

Perth and Kinross Council
Planning & Development Management Committee – 18 October 2017
Report of Handling by Interim Development Quality Manager

Erection of 2 dwellinghouses (revised design plot 2) on
land SW of Stonegarth, Murrayshall

Ref. No: 17/01170/FLL
Ward No: P2 - Strathmore

Summary

This report recommends approval of the application for a revised design to the dwellinghouse at plot 2 on land SW of Stonegarth at Murrayshall. The development proposal is not considered to comply with the relevant provisions of the Development Plan however there are material considerations which outweigh the Development Plan.

BACKGROUND AND PROPOSAL

- 1 There is a considerable amount of planning history associated with this site and it is prudent to highlight this as it has a significant bearing on the assessment of this application.
- 2 Historically there was an indoor driving range located on this site. This consisted of a steel portal frame building. Under a previous version of the Housing in the Countryside policy the demolition of this building and replacement with a large single dwellinghouse was approved, application 10/00133/FLL refers. That consent was implemented with the carrying out of ground works, utilities and the formation of a site access. That consent pre-dated the current adopted Local Development Plan (LDP) and the Green Belt designation.
- 3 In 2016 an application for two houses was submitted. In that application the agent noted that the scheme for two units on the site did not introduce any additional visual impact to the amenity of the surrounding area. Both the combined footprint, and the overall form, scale and mass of the two houses would be less than the single house which already had consent.
- 4 The assessment of the 2016 scheme confirmed that the proposal did not comply with the approved TAYplan 2012 and the LDP due to the Green Belt designation. However, given the existing 2010 planning consent had been implemented and both the combined footprint, and the overall form, scale and mass of the two houses proposed in the 2016 application would be less than the single house these were material considerations that justified overriding the adopted Development Plan which resulted in the approval of application 16/00342/FLL.
- 5 This application seeks to make amendments to the scheme approved for plot 2. This includes changes to the internal layout of the building, changes to the

building fenestration, the positioning of windows and altering the positioning of the footprint within the site. This plot is located to the south west corner of the building group. Stonegarth House is located to the east, plot 1 associated with application 16/00342/FLL is located to the west and Two Mile House is located across Balcraig Road to the north.

- 6 It should be noted that works to plot 1 have commenced. Concerns regarding how these works have been carried out were raised with the Planning Authority. Following investigations by the Enforcement Team, it became apparent that this plot had not been undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and so an application to deal with the proposed changes was requested as per section 33 of the Planning Act as the changes were considered to be material in nature and could not be dealt with as a non-material variation to the application under Section 64 of the planning Act. A revised application has therefore now been submitted for plot 1 and this is currently pending consideration, application 17/01405/FLL refers.

NATIONAL POLICY AND GUIDANCE

- 7 The Scottish Government expresses its planning policies through the National Planning Framework (NPF) 3, the National Roads Development Guide 2014, Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) 2014 and Planning Advice Notes (PAN).

National Planning Framework

- 8 The NPF3 is a long-term strategy for Scotland and is a spatial expression of the Government's Economic Strategy and plans for development and investment in infrastructure. Under the Planning etc (Scotland) Act 2006 this is now a statutory document and material consideration in any planning application. The document provides a national context for Development Plans and planning decisions as well as informing the on-going programmes of the Scottish Government, public agencies and local authorities.

The Scottish Planning Policy 2014

- 9 The SPP is a statement of Scottish Government policy on land use planning. The following sections of the SPP will be of particular importance in the assessment of this proposal:
 - Sustainability : paragraphs 24 – 35
 - Placemaking : paragraphs 36 – 57
 - Promoting Rural Development : paragraphs 74 – 83

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 10 The Development Plan for the area comprises the TAYplan Strategic Development Plan 2012-2032 and the Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014.

TAYPlan Strategic Development Plan 2012-2032

- 11 TAYplan sets out a vision for how the region will be in 2032 and what must occur to bring about change to achieve this vision. The vision for the area as set out in the plans states that:

“By 2032 the TAYplan region will be sustainable, more attractive, competitive and vibrant without creating an unacceptable burden on our planet. The quality of life will make it a place of first choice where more people choose to live, work, study and visit, and where businesses choose to invest and create jobs.”

- 12 The following section of the TAYplan 2012 is of particular importance in the assessment of this application:

Policy 3: Managing TAYplan’s Assets

- 13 Seeks to respect the regional distinctiveness and scenic value of the TAYplan area and presumes against development which would adversely affect environmental assets.

Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014

- 14 The Local Development Plan (LDP) was adopted by Perth and Kinross Council on 3 February 2014. It is the most recent statement of Council policy and is augmented by Supplementary Guidance.
- 15 The LDP sets out a vision statement for the area and states that, *“Our vision is of a Perth and Kinross which is dynamic, attractive and effective which protects its assets whilst welcoming population and economic growth.”*
- 16 The relevant policies are;

Policy PM1A - Placemaking

- 17 Development must contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment, respecting the character and amenity of the place. All development should be planned and designed with reference to climate change mitigation and adaption.

Policy PM1B - Placemaking

- 18 All proposals should meet all eight of the Placemaking criteria.

Policy PM3 - Infrastructure Contributions

- 19 Where new developments (either alone or cumulatively) exacerbate a current or generate a need for additional infrastructure provision or community facilities, planning permission will only be granted where contributions which are reasonably related to the scale and nature of the proposed development are secured.

Policy PM4 - Settlement Boundaries

- 20 For settlements which are defined by a settlement boundary in the Plan, development will not be permitted, except within the defined settlement boundary.

Policy NE5 - Green Belt

- 21 Development in the Green Belt will only be allowed where it conforms with the 5 criteria set out. The Housing in the Countryside Policy RD3 does not apply in the Green Belt.

Policy ER6 - Managing Future Landscape Change to Conserve and Enhance the Diversity and Quality of the Areas Landscapes

- 22 Development proposals will be supported where they do not conflict with the aim of maintaining and enhancing the landscape qualities of Perth and Kinross and they meet the tests set out in the 7 criteria.

OTHER GUIDANCE

Development Contributions

- 23 Sets out the Council's Policy for securing contributions from developers of new homes towards the cost of meeting appropriate infrastructure improvements necessary as a consequence of development.

Draft Placemaking Guide

- 24 The purpose of the guidance is to give advice as to how development can comply under the terms of the Local Development Plan Policy PM1: Placemaking. The Draft Placemaking Supplementary Guidance was consulted upon between 13 July 2017 and 31 August 2017. The Council will now consider the responses received before presenting the next Draft to Committee for approval.

PLANNING SITE HISTORY

- 25 07/00284/OUT Replacement of existing indoor driving school with 1no dwellinghouse (plot E) (in outline) 11 September 2007. Application Approved by Committee.
- 26 10/00133/FLL Erection of dwellinghouse 28 April 2010. Application Approved under delegated powers.
- 27 16/00342/FLL Erection of 2 dwellinghouses 21 November 2016. Application Approved under delegated powers.
- 28 17/01450/FLL Erection of a dwellinghouse (revised design in part retrospect) (Plot 1) pending consideration.

CONSULTATIONS

EXTERNAL

Scottish Water

- 29 No objections with regards to infrastructure capacity.

Perth Airport

- 30 No response within consultation period.

INTERNAL

Transport Planning

- 31 No objection to the proposal subject to condition relating to access, turning and parking provision.

Strategy and Policy

- 32 The proposed site is within the Green Belt. LDP policy NE5: Green Belt and TAYplan Policy 3: Managing TAYplan's Assets are relevant. Nonetheless, there is an existing consent on the site for the erection of 2 dwelling houses. Previous to this, there was consent given for 1 single dwelling house which predated the current adopted LDP and the Green Belt designation.
- 33 The application site falls within the designated Green Belt; the Housing in the Countryside policy does not apply within the Green Belt. LDP policy NE5 is a restrictive policy which only permits development within the Green Belt in specific limited circumstances. The proposal does not accord with policy NE5: Green Belt. However, the fact that there is an existing consent cannot be ignored.
- 34 The applicant now proposes a change of orientation and elevation on the site. From a Placemaking perspective, it is important the footprint, overall form, scale and massing of the two houses does not make any greater visual impact within the Green Belt than the previous proposal which was given consent. The proposal does not accord with Green Belt policy but as consent has already been given, there is no objection from a policy viewpoint.

Contributions Officer

- 35 This proposal is for a change of house type and will not increase the overall number of units on site. No additional contributions will be required.

REPRESENTATIONS

- 36 A total of twelve letters of representation were received during the advertisement period for the application.

37 The representations have objected for the following reasons: -

- Contrary to the Development Plan. Green Belt policy and place making policies and PKC draft Placemaking guide.
- Affects visual amenity.
- Overlooking, perception of overlooking impact on privacy of dwellings and garden ground especially with height of the building, height of the site and with principal rooms now located on the first floor.
- Excessive height.
- Concerns with design. Overdominance.
- Out of character with area. Inappropriate housing density.
- Light pollution.
- Flooding Risk. Concerns with surface water spilling onto carriageway.

38 The above matters are addressed in the Appraisal section of this report. However the following elements are best addressed at this stage under the following areas:-

- A number of concerns are raised regarding the acceptability of the changes made to Plot 1 – These points are noted however for the avoidance of doubt they are not applicable to the assessment of this application which relates to Plot 2 only. It should be noted that the changes made to Plot 1 are considered to be material. Accordingly, they have not been dealt with as a non-material variation under section 64 and instead an application has been requested to assess the changes proposed by the agent. It should be noted that application 17/01450/FLL for plot 1 has been submitted and is pending consideration.
- Concerns with the accuracy of the submitted plans. Not to scale, no topographical information or datum point – A number of plans and supporting documentation has been submitted in support of the application. This details the site history and also documents the location of the previous building on the site and earlier approvals. While I note that not all plans have a defined scale they are referenced with dimensions and enable the plans to be scaled. In this case I am content that there is sufficient information to assess the plans and the relationship with neighbouring properties. The Balcraig Road is a defined reference point and I am content that this is a suitable datum to base my assessment.
- Concerns that impact will be worse when a garage is eventually built – I note that permitted development rights in certain circumstances may enable the owner of plot 2 to build a garage on the site. In this case I consider it prudent to remove permitted development rights. This would mean that any future garage on the site would be subject to a further application and the acceptability of that proposal assessed against the Development Plan at that time. This is addressed by condition 9.
- Property values - It should be noted that the potential loss in property value falls outwith the remit of this assessment.

- Change in levels since submission of the application – It is noted that works have commenced on site at Plot 1 with spoil from this development moved around the site. This is a normal part of construction activity associated with clearing vegetated land and excavating foundations. While the levels may have changed since the submission of this application there will be a requirement to ensure that the development coincides with the levels depicted in the submitted plans.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

39	Environment Statement	Not required
	Screening Opinion	Not required
	Environmental Impact Assessment	Not required
	Appropriate Assessment	Not required
	Design Statement / Design and Access Statement	Not required
	Report on Impact or Potential Impact	Supporting documentation submitted.

APPRAISAL

Policy Appraisal

- 40 Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) requires the determination of the proposal to be made in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The determining issues here are whether the proposals comply with Development Plan policy and Supplementary Guidance or if there are other material considerations, which justify a departure from policy.
- 41 The most relevant policies of the TAYplan Strategic Development plan 2012 and Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014 including Supplementary Guidance are listed in the policy section above.
- 42 The proposed site is within the Green Belt. LDP policy NE5: Green Belt and TAYplan Policy 3: Managing TAYplan's Assets are relevant.
- 43 I note that the Report of Handling associated the 2016 application considered the Green Belt Designation and the weight to be attached to the site history which was a material consideration. For completeness and to assist committee it is worthwhile detailing the assessment undertaken during the 2016 application:-
- 44 *There is an existing consent on the site for a large single house which was approved under a previous version of the Housing in the Countryside policy. This consent pre-dated the current adopted Local Development Plan and the Green Belt designation. The application site now falls within the designated Green Belt; the Housing in the Countryside policy does not apply within the*

Green Belt. LDP policy NE5 is a restrictive policy which only permits development within the Green Belt in specific limited circumstances.

- 45 *From a policy point of view, the key consideration is the fact that the existing planning consent is implemented with the carrying out of ground works, utilities and the formation of a site access. As a completely new application the proposal does not accord with policy NE5: Green Belt. However, the fact that there is an existing consent cannot be ignored.*
- 46 *The applicant suggests that the two house development now proposed does not introduce any additional visual impact to the amenity of the surrounding area. Both the combined footprint, and the overall form, scale and mass of the two houses will be less than the single house which already has consent. The latest proposal does not accord with Green Belt policy. However, given the specific circumstances set out above it is suggested that allowing the two house development may be a practical solution in this instance. There is therefore no objection to the proposal on policy grounds .*
- 47 While I note that letters of representation have highlighted concern with the proposals relationship to the Development Plan and the Green Belt there is already a planning consent in place for two houses on this site, therefore the principle of developing plot 2 has already been accepted under application 16/00342/FLL. I assess the proposed changes to the house design and layout below.

Design and Layout

- 48 The site is also required to be assessed against the 'Placemaking' policies of the adopted local plan.
- 49 The Placemaking policies confirm that development must contribute positively, to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment. All development should be planned and designed with reference to climate change, mitigation and adaptation.
- 50 The 2016 application included a design statement which explained the project ethos, the project brief and the design influences. It was considered under that application that the design, massing and materials used in the construction of the house were acceptable.
- 51 I note that letters of representation have highlighted concern with the design, scale, height and mass of the proposed building for plot 2 and how this affects the areas visual amenity. However, it should be noted that the general massing of the building and the design concept already has approval under application 16/00342/FLL. While the agent was of the view that the changes to the scheme under assessment were not material the Planning Authority's stance is these alterations were and required assessment. The changes are discussed in greater detail below.

- 52 The proposed changes to plot 2 consist of an adjustment to the house position on the site, adjustment to the roof profile on the north elevation to incorporate a covered balcony area as well as alterations to the window locations.
- 53 I consider the adjustment in the axis of the building footprint of plot 2 is an improvement and ties up with the axis alignments of the surrounding building group and plot 1. I do not consider that this amendment in layout conflicts with the Placemaking policies of the Local Development Plan.
- 54 Concerns with dominance have been raised by objectors. I consider that the alterations to the north elevation and roof pitch to accommodate an enclosed balcony area will be more dominant as the previous angling of the roof slope softened the design. However, I do not consider the change to be significantly detrimental for the scheme to be at odds with the Placemaking policy and the Draft Placemaking Guide. It is also worth noting that the material used to the upper section of the dwelling is the same as the roof which further diminishes the impact. In terms of design I have no concerns with the window proportions or the enclosed balcony, the implications these have on residential amenity will be discussed under that heading.
- 55 Overall I consider the proposal does not conflict with the Placemaking policies PM1A / PM1B of the Local Development Plan or the Draft Placemaking Guide.

Residential Amenity

- 56 The proposal has the potential to result in overlooking and overshadowing to neighbouring dwellings and garden ground. There is a need to secure privacy for all the parties to the development, those who would live in the new development and those that live in adjoining dwellings. Planning control has a duty to future occupiers not to create situations of potential conflict between neighbours.

Overlooking:

- 57 The fact that new development would overlook existing residential property and affect privacy is a common planning issue, even if neighbours do not object. The impact of overlooking can vary due to site layout and the types of rooms involved, it is therefore necessary to assess each application on a case by case basis.
- 58 This proposal has changed the internal accommodation and there is now principal living accommodation on the first floor and the window openings on the elevations of the building have been altered along with the formation of a balcony area within the roof space.
- 59 Concerns have been raised regarding the possible loss of privacy to neighbouring properties especially with the difference in height between the proposed plot and surrounding properties. I note that reference has been made to separation distances in letters of representation with a separation distance of 30 metres also being quoted. As a rule of thumb a minimum 18 metres window

to window distance at 90 degrees is usually sought between properties to achieve a reasonable level of residential amenity however this requires to be applied flexibly taking account of site specific circumstances. This distance is reduced as the angle between the windows change and become more acute.

- 60 During my site visit I took account of the characteristics of the existing properties in this nucleated building group and the existing relationships that these buildings have. Due to the building group layout and orientation the relationship between some properties are intertwined with some closer than the distance between plot 2 and neighbouring properties. In this context I disagree that a 30 metre separation distance is required as suggested in the letter of representation. Taking account of site context, including the topography of the site I am of the opinion that an acceptable level of privacy will be maintained in the surrounding residential properties taking account of window to window distances. I assess the relationship of plot 2 with areas of neighbouring properties garden ground below.

Stonegarth:

- 61 Stonegarth is located to the east of plot 2, the property is set against the public road with a garden ground behind the plot to the south as well as a further area of garden ground to the east. The existing boundary treatment surrounding Stonegarth is generally open in nature so there is interaction between the garden ground and the golf course. The reorientation of the house on plot 2 and the provision of a garden ground area to the east has the potential to result in a loss of privacy to Stonegarth, however the provision of a suitable boundary treatment can secure privacy between these two areas of garden ground. The revised house type now includes a large expanse of glazing to the east elevation at the first floor level. This is a significant change to the proposal. However, given the intervening distance is in excess of 9 metres between the window and the boundary of plot 2, along with the characteristics of the building group and the extent of the garden ground at Stonegarth, I do not consider that this would result in an unacceptable impact on residential amenity.

Two mile house:

- 62 Two Mile House is located to the north of plot 2. I note that representation has highlighted there are two areas of garden ground associated with this property and due to the orientation of the plot both areas of garden ground are utilised by residents residing in Two Mile House. The existing property would screen the garden ground to the north from plot 2. My assessment therefore focuses on the relationship of plot 2 and the garden ground area to the south.
- 63 It should be noted that between the proposed plot and the southern garden ground of Two Mile House and plot 2 is a public road, Balcraig Road. There is a low boundary stone wall that defines the curtilage of Two Mile House but it does not act as a privacy barrier between the garden ground and the public road, accordingly this area of garden ground can be viewed by the public. Concerns have been raised in the letters of representation regarding the loss of privacy to the southern garden ground from plot 2. In this case I do not consider

there is an adverse impact on the garden ground given the intervening distances between the proposed dwelling and the curtilage of Two Mile House especially when taking account of the building grouping and the distances between Stonegarth and garden ground associated with Shangrila. While I acknowledge plot 2 is located higher than Stonegarth, nevertheless, it is also further away.

Overshadowing:

- 64 Although not a matter specifically referred to in ministerial guidance, the protection of neighbouring developments from unreasonable loss of light is a well-established proper planning consideration. The Building Research Establishment (BRE) document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight- a guide to good practice 1991' sets out guidelines on how to assess the potential impact, it should be noted that the standards are not mandatory and should be interpreted flexibly.
- 65 From an assessment of the plans (including the agents sun path analysis) and take cognisance of the BRE document, I consider a reasonable level of daylight and sunlight is maintained to neighbouring properties throughout the majority of the day and the extent of overshadowing is not excessive and does not warrant refusal of the application especially when taking account of the steel clad building which was previously on the site.

Light Pollution:

- 66 Concerns have been raised regarding light pollution from the development. In certain cases illumination can have serious amenity implications on neighbouring uses and the countryside. It is worth noting that there would be an element of light pollution associated with previous consents on the site. Notwithstanding this I do not consider that light emanating from living and bedrooms of this proposal will be unduly intrusive on the countryside as there would be light emanating from existing dwellings within this building group.

Flood Risk

- 67 The site is not in an area subject to river flooding. I acknowledge that there are issues with surface water and construction run-off from the site. This matter has been raised with the agent and this will be subject to further monitoring from the Planning Enforcement Team. Under the 2016 consent there was a requirement for a permanent solution to manage and prevent water from the site escaping onto the public road, this is still applicable to this application therefore conditional control should be re-applied, see condition 5.

Landscape

- 68 Development and land use change should be compatible with the distinctive characteristics and features of Perth & Kinross's landscape. Development proposals will be supported where they do not conflict with the aim of maintaining and enhancing the landscape qualities of Perth and Kinross. In this

case the formation of a residential development on this site is not considered to significantly erode the quality of the landscape and was accepted under previous applications. I do however consider it to prudent to reapply conditional control to this application to ensure a suitable form of boundary treatment at the site is secured and implemented and this is included as condition 3.

Road and Access

- 69 Transport Planning have no objections. Conditional control can be applied to ensure the proposal does not conflict with Policy TA1 and would be achieved under conditions 6, 7 and 8 in relation to access, turning and parking provision.

Developer Contributions

- 70 There is no change to the number of units on the site. The required developer contributions have already been secured under application 16/00342/FLL.

Economic Impact

- 71 The economic impact of the proposal is likely to be minimal and limited to the construction phase of the development.

LEGAL AGREEMENTS

- 72 None required.

DIRECTION BY SCOTTISH MINISTERS

- 73 Under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013, regulations 30–33 there have been no directions by the Scottish Government in respect of an Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion, call in, or notification relating to this application.

CONCLUSION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 74 In conclusion, the application must be determined in accordance with the adopted Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this respect, the proposal is not considered to comply with the approved TAYplan 2012 and the adopted Local Development Plan 2014. However, I have taken account of material considerations, specifically in relation to the planning history for the site and find they would justify overriding the adopted Development Plan. On that basis the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

A Approve the application subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The proposed development must be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and documents, unless otherwise provided for by conditions imposed on the planning permission.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the plans approved.

- 2 A sample of external materials shall be submitted for the approval of the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The external materials as approved shall be implemented prior to the occupation and or use of the development.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity; to ensure a satisfactory standard of local environmental quality.

- 3 Details of the proposed boundary treatments for the site shall be submitted for the approval of the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The approved scheme shall be completed prior to the occupation of the unit.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity; to ensure a satisfactory standard of local environmental quality.

- 4 The wood burning stove shall only burn fuel as recommended by the manufacturer and shall be operated and maintained in line with manufacturer's advice.

Reason - In order to safeguard the residential amenity of the area.

- 5 The gradient of the access shall not exceed 3% for the first 5.00 metres measured back from the edge of the carriageway and the access shall be constructed so that no surface water is discharged to the public road.

Reason -In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety and in the interests of free traffic flow.

- 6 Prior to the occupation or use of the approved development the vehicular access shall be formed in accordance with specification Type B, Fig 5.6 access detail to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

Reason -In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety and in the interests of free traffic flow.

- 7 Prior to the occupation or use of the residential unit, turning facilities shall be provided within that plot to enable all vehicles to enter and leave in a forward gear and thereafter retained to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety and in the interests of free traffic flow.

- 8 Prior to the occupation or use of the approved development a minimum of 2 No. car parking spaces shall be provided within the plot and thereafter retained.

Reason - In the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety and in the interests of free traffic flow.

- 9 No development or extensions, whether or not permitted by virtue of Schedule 1, Part 1, Class 1A, 1B and 3A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(Scotland) Order, 1992 or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order, shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse hereby approved.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity; to ensure a satisfactory standard of local environmental quality.

B JUSTIFICATION

The proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan however there are material reasons which justify departing from the Development Plan

C PROCEDURAL NOTES

None.

D INFORMATIVES

- 1 This planning permission will last only for three years from the date of this decision notice, unless the development has been started within that period. (See section 58(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended).
- 2 Under section 27A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) the person undertaking the development is required to give the planning authority prior written notification of the date on which it is intended to commence the development. A failure to comply with this statutory requirement would constitute a breach of planning control under section 123(1) of that Act, which may result in enforcement action being taken.
- 3 As soon as practicable after the development is complete, the person who completes the development is obliged by section 27B of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) to give the planning authority written notice of that position.
- 4 The applicant is advised that in terms of Sections 56 of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 he must obtain from the Council as Roads Authority consent to open an existing road or footway prior to the commencement of works. Advice on the disposal of surface water must be sought at the initial stages of design from Scottish Water and the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency.
- 5 Please consult the Street Naming and Numbering Officer, The Environment Service, Perth and Kinross Council, Pullar House, 35 Kinnoull Street, Perth PH1 5GD for a new postal address. The form is downloadable from www.pkc.gov.uk and should be returned to snn@pkc.gov.uk

- 6 No work shall be commenced until an application for building warrant has been submitted and approved.

Background Papers: 12 letters of representation

Contact Officer: John Russell – Ext 75346

Date: 2 October 2017

Anne Condliffe
Interim Development Quality Manager

If you or someone you know would like a copy of this document in another language or format, (on occasion, only a summary of the document will be provided in translation), this can be arranged by contacting the Customer Service Centre on 01738 475000.

You can also send us a text message on 07824 498145.
--

All Council Services can offer a telephone translation facility.
--