

Issue 48	Strathmore and the Glens Area – Settlements with Proposals	
Development plan reference:	H68 - Ardler Road, Meigle, page 240 H69 - Forfar Road, Meigle, page 241	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Elizabeth Gordon (0110) Gordon L Halder (0134) Mr Rae Taylor (0182) Michael McLaren (0255) Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (PKHT) (0272) Mrs L Lobban (0297) Hadden Group Ltd (0418/01) Ronnie McNiven (0448) Alison Gambling (0551) Bellway Homes Limited (0559) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) (0742)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Settlement summaries and allocated sites in Strathmore settlements with proposals	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
Meigle		
<u>Proposed Sites</u>		
Gordon L Halder (0134/01/001): Both H68 and H69 are on agricultural land with Grade A soil. Less fertile agricultural land and derelict land should be prioritised for development. There is a historic issue with sewage capacity in Meigle and it would require a major system upgrade to support the amount of houses proposed in the Plan. There is no need or demand in the settlement for large scale development. Development would compromise the village`s character and put strain on the local school.		
Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/005): H68 and H69 are not effective sites. They were allocated in the 1988 Local Plan (CD058; page 57) as well as the Adopted LDP (CD014; pages 298-299) and it is questionable why development never took place on either. Furthermore, site 69 was only assessed for 50 units rather than the indicated capacity range of 64-100. Considering against the tests set out in PAN 2/2010 (CD040; pages 16-17), there are questions in relation to the ownership and marketability of both sites. To meet housing land requirement in the Strathmore HMA, additional sites should be allocated instead of or in addition to H68 and H69.		
<u>H68 Ardler Road</u>		
Elizabeth Gordon (0110/01/002): Since the Development Plan adopted for the area in		

1998 (CD058; page 57) the housing numbers for the site have been gradually increased from 18 to the currently suggested 23-36. At the same time, there is a lack of local employment opportunities and public transport services are limited. There is also concern about the high likelihood of flooding from the Meigle Burn and developing a field which currently absorbs rainwater. Although a Flood Risk Assessment is amongst the developer requirements, a Drainage Impact Assessment is also necessary as the Burn is reaching its capacity as a drainage ditch. The Plan should specify that the only suitable access to the site is to Ardler Road; Tree Back along the NW boundary of the site is an unadopted single track road. The respondent notes that the use of developer requirements is inconsistent, requirements mentioned for other sites such as 'sympathetic built form and layout'; archaeological investigation, and Drainage Impact Assessment are relevant to H68 as well.

Rae Taylor (0182/01/002): Flood risk on site has been increasing over the past years which undermine the assumptions made in the previous development plans. The scope of the Flood Risk Assessment required by the Proposed Plan is unclear, it should be explicit that it includes impact on any property not only the ones adjacent to the site. A Drainage Impact Assessment should also be required for the site. The housing capacity range is higher than the suggested 20 houses in the Adopted Plan (CD014; page 298). It should be specified if the intention is to develop smaller houses on site and numbers should be reduced to 20. An archaeological investigation should be required to recover any historic evidence before development takes place. It is unclear what is required in terms of creating links to existing Green Infrastructure. While an otter survey is required by the Proposed Plan, the impact of development on other species (e.g. beaver, mink, water rat) should also be assessed.

Alison Gambling (0551/01/001): High density development is not sympathetic to the character of the village and its immediate surroundings. Medium or low density would be more suitable for this site, reducing the capacity range to 14-23 or <14. A higher number of houses would further increase flood risk for properties in the area and would have a higher impact on parking and road usage.

Hadden Group Ltd (0418/01/001): Supports the allocation of the site. The site is in the control of the respondent and its physical constraints such as flood risk were examined and assessed. It is an effective housing site identified in the adopted LDP that could be developed in the emerging LDP2 period. The indicative capacity range in the Proposed Plan is appropriate and factors in developer requirements and affordable housing provision. Reducing this would be counter-productive from a development economics point of view. The preparation of a detailed planning application for site H68 is underway and it is likely to be submitted in 2018.

SEPA (0742/01/060): Supports the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment.

H69 Forfar Road

Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/010): Recommends highlighting the likelihood of an archaeological investigation being required.

L Lobban (0297/01/001): Instead of developing prime agricultural land, non-productive land such as the strip along the disused railway line should be utilised. Less than 50 houses would be more in keeping with the character of the village instead of the

suggested 100. The site is in a flood area and as it is on higher ground, development could worsen flooding issues elsewhere. The current infrastructure, including roads, employment opportunities, schools and other services cannot support the proposed scale of expansion. Reasonable expansion to the village would be acceptable.

Ronnie McNiven (0448/01/001): The traffic concerns which have been raised in relation to a previous application to the site (08/00055/FUL) have not been addressed (RD034). There is a high volume and speed of traffic passing through the village and traffic is often stopped at the junction of the A94 and B954. New development would only make congestion in the area worse.

Michael McLaren (0255/01/001): The landowner confirms that they support the development of the site. They are encouraged by renewed interest in the proposed purchase of the site indicating development interest in the village and site H69.

New Sites

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/001): MIR site H272 (MD012) should be allocated in the Proposed Plan. The reasons include issues with the deliverability of sites H252, H68, H69 and H341 within the Strathmore HMA Area. Without the evidence to suggest that these sites can be delivered, the Council should consider alternative sites instead of or in addition to them. H272 meets all the effective land supply tests as outlined in PAN 2/2010 (CD040; pages 16-17) and could be developed as a mix of low density and medium density areas. The proposal has been revised since the previous examination and the number of units was reduced to 125-150. It can also deliver planning gains such as 25% affordable housing, improved open space provision and enhancement of the Scheduled Monument on site. Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/006) also questions the SEA scoring (CD079; pages 253-273) for MIR site H272 and suggests more positive results.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Meigle

Proposed Sites

Gordon L Halder (0134/01/001): Delete both H68 and H69.

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/005): Sites H68 and H69 are not effective and should either be removed from the Plan with alternative sites allocated or alternative sites should be added to the existing allocations.

H68 Ardler Road

Elizabeth Gordon (0110/01/002): Reduce housing numbers to a maximum of 20 houses. A detailed Drainage Impact Assessment should be added to developer requirements. Specify that the only potential access to the site is onto Ardler Road.

Rae Taylor (0182/01/002): Reduce housing numbers to a maximum of 20 houses. Clarify that the Floor Risk Assessment needs to include impact on any property not only the ones adjacent to the site. A Drainage Impact Assessment and an Archaeological Investigation

should also be required for the site. Clarify requirement in relation to Green Infrastructure and require the survey of animals living in the burn other than otters.

Alison Gambling (0551/01/001): Reduce capacity range for the site to reflect medium or low density.

H69 Forfar Road

Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/010): Highlight the likelihood of an archaeological investigation being required at the Site Specific Developer Requirements section for the site.

L Lobban (0297/01/001): Reduce capacity to a maximum of 50 and concentrate development on non-productive agricultural land.

Ronnie McNiven (0448/01/001): No specific modification was sought but concerns were raised regarding the traffic impact of the proposal.

New Sites

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/001 & 006): Allocate site H272 for housing and alter the SEA scoring for the site.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

Meigle

Proposed Sites

Gordon L Halder (0134/01/001): H68 and H69 are smaller allocations, giving an element of choice within the Strathmore area. Both are situated a short walk away from the centre and local facilities. Although it is not a tiered settlement, Meigle has a good range of facilities and services including a shop, post office, primary school, church and cafes. There is an hourly service into Blairgowrie and Dundee (Bus 57; 57A) providing an alternative to commuting by car. It is acknowledged that development would result in the loss of some prime agricultural land which surrounds the village from all sides. To minimise impact on soil resources, Policy 49 requires developments to implement appropriate soil management measures and consider opportunities to re-use good-quality soils elsewhere. There is no reason to believe however that development would take away from the village's character. In terms of local infrastructure, the primary school has capacity (62% occupancy) to accommodate new pupils (CD124). Scottish Water is currently undertaking assessments to determine the exact capacity of Meigle Wastewater Treatment Works and expects to have an accurate view by mid-September 2018. They confirmed that in a worst case scenario where no additional capacity can be released, they would look to support interim solutions to facilitate development.

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/005): Despite not coming forward in the current Plan period, it would be premature to consider either site non-effective. Hadden Group has recently submitted a detailed planning application (18/01144/FLL) for H68 which indicates that the site is effective under the conditions outlined by the Proposed Plan.

H69 is under the ownership of a landowner who supports the development of the site. The site is currently being marketed and there are no known constraints which would make it non-effective. It should also be taken into account that in the past years the housing market has been going through a phase of recovery with low build rates.

The respondent refers to the assessment of H69. The site has been carried forward from the Adopted Local Development Plan (CD014; pages 298-299) and the principle of the proposed land use was considered appropriate at the LDP1 Examination (CD015; pages 887-888). As discussed below under the H69 Forfar Road heading, the capacity range which is now shown in the Proposed Plan reflects the Council's new approach of defining site capacity.

H68 Ardler Road

Elizabeth Gordon (0110/01/002); Rae Taylor (0182/01/002); Alison Gambling (0551/01/001): The site is well situated between the town centre and Victory Park. During the preparation of the Proposed Plan, further work has been carried out to determine the capacity of the site with regards to changing market conditions. There is a growing demand for affordable units as well as smaller homes for downsizing and first time buyers. The site has the potential to accommodate these types of accommodation within a higher density development. Based on the assumption that 75% of the site is developable and high density can be achieved, the capacity range was increased to 23-36. This is not considered out of character with the village as Meigle already has some higher density areas with smaller plots (e.g. across the road from site H68).

SEPA's latest record on flood risk indicates low and medium probability river flooding to the northern boundary of the site. This area is marked for indicative landscaping in the Proposed Plan to ensure no development takes place here. Any proposal for the site will have to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and comply with Policy 50 which states that there is a presumption against development which would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. Although a Drainage Impact Assessment is not highlighted on the list of developer requirements, Policy 50 states that a DIA will be required for any proposal greater than 1000m².

Ardler Road provides a logical primary access to the site and the indicative landscaping to the north separates development from Tree Back Road. If despite of this vehicular access was proposed onto Tree Back, its suitability would be considered at the planning application stage.

Based on Council records, H68 does not contain any site of archaeological significance. However, Policy 26B states that if discoveries are made during any development, works should be suspended and the Local Authority should be informed. In terms of protecting wildlife at the burn, developer requirements refer to Policy 45 which deals with the protection of watercourses within the River Tay Special Area of Conservation. The Policy specifically requires an otter survey to be undertaken where the development site is within 30m of a watercourse as it is a qualifying feature of the River Tay SAC. Under Policy 40, development is required to protect all species and enhance wildlife habitats. Any negative impact of a proposal on species in and around the burn would have to be mitigated at the planning application stage.

The developer requirement for green infrastructure to link with the wider network is considered to be clear; there are obvious links to be made with Victory Park to the west as well as to the burn through the indicative landscaping area to the north of the site.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter is minded to accept the modification requesting the addition of a Drainage Impact Assessment to the site specific developer requirements, the Council would be comfortable with making this change as it would not have any implications for any other aspect of the plan.

H69 Forfar Road

L Lobban (0297/01/001); Ronnie McNiven (0448/01/001): Site H69 is carried forward from the Adopted Plan (CD014; pages 298-299) as it remains suitable for residential development. The housing numbers are limited to 50 during the lifetime of the plan and part of the site should be safeguarded for educational use and/or playing fields adjacent to the school. The capacity range for the site was based on known constraints and medium density which is considered to be appropriate in the context of the surrounding area. Flood risk constraints were factored into the estimated developable area and any proposal would have to comply with Policy 50 which protects against development that would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. In relation to concerns over transport infrastructure, the Council's Transport Planning Team has confirmed that there is no road capacity issue in Meigle. However a junction analysis would be useful in order to identify any necessary junction realignment or improvements at Dundee Road / Forfar Road. A Transport Statement would determine the impact that future development traffic might have on this junction.

No modification is proposed to the Plan. However if the Reporter is minded, a Transport Statement could be added to site specific developer requirements to ensure that the impact of the development on the nearby junction is fully understood and mitigated.

Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust (0272/01/010): The site is considered to have some archaeological potential as a medieval papal bulla (MPK 18069) has been found in the southern part of the field. 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.

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 not have any implications for any other aspect of the plan.

New Sites

Bellway Homes Limited (0559/01/001 & 006): Site H272 (MD012) has not been supported in the last Examination as it is less well connected to the village than the two sites proposed in the Plan (CD015; page 888). It is further away from the village centre and separated from the existing built up area by a stretch of woodland and stone wall that runs along its norther and western boundaries. The main access is proposed onto Ardler Road, some parts of which are very narrow, with no public footpaths. The development may also affect the setting of historic structures including Belmont Castle. Although housing numbers have been reduced in the current submission, it is still a large scale site,

exceeding the area of both existing allocations in Meikle. It should also be noted that 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. Meikle is not identified as a tiered settlement in TAYplan (CD022; pages 8-11) and it is not considered necessary or appropriate to allocate H272 in addition to or instead of the proposed sites in the Plan.

The respondent refers to the effectiveness of sites H252 in Alyth, H68 and H69 in Meikle and H341 in Rattray. As stated above, both sites in Meikle are considered to be effective. The sites in Alyth and Blairgowrie/Rattray are discussed under the relevant Schedule 4 summaries (see Issues 45 and 46).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

In terms of the suggestion to alter the SEA for the site, the current assessment – as part of the Environmental Report Addendum (2017) (CD067) - reflects the Council's views. Any technical corrections and/or clarifications to the assessment will be included in the Post Adoption Statement once the Local Development Plan has been formally adopted. This will be made available for public viewing online and in hard copy, in accordance with Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 (CD027).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Reporter's conclusions:
Reporter's recommendations: