

NOTICE OF REVIEW

UNDER SECTION 43A(8) OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT
1997 (AS AMENDED) IN RESPECT OF DECISIONS ON LOCAL DEVELOPMENTS

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCHEMES OF DELEGATION AND LOCAL REVIEW
PROCEDURE) (SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2013

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (APPEALS) (SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2008

IMPORTANT: Please read and follow the guidance notes provided when completing this form. Failure to supply all the relevant information could invalidate your notice of review.

Use **BLOCK CAPITALS** if completing in manuscript

Applicant(s)

Name Russell Baird
Address Messrs George M Baird
West Whitefield Farm,
Burrelton, Blairgowrie
Postcode PH139PT
Contact Telephone 1
Contact Telephone 2
E-mail* jbrewster@urds.co.uk

Agent

Name Urban Rural Design
Address Rotmell Farm
Ballinluig
Pitlochry
Postcode PH9 0NU
Contact Telephone 1 01350 727559
Contact Telephone 2 07827 947143
E-mail* jbrewster@urds.co.uk

Mark this box to confirm all contact should be
through this representative:

*Do you agree to correspondence regarding your review being sent by e-mail? Yes

Planning Authority

Perth and Kinross

Planning authority's application reference number 25/00814/IPL

Site address Land 180 Metres
North East Of Hillocks Farm Burrelton Blairgowrie PH13 9PX

Description of proposed development

Planning in principle Application for Farmhouse

Date of application 2nd June 2025

Date of decision (if any) 13th November 2025

Note. This notice must be served on the planning authority within three months of the date of the decision notice or from the date of expiry of the period allowed for determining the application.

Nature of application

1. Application for planning permission (including householder application)
2. Application for planning permission in principle
3. Further application (including development that has not yet commenced and where a time limit has been imposed; renewal of planning permission; and/or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition)
4. Application for approval of matters specified in conditions

Reasons for seeking review

1. Refusal of application by appointed officer
2. Failure by appointed officer to determine the application within the period allowed for determination of the application
3. Conditions imposed on consent by appointed officer

Review procedure

The Local Review Body will decide on the procedure to be used to determine your review and may at any time during the review process require that further information or representations be made to enable them to determine the review. Further information may be required by one or a combination of procedures, such as: written submissions; the holding of one or more hearing sessions and/or inspecting the land which is the subject of the review case.

Please indicate what procedure (or combination of procedures) you think is most appropriate for the handling of your review. You may mark more than one box if you wish the review to be conducted by a combination of procedures.

1. Further written submissions
2. One or more hearing sessions
3. Site inspection
4. Assessment of review documents only, with no further procedure

If you have marked box 1 or 2, please explain here which of the matters (as set out in your statement below) you believe ought to be subject of that procedure, and why you consider further submissions or a hearing are necessary:

Site inspection

In the event that the Local Review Body decides to inspect the review site, in your opinion:

1. Can the site be viewed entirely from public land? Yes
2. Is it possible for the site to be accessed safely, and without barriers to entry? Yes

If there are reasons why you think the Local Review Body would be unable to undertake an unaccompanied site inspection, please explain here:

N/A

Statement

You must state, in full, why you are seeking a review on your application. Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review.

Note: you may not have a further opportunity to add to your statement of review at a later date. It is therefore essential that you submit with your notice of review, all necessary information and evidence that you rely on and wish the Local Review Body to consider as part of your review.

If the Local Review Body issues a notice requesting further information from any other person or body, you will have a period of 14 days in which to comment on any additional matter which has been raised by that person or body.

State here the reasons for your notice of review and all matters you wish to raise. If necessary, this can be continued or provided in full in a separate document. You may also submit additional documentation with this form.

Please refer to appended supporting statement Appendix A

Have you raised any matters which were not before the appointed officer at the time the determination on your application was made? Yes No

If yes, you should explain in the box below, why you are raising new material, why it was not raised with the appointed officer before your application was determined and why you consider it should now be considered in your review.

Example applications which have had a positive determination based on the reasons for refusal

List of documents and evidence

Please provide a list of all supporting documents, materials and evidence which you wish to submit with your notice of review and intend to rely on in support of your review.

Please refer to appended supporting statement Appendix A

Note. The planning authority will make a copy of the notice of review, the review documents and any notice of the procedure of the review available for inspection at an office of the planning authority until such time as the review is determined. It may also be available on the planning authority website.

Checklist

Please mark the appropriate boxes to confirm you have provided all supporting documents and evidence relevant to your review:

- Full completion of all parts of this form
- Statement of your reasons for requiring a review

- All documents, materials and evidence which you intend to rely on (e.g. plans and drawings or other documents) which are now the subject of this review.

Note. Where the review relates to a further application e.g. renewal of planning permission or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition or where it relates to an application for approval of matters specified in conditions, it is advisable to provide the application reference number, approved plans and decision notice from that earlier consent.

Declaration

I the applicant/agent [delete as appropriate] hereby serve notice on the planning authority to review the application as set out on this form and in the supporting documents.

Signed: Jane Brewster

Date: 28/01/26

APPENDIX A

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

Planning in Principle Application

Erection of a Single Dwellinghouse on the Basis of Agricultural Need

Land at West Whitefield Farm, Burrelton, Blairgowrie, Perthshire, PH13 9PT

1.0 Introduction

This Planning in Principle application seeks consent for the erection of a single family dwellinghouse at West Whitefield Farm, Burrelton, on the basis of established agricultural need, operational necessity, and long-term succession planning.

The application is submitted in support of a long-established and viable farming enterprise operated by **Messrs George M Baird (Holding No. 89/666/0008)**. The proposal is founded on robust evidence of labour requirement, modern farming practices, animal welfare considerations, and compliance with both **National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4)** and the **Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2019**, together with the associated **Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance**.

The proposed dwelling is essential to the continued sustainable management of the farm and to facilitate a structured generational succession, ensuring the long-term viability of the holding.

2.0 The Farm Business

West Whitefield Farm extends to approximately **199 hectares (490 acres)** of agricultural land located around 12 miles east of Perth. The landholding is geographically dispersed and accessed via a private farm road from the Collace Road, with links to the A93 and A94.

The farm enterprise comprises:

- Grassland grazing
- Winter oilseed rape
- Spring barley
- A flock of approximately **250 crossbred ewes**
- A **world-renowned Highland pony stud**, including 11 broodmares and progeny

Livestock are managed predominantly **outdoors year-round**, reflecting modern agricultural practices based on rotational grazing, outdoor lambing, and foaling. As such, the operational focus of the business is not confined to farm buildings but extends across the wider landholding.

A **Labour Requirement Report prepared by SAC Consulting (Scottish Agricultural College)** confirms that the farm generates an annual labour requirement **in excess of three full-time labour units**, fully justifying the need for an additional on-site dwelling.

3.0 Existing Residential Accommodation on the Holding

There are currently **three residential properties** associated with West Whitefield Farm:

1. **The Main Farmhouse**

Occupied by the applicant's parents, who continue to play an active role in daily farm operations. However, they are approaching retirement and will retain the farmhouse as part of the agreed succession and retirement arrangements. This property will not be available to meet the ongoing operational needs of the farm.

2. **Farm Cottage (Life Rent)**

This property is subject to a long-term life rent arrangement and is occupied by a family member. It is not within the legal or practical control of the applicant and cannot be considered available accommodation for farm workers or succession purposes.

3. **Second Cottage (Separate Ownership)**

This property is owned by the applicant's brother, is currently unoccupied, and is in a state of disrepair (it is a derelict shell). It is not available to the applicant and, regardless, is not of a suitable size or condition to accommodate the applicant's family.

Even if availability were not constrained by ownership and legal arrangements, the **SAC report confirms that three labour units – and therefore three dwellings – are justified** by the scale and nature of the enterprise.

4.0 The Applicant's Role and Succession Planning

The applicant has been actively involved in the farm business for over a decade and is now in the process of assuming **majority control**, with full succession planned in due course.

Farming is inherently **hands-on and operational**, involving long and irregular hours, seven days a week, often extending into night-time during lambing, foaling, adverse weather events, and security incidents. Management within agriculture cannot be separated from physical presence and direct involvement.

Historically, the business has been operated with fewer labour units than recognised standards, requiring the applicant's parents to work significantly beyond normal working hours. This arrangement is no longer sustainable.

The provision of an on-site dwelling for the applicant is therefore **essential** to:

- Maintain animal welfare standards
- Ensure rapid response to emergencies
- Safeguard farm security
- Facilitate a smooth and viable generational transition

Off-site accommodation in Perth, Coupar Angus, or elsewhere would be impractical and would undermine the effective operation of the farm.

5.0 Description of the Proposed Development

The application seeks **Planning in Principle** for a single family dwellinghouse within a site area of approximately **0.5 acres**, located in the corner of an existing field.

Key characteristics of the site include:

- An established access directly onto a minor public road
- Mature field boundaries to the east and south
- Rising landform and woodland backdrop to the north
- Visual containment provided by existing topography and vegetation

Indicative plans demonstrate a potential dwelling of traditional rural form, potentially two storeys, using high-quality materials such as natural stone, render, metal and timber cladding. Final design, scale and materials would be subject to detailed planning approval.

6.0 Site Selection and Operational Justification

The proposed site has been carefully selected as the **optimal location** to meet the operational, welfare, security and landscape requirements of the farm.

6.1 Central Location and Operational Efficiency

The site lies centrally within the landholding and provides direct access to a significant proportion of the grazing and livestock areas, particularly those used year-round for sheep and ponies. This allows for:

- Continuous passive supervision
- Rapid intervention during emergencies
- Efficient daily management of livestock and land

6.2 Animal Welfare Considerations

Category 3 of the Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance requires that a dwelling be **essential for animal welfare reasons**.

At West Whitefield Farm, livestock are not housed in sheds for prolonged periods. Instead, welfare requirements are best met through proximity to grazing fields rather than farm buildings. The proposed dwelling is located immediately adjacent to fields used for lambing and foaling, ensuring compliance with both the **letter and spirit** of the policy.

6.3 Security and Health & Safety

Livestock theft and unauthorised access typically occur from fields rather than steadings. The proposed site provides passive supervision of vulnerable areas and complements the existing security provided by the main farmhouse.

Health and safety risks at West Whitefield arise primarily within the fields and grazing areas. The central location of the dwelling allows for effective oversight and rapid response where risks are greatest.

7.0 Planning Policy Assessment

7.1 National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4)

NPF4 Policy 17(a) supports new homes in rural areas where development:

- Is suitably scaled, sited and designed; and
- Is necessary to support the sustainable management of a viable rural business; and
- Demonstrates an essential need for a worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work.

The policy does **not** require a dwelling to be adjacent to farm buildings. In this case, the applicant's place of work is the wider landholding itself. The proposal fully accords with NPF4.

7.2 Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan 2019

The site lies within the countryside, where Policy 19 supports housing associated with established economic activity, subject to compliance with the Housing in the Countryside Guidance.

Policy 1 (Placemaking) is satisfied through careful site selection, landscape integration, and the intention to deliver a high-quality rural dwelling at the detailed stage.

8.0 Landscape and Visual Impact

The proposed site meets all relevant siting criteria:

- It is not located on a skyline, ridge, or prominent slope
- It benefits from strong existing containment on multiple sides
- It reflects the established pattern of development along this road corridor
- It will not be visually prominent from key vantage points

There is clear precedent for residential development at similar elevations and within similar landscape contexts in the area, including recently approved applications with comparable siting characteristics.

9.0 Consideration of Alternatives

Alternative locations, including areas adjacent to farm buildings, have been considered and discounted due to:

- Lack of visual containment
- Plateau-style topography
- Greater landscape impact
- Reduced proximity to livestock grazing areas

The proposed site represents the **best fit** in landscape, operational, and welfare terms.

10.0 RESPONSE TO REASONS FOR REFUSAL

10.1 Reason for Refusal 1

Alleged conflict with NPF4 Policy 17(a), 17(a)(v) and 17(a)(vi)

10.1.a NPF4 Policy 17(a): Suitably Sited and In Keeping with the Character of the Area

Policy test:

NPF4 Policy 17(a) states that development proposals for new homes in rural areas will be supported where the development is *“suitably scaled, sited and designed to be in keeping with the character of the area.”*

Response:

The conclusion that the site is “not defined, standalone and easily separated from farming operations” is not supported by an objective assessment of the site or its context.

The proposed site:

- Is visually contained by an established road, verge and tree belts
- Has a rising landform and woodland backdrop to the north and east
- Sits within an established pattern of dispersed rural development along the same road corridor

The site therefore **responds positively to landform and landscape character**, as required by Policy 17(a). The policy does not require a site to be physically attached to existing farm buildings, nor does it prohibit development on land associated with agricultural fields where containment and integration are demonstrated.

The proposal is **suitably sited** and respects the rural character of the area, fully satisfying the opening requirement of Policy 17(a).

10.1.b NPF4 Policy 17(a)(v): Essential Need for a Worker to Live at or Near Their Place of Work

Policy test:

Policy 17(a)(v) supports development where it:

“is demonstrated to be necessary to support the sustainable management of a viable rural business or craft, and there is an essential need for a worker (including those taking majority control of a farm business) to live permanently at or near their place of work.”

Response:

The refusal asserts that the essential need for an additional dwelling has not been demonstrated. This directly contradicts the submitted evidence.

A **SAC Labour Requirement Report**, prepared by recognised agricultural consultants, confirms that the farm generates **in excess of three full-time labour units**. This professional assessment provides objective evidence that the current residential provision is insufficient to meet the operational needs of the business.

The applicant:

- Has been actively involved in the farm for over a decade
- Is in the process of taking majority control of the business
- Is required to provide continuous on-site presence due to outdoor livestock management, lambing, foaling, security and welfare concerns

NPF4 explicitly includes workers **“taking majority control of a farm business”** within the scope of Policy 17(a)(v). The applicant falls squarely within this category, and the necessity for permanent on-site accommodation is clearly established.

The policy does **not** require the dwelling to be adjacent to farm buildings. The policy test is proximity to the *place of work*, which at West Whitefield is the wider landholding and grazing areas rather than a single steading location.

Accordingly, the proposal fully complies with Policy 17(a)(v).

10.1.c NPF4 Policy 17(a)(vi): Single Home for Retirement Succession of a Viable Farm Holding

Policy test:

Policy 17(a)(vi) supports development where it:

“is for a single home for the retirement succession of a viable farm holding.”

Response:

The refusal suggests that succession needs can be met by an existing “additional house”. This conclusion is based on an incorrect assumption regarding availability and control.

The existing cottage:

- Is occupied under a long-term life rent arrangement
- Is not legally available to the applicant
- Forms part of an established family succession agreement

NPF4 does not require applicants to displace lawful occupants or restructure private legal arrangements in order to avoid new development. The policy test is whether the proposal supports **retirement succession**, not whether another dwelling exists in theory.

Furthermore, the SAC Labour Report demonstrates that the scale of the business justifies **three labour units and three dwellings**. Even if availability were assumed (which is expressly denied), the policy justification for the proposed dwelling remains valid.

The proposal therefore directly supports retirement and succession planning in accordance with Policy 17(a)(vi).

10.2 Reason for Refusal 2

Alleged conflict with LDP Policy 19 and Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance (Category 3)

11.2.a LDP Policy 19: Housing in the Countryside – Principle of Development

Policy test:

Policy 19 supports single houses in the countryside where they fall within defined categories and comply with the Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance.

Response:

The proposal is correctly assessed under **Category 3 – New Houses in the Open Countryside**. Policy 19 requires compliance with *at least one* category; it does not require proposals to satisfy multiple categories.

The refusal’s reference to failure to meet Categories 1, 2, 4, 5 or 6 is therefore irrelevant to the determination of the application.

10.2.b Housing in the Countryside SG – Category 3: Siting Criteria

Policy test:

Category 3 requires that:

- The site is well integrated with landform
- Existing features provide containment
- The proposal avoids prominent or skyline locations
- The dwelling relates appropriately to the landscape

Response:

The refusal's reliance on the site being "within the corner of a field" misapplies the guidance. The Supplementary Guidance does not prohibit field corner sites. It requires assessment of **containment, integration and visual impact**.

The proposed site:

- Is bounded by an established road and verge
- Benefits from mature tree belts and rising landform
- Has a clear and defensible site definition
- Avoids skyline, ridge and visually exposed locations

These characteristics meet the Category 3 siting criteria and, critically, provide **greater containment than alternative locations near the farm buildings**, which lie on open plateau land with limited landscape structure.

10.2.c Housing in the Countryside SG – Category 3: Animal Welfare and Operational Need

Policy test:

Category 3 requires evidence that the dwelling is "*essential to the continued operation of the farm for animal welfare reasons*" and that proximity to livestock is appropriate.

Response:

At West Whitefield Farm, livestock are managed outdoors for the majority of the year, including lambing and foaling. Welfare, security and health and safety requirements therefore arise primarily within the fields, not at the steading.

The proposed dwelling:

- Is immediately adjacent to grazing and livestock areas
- Allows rapid response to welfare issues and emergencies
- Provides passive supervision of animals year-round

This directly satisfies the animal welfare requirements of Category 3 and reflects modern agricultural practice, as anticipated by the guidance.

10.2.d Housing in the Countryside SG – Economic Justification

Policy test:

Category 3 requires robust evidence of economic and operational need.

Response:

The SAC Labour Requirement Report provides independent, professional confirmation that the farm requires more than three full-time labour units. This evidence has not been disputed by any alternative assessment.

The economic need for an additional dwelling is therefore **clearly, robustly and objectively demonstrated**, in full accordance with the Supplementary Guidance.

10.3 Overall Policy Compliance and Planning Balance

When assessed correctly against:

- NPF4 Policy 17(a), (v) and (vi)
- LDP Policy 19
- Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance (Category 3)

...the proposal is fully policy-compliant.

The refusal arises from:

- An unduly restrictive interpretation of “place of work”
- Incorrect assumptions regarding dwelling availability
- Insufficient weight given to professional labour evidence
- An outdated understanding of modern farming operations

11.0 Relevant Perth & Kinross Approvals – Comparable Countryside Development

When considering the Planning Review, it is important to note that **Perth & Kinross Council has recently granted permission for several residential development proposals in rural/countryside locations** where no specific policy allocation exists and where justification has varied. These decisions demonstrate that the Council is prepared to support rural housing where the policy tests under **NPF4** and the **Local Development Plan / Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance** are met, and/or where context and material considerations have been judged to justify development in the open countryside.

There are a number of recent and historic approvals within the Perth & Kinross Council area for dwellinghouses in countryside locations that share clear similarities with the proposed development at West Whitefield Farm. These permissions are material in demonstrating how Policy 19 of the Local Development Plan and the Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance have been applied in practice.

The examples below include dwellings approved in open countryside, often remote from farm buildings, located within corners of fields or agricultural land, and in some cases without an agricultural or operational justification.

Examples include:

11.1.a Land 70 Metres South West of Wetlands Cottage, Tullibardine

24/01877/FLL – *Erection of 3 dwellinghouses and associated works*

This application for multiple houses in a rural agricultural context was **approved by the Council in December 2024**. Although unrelated to a specific agricultural business, the decision shows that the Council has recently granted **new residential development in countryside locations** where the cumulative impact, containment and landscape context were judged acceptable.

11.1.b Land 100 Metres North West of Dairy Orchil Home Farm, Braco

25/01245/FLL – *Erection of dwellinghouse, siting of caravan and storage container (temporary), installation of sewage treatment plant and associated works*

This decision was **approved by Perth & Kinross Council in late 2025** and confirms that a **house in principle in a countryside location**, accompanied by temporary operational structures and justification, was found acceptable. Importantly, the formal approval demonstrates that rural housing proposals are not automatically

dismissed solely on the basis that they are in the countryside, but that they must be judged on their individual operational context and compliance with policy.

11.1.c Land 100 Metres South West of Aquila, Braco Road, Comrie

25/01552/FLL – Erection of dwellinghouse and garage

Approved in mid-2025, this case again illustrates the Council's willingness to support new residential development in rural settings where the application meets policy requirements or the planning balance favours housing.

11.1.d. Land 90 Metres North of Balhomish Farm, Birnam, Dunkeld (PH8 0BW)

24/01310/FLL – Erection of a dwellinghouse and garage, alterations to ruinous building to form ancillary accommodation and associated works

This permission was granted for a new dwelling in a rural location set away from the main farm buildings. While the proposal included alterations to a ruinous structure, the primary residential element represents a new countryside dwelling with siting characteristics comparable to the current proposal, including its relationship to agricultural land rather than a defined settlement or building group.

11.1.e Land 200 Metres South East of Meikle Findowie Farm, Amulree

19/02008/FLL – Erection of a dwellinghouse

This application was approved for a standalone dwelling in open countryside, remote from the main farm steading and not forming part of a building group. The site sits within agricultural land and demonstrates that distance from farm buildings has not been determinative where siting, landscape integration and overall planning balance were considered acceptable.

11.1.f Land 500 Metres South East of Spirit of Wood, Mains of Murthly, Aberfeldy (PH15 2EA)

24/01748/IPL – Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle)

This recently approved Planning in Principle application relates to a house in open countryside, remote from farm buildings and settlement boundaries. The approval confirms that the Council has accepted the principle of new housing in countryside locations where siting criteria and landscape context are considered appropriate, even at the outline stage.

11.1.g Land 80 Metres North West of Spoutwells Farm, Meikleour

24/00068/FLL – Erection of a dwellinghouse

This case is particularly relevant. The approved dwelling is located within agricultural land, bounded by landscape features and a road, and is not immediately adjacent to the farm steading. The siting arrangement — including its relationship to a field corner and existing boundaries — closely mirrors the proposed siting at West Whitefield Farm.

11.2 Why These Precedents Are Relevant to This Case

Whilst we fully appreciate that each application must be determined on its own merits, these decisions are material considerations and illustrate how the Council has previously exercised planning judgment under Policy 19, the Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance, and now NPF4 Policy 17.

Against this context, it is difficult to sustain the conclusion that the West Whitefield proposal is unacceptable due to siting, remoteness, or lack of justification, particularly where comparable — and in some cases less justified — developments have been approved.

We hope the same balanced planning judgment to this proposal is exercised as has been applied in a number of comparable decisions across the Perth and Kinross area. Recent approvals demonstrate that the Council has supported new dwellinghouses in open countryside locations, including field-based and relatively remote sites,

where siting, landscape integration and overall planning balance were considered acceptable — in several cases without the level of operational or economic justification presented here.

In contrast, the proposal at West Whitefield Farm is supported by independent professional evidence confirming an essential labour and operational need, a clear succession strategy, and demonstrable animal welfare and security requirements. The site is well contained, avoids prominent or skyline locations, and reflects an established pattern of dispersed rural development. When assessed objectively against the wording and intent of NPF4 Policy 17, LDP Policy 19 and the Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance, the proposal is at least as compliant — and in many respects more robustly justified — than developments previously granted consent.

These approved applications establish **material planning context** within the Perth & Kinross area demonstrating that:

- The Council will grant consent for **new houses in the open countryside** where criteria set out in **NPF4** and the **Local Development Plan** are satisfied, or where individual circumstances justify the proposal.
- Approvals have been given in **relatively isolated field locations**, not wholly within building groups or settlements, indicating that rural housing proposals are considered on **operational merit and landscape impact**, not purely on prescriptive siting rules.
- This approach aligns with the spirit of **NPF4 Policy 17(a)**, which supports new rural homes where they are necessary to sustain viable rural businesses, and where siting, scale and landscape impact are acceptable.
- New dwellinghouses have been approved in open countryside locations, including field corners and agricultural land.
- Proximity to farm buildings has not been a prerequisite for approval where landscape containment and siting criteria are satisfied.
- In several cases, dwellings have been approved without an agricultural or operational justification, whereas the current proposal is supported by a robust SAC labour requirement report and clear succession planning evidence.
- Sites described as “remote” in absolute terms have nevertheless been found acceptable when assessed against landscape character, containment and policy intent.

None of these permissions appear to be for allocated housing sites within settlements, yet they were judged favourably based on the specific context, policy compliance and material considerations — a planning balance that mirrors the circumstances of the West Whitefield Farm proposal.

When compared with these examples, the proposed dwelling at West Whitefield Farm is at least as well justified, and in many respects better supported, given its direct relationship to an established and viable farming enterprise, demonstrable operational need, and animal welfare requirements.

12.0 Conclusion

This proposal represents a justified, policy-compliant and essential form of development.

The evidence clearly demonstrates that:

- West Whitefield Farm is a viable and established agricultural business
- The labour requirement exceeds three full-time units
- Existing residential accommodation cannot meet current or future needs
- The applicant's permanent on-site presence is essential for animal welfare, security, health and safety, and succession planning
- The proposed site is carefully chosen to minimise landscape impact while maximising operational efficiency

The proposal accords fully with **NPF4**, the **Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan**, and the **Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance**.

We therefore ask that the review body consider that this proposal is **not** speculative residential development but a carefully justified, policy-compliant application that directly supports the sustainable operation and long-term succession of a viable farming business.

Independent professional evidence from SAC confirms that West Whitefield Farm generates a labour requirement in excess of three full-time units. The applicant is taking majority control of the business and requires permanent on-site accommodation to meet modern animal welfare, security, and operational demands. National Planning Framework 4 expressly supports such proposals where there is an essential need for a worker to live at or near their place of work, and that test is clearly met in this case.

The refusal relies on an overly narrow interpretation of the "farm hub" and incorrect assumptions regarding the availability of existing dwellings. Modern farming operations at West Whitefield are field-based, with livestock managed outdoors year-round. The proposed site is centrally located within the holding, immediately adjacent to grazing and lambing areas, and is therefore functionally integrated with the applicant's place of work.

In landscape terms, the site is well contained, avoids skyline or prominent locations, and reflects the established pattern of development in the area. It satisfies the siting and animal welfare criteria of Category 3 of the Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance and complies with Policy 19 of the Local Development Plan.

When assessed against the wording and intent of NPF4 and the adopted Development Plan, the proposal represents appropriate, necessary and sustainable rural development. For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Local Review Body grants **Planning Permission in Principle** for the proposed dwelling at West Whitefield Farm.