proposed Plan does state that a Flood Risk Assessment may be required. The Council's Flooding Team would indicate a need for an FRA at the planning application stage if the proposed development was likely to be affected by surface water flood risk or increase the probability of flood risk elsewhere. Under Policy 50, a Drainage Impact Assessment will be required for the site regardless. Depending on the proposal, this may be sufficient in addressing issues around surface water flood risk.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### H258 Golf Course Road & H64 Blairgowrie South

Alistair & Fiona Gall (0216/01/001); Karen & Allan Smith (0204/01/001); Colin Thom (0295/01/001); G McPherson (0306/01/001); WT & MH Ramsay (0661/01/001); John &



Sylvia Mather (0575/01&02/001); Mrs M Stewart (0639/01/001); J Fleming (0664/01/002); Nichola McCourty (0089/01/003); Graeme Findlay (0359/01/001); Ms Zoe Grassie (0635/01/001); Galbraith Group (0555/01/002):

H258 and H64 are adjacent sites at the edge of the Rosemount area. H64 is an existing housing site which has in principle planning application awaiting decision (17/00961/AMM). H258 was previously designated as open space and is now proposed as an extension to H64. Although the majority of responses were received in relation to H258, the issues raised relate to both sites and will be discussed together.

Rosemount is an attractive area within the settlement boundary of Blairgowrie where several housing sites have been proposed for development in the past. Despite the high demand, the Council have been limiting development in the area in order to retain its special semi-rural character. There is presumption in favour of development under masterplans which allow for a coordinated approach to development and delivering greater benefits to local infrastructure. The location of both sites is favourable in relation to local facilities such as the school and the playing fields. The link Road from Hazelwood Road to Berrydale road within H64 is expected to improve connectivity and permeability within the area. H258 is supported as it is a logical extension to H64 and allows for a new connection to be made with Golf Course Road.

Proposals for these sites are required to respond to the countryside setting of the Rosemount area and create new linkages with existing open spaces and core paths. Existing vegetation on site is limited; shrubs and tree lines along the edges can be incorporated in the design of development. Measures to support biodiversity can be incorporated in the development through appropriate landscaping and private gardens also provide a variety of habitats for wildlife. The impact of the development as well as construction on neighbouring households is assessed in detail at the planning application stage.

On both H258 and H64, development is subject to a Transport Assessment to ensure there is capacity for additional traffic in the area. The three access points which H258 and H64 share facilitates the distribution of traffic across the area instead of putting pressure on one access. Under Policy 51, both developments will be required to connect to the public sewer. At the planning application stage, Scottish Water is consulted in order to make sure that the Waste Water Treatment Works has capacity to accommodate additional development. In terms of school capacity, education contributions will be sought from developers in line with Policy 5. (Also see response under the infrastructure section).

Site H258 is currently occupied by the Riding for the Disabled Group on an informal basis, without a formal lease. The Golf Course Road field has been used for the group's entire operation as a short term solution after losing the use of a nearby outdoor arena in early 2018. The group believes that the alternative sites the landowner may provide would not be suitable for their needs as they lack existing stables and security of tenure which would be required to apply for grants and expand their services. As a lease is not in place and the land use has not formally changed in planning terms (e.g. to educational/community facility), it is not considered appropriate to require the developer or the landowner of the site to provide a suitable alternative for the group. Making this a condition would set a precedent which may discourage others to allow for temporary uses, for community benefit, on land with a long term development potential. As requested in the representation, the Council has made contact with the RFDA. While it cannot guarantee that an alternative site will be found, the Council would like to see this valuable service

continue and offered to assist the group with searching for a suitable location.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): The indicative site drawings are shown together for H258 and H64 as the two sites are closely interlinked and will be connected though a link road. Any proposal for these sites should take into consideration the relationship to the wider area allocated for housing.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter is minded to make the modification, the Council would not oppose to highlighting the site boundary between H258 and H64 to make the indicative site drawing clearer.

#### H63 Glenalmond Road Rattray

Kristin Barrett (0423/01/003): The site is carried forward from the Adopted LDP (CD014; page 283) and detailed planning permission for residential development has been granted for the site (16/01861/FLM). The site is currently farmland with some trees and shrubs around its boundary. The developer requirements and the site drawing that shows the proposed landscaping and paths reflects the design approved at the planning application stage which is considered to be in line with the Policies on the retention and provision of open space and green infrastructure. In terms of the distribution of affordable housing units, the Draft Placemaking Guide (CD041) promotes a variety of tenure which is distributed evenly across the community and allows for greater inclusivity (para 3.3.2).

Woodland Trust Scotland (0462/01/002): The Council does not consider it necessary to have a requirement for all new trees to be planted to be of native species and therefore does not support this change. The issue is discussed in detail under the 'Site Allocations' section of Issue 16 A Natural, Resilient Place.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

#### Rosemount Open Space

Rosemount is a primarily residential area with a semi-rural character. Most of the land is privately owned however a significant area of greenspace is protected for its amenity value. In response to comments received at the MIR stage, the open space boundary has been revised to ensure consistency across the area (CD209). The proposed designation allows for small scale development within well-defined garden grounds and covers other areas which contribute to the special character of Rosemount and should be retained. On a settlement level, developable land is getting scarce within the settlement boundary. Retaining open space around Rosemount is weighed up against the opportunity to provide housing close to local facilities. As Rosemount is a sensitive location and the demand to develop is high, there is a preference for development under masterplans (such as H64 & H258). One off developments which originally created the character of the area, in current circumstances could result in the fragmentation of open spaces with high visual amenity value.

Mr C & Mrs F McCarthy (0659/01/001): Changing the designation of the 1998 Local Plan, the 2014 Adopted Plan tightened the open space boundary around the little Struan following the line of a fence. The Proposed Plan carries forward a very similar version realigning the open space boundary as shown on the map submitted by the respondent

(CD200). The first two applications cited in the representation (06/01776/FLL; 12/00086/FLL) were both granted planning permission under the 1998/2005 Plan boundary. The 2014 application for the renewal of planning permission (14/01533/FLL) was granted regardless of the open space boundary change as no built development was proposed on the overlapping area (CD187). Permitted development rights within the curtilage of the house were revoked as part of this consent in order to retain control of any future built development. In the officer's report it was flagged up that the new open space boundary did not take into account of the 2012 planning consent. Since then works have started on site and in 2017 an application for a different design was approved (17/01317/FLL) (CD193) (CD205).

The area covered by the 2014 planning permission could be acknowledged as the garden ground of the new residential unit however removing the open space designation would not change the fact the permitted development rights have been revoked as part of the planning consent. Furthermore, the revised design approved in 2017 indicates that the new property's garden ground does not stretch as far as the open space designation. The area which the respondent requests to be outwith the open space designation appears to be part of the larger undeveloped area to the west of Woodlands Road (CD210). During the LDP1 examination the reporter acknowledged the value of this undeveloped area and also stated that Woodlands Road is a narrow country lane with no footways, sharp bends and with poor visibility and it is not an ideal location for further development.

The respondent also refers to some other changes in the area which have occurred over time (CD237). The changes are justified below:

- Site A & D - the open space designation was removed to exclude the houses and their well-defined garden grounds.
- Site C – this site is covered below, under the response to Mr Michal Wojtowicz (0133/01/001)
- Site E – the site changed from agricultural designation to a proposed site for football pitches and is now protected as open space / sport facility.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mr Michal Wojtowicz (0133/01/001): The area in question is part of the front garden of 'Belfield' and has been designated as open space since 1998 for its visual amenity value. The suitability of the open space designation was revisited during the previous examination, where the Reporter stated that the designation should be maintained (CD015; page 862). It was argued that the area makes a small but valuable contribution to the sense of openness at Rosemount and visual connection between Woodland Road and the wider undeveloped area to the west. There has been no change since then which would justify altering the open space boundary this time around.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Maureen Brass (0266/01/001): In 2014, planning permission (14/01122/IPL) for the development of a house on site was refused as it was contrary to the LDP. In relation to this proposal the argument was made that although only a small part of the open space designation was affected, it would undermine the objective of the policy and encourage further piecemeal development in the area. Although it is acknowledged that part of the wider area was formerly part of a semi enclosed walled garden, development on this plot would close a gap and block views from Golf Course Road across the area, affecting the sense of openness (CD208). The boundary around the property has been revised during

the preparation of the Proposed Plan and the private garden ground to the front of the property was excluded from the open space designation. The private garden of the property is large enough to provide scope for development subject to planning permission and there are also some outbuildings on site which could be repurposed. It is not considered appropriate to remove the proposed area of open space from the designation.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Galbraith Group (0555/01/001); P. Keir Doe (0598/05/001): Both sites (MD004) were zoned for `agricultural land` in the Eastern Area Local Plan (1998) (CD058; Map B) and for open space in the adopted LDP (CD014; page 283). In the previous examination the reporter stated that the open space designation, including privately owned areas, helps preserve the semi-rural character of Rosemount. Removing the designation would result in areas of white land within the settlement boundary and open them up for development. Compared to proposed sites H64 and H258 which are in the same area, these sites are less centrally located and would not result in the same benefits (e.g. improved connectivity). Both sites would use Golf Course road as a main access which may not have the capacity to accommodate additional development, considering the existing allocations on the other side of Rosemount. Furthermore, both sites would be visually prominent from the road, breaking the continuous line of hedges which currently border the sites (CD202). While the Stillesmuir Farm site was submitted during pre-MIR call for sites stage the Council did not take it forward into either the MIR or the Proposed Plan. Neither site had the benefit of full public consultation. Considering that housing numbers could be met elsewhere in the area it is not a preferable option to remove the open space designation in either of these cases.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Mr Bernard Walton (0202/01/002): It is acknowledged that the fields at Rosemount are not prime agricultural land as opposed to some of the other sites which are allocated in the Plan. As detailed above, development in Rosemount is currently limited by the open space designation and the commitment to retain its semi-rural character. Were larger scale development encouraged here it would fundamentally alter the areas character and require a change in approach with as preference for the development of a comprehensive masterplan. This approach, or the specific site, was not submitted during the earlier LDP2 plan preparation stages and so has not had the benefit of stakeholder engagement or public consultation. If it were to be considered, it would be for the next plan cycle as it would require both public consultation and detailed environmental assessment.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

### New Sites

Two respondents have mentioned further alternative sites however none of these representations included any detail (e.g. site boundaries) or indicated the effectiveness of alternative sites:

- Jean Squires (0340/01/001&002): An area of land south to Davie Park in Rattray (CD079, pages 298-306) has previously been assessed for residential use but was ruled out due to impact on transport infrastructure. Rattray is not considered an ideal location for large scale development as it is likely to require a new bridge over River Ericht which may make development unviable.
- Stuart Nichol (0041/01/005): In terms of the expansion of the tourism designation

around Blairgowrie Holiday Park, the Council is not aware of a demand for additional land for tourism related activities at this location. If any interested party was to suggest the designation of this area, the site would have to be assessed alongside other proposals and be subject to stakeholder engagement and public consultation.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**