

**TCP/11/16(547) – 17/00840/IPL – Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) on land 70 metres south east of New Mains Farmhouse, Inchtute**

## **INDEX**

- (a) Papers submitted by the Applicant (***Pages 427-552***)
- (b) Decision Notice (***Pages 455-456***)
  - Report of Handling (***Pages 447-459***)
  - Reference Documents (***Pages 469-480 and 485-552***)
- (c) Representations (***Pages 555-578***)



**TCP/11/16(547) – 17/00840/IPL – Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) on land 70 metres south east of New Mains Farmhouse, Inchture**

**PAPERS SUBMITTED  
BY THE  
APPLICANT**







Pullar House 35 Kinnoull Street Perth PH1 5GD Tel: 01738 475300 Fax: 01738 475310 Email: [onlineapps@pkc.gov.uk](mailto:onlineapps@pkc.gov.uk)

Applications cannot be validated until all the necessary documentation has been submitted and the required fee has been paid.

Thank you for completing this application form:

ONLINE REFERENCE 100051841-004

The online reference is the unique reference for your online form only. The Planning Authority will allocate an Application Number when your form is validated. Please quote this reference if you need to contact the planning Authority about this application.

## Applicant or Agent Details

Are you an applicant or an agent? \* (An agent is an architect, consultant or someone else acting on behalf of the applicant in connection with this application)

☐ Applicant ☒ Agent

## Agent Details

Please enter Agent details

|                       |                        |  |                      |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Company/Organisation: | JON FRULLANI ARCHITECT |  |                      |
| Ref. Number:          |                        | You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: * |                      |
| First Name: *         | JON                    | Building Name:                                       | UNIT 5, DISTRICT 10, |
| Last Name: *          | FRULLANI               | Building Number:                                     |                      |
| Telephone Number: *   | 01382224828            | Address 1 (Street): *                                | 25 GREENMARKET       |
| Extension Number:     |                        | Address 2:   |                      |
| Mobile Number:        |                        | Town/City: *   | DUNDEE               |
| Fax Number:           |                        | Country: *   | UNITED KINGDOM       |
|                       |                        | Postcode: *  | DD1 4QB              |
| Email Address: *      | jon@jfarchitect.co.uk  |  |                      |

Is the applicant an individual or an organisation/corporate entity? \*

☒ Individual ☐ Organisation/Corporate entity

## Applicant Details

Please enter Applicant details

|                      |                                       |  |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Title:               | <input type="text" value="Mr"/>       | You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: * |
| Other Title:         | <input type="text"/>                  | Building Name: <input type="text" value=""/>         |
| First Name: *        | <input type="text" value="James"/>    | Building Number: <input type="text"/>                |
| Last Name: *         | <input type="text" value="Hamilton"/> | Address 1 (Street): * <input type="text" value=""/>  |
| Company/Organisation | <input type="text"/>                  | Address 2: <input type="text"/>                      |
| Telephone Number: *  | <input type="text"/>                  | Town/City: * <input type="text" value=""/>           |
| Extension Number:    | <input type="text"/>                  | Country: * <input type="text" value=""/>             |
| Mobile Number:       | <input type="text"/>                  | Postcode: * <input type="text" value=""/>            |
| Fax Number:          | <input type="text"/>                  |  |
| Email Address: *     | <input type="text"/>                  |  |

## Site Address Details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Planning Authority:   | <input type="text" value="Perth and Kinross Council"/> |
| Full postal address of the site (including postcode where available): |  |
| Address 1:  | <input type="text" value="New Mains Farmhouse"/>       |
| Address 2:  | <input type="text" value="Inchture"/>                  |
| Address 3:  | <input type="text"/>                                   |
| Address 4:  | <input type="text"/>                                   |
| Address 5:  | <input type="text"/>                                   |
| Town/City/Settlement:   | <input type="text" value="Perth"/>                     |
| Post Code:  | <input type="text" value="PH14 9SE"/>                  |

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

|          |                                     |         |                                     |
|----------|-------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|
| Northing | <input type="text" value="728846"/> | Easting | <input type="text" value="327280"/> |
|----------|-------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|

## Description of Proposal

Please provide a description of your proposal to which your review relates. The description should be the same as given in the application form, or as amended with the agreement of the planning authority: \*  
(Max 500 characters)

Sub division of existing curtilage within New Mains Farm to form 1 plot within large area of existing garden ground, facilitating the erection of a 1 1/2 storey dwelling.

## Type of Application

What type of application did you submit to the planning authority? \*

- ☐ Application for planning permission (including householder application but excluding application to work minerals).
- ☒ Application for planning permission in principle.
- ☐ Further application.
- ☐ Application for approval of matters specified in conditions.

What does your review relate to? \*

- ☒ Refusal Notice.
- ☐ Grant of permission with Conditions imposed.
- ☐ No decision reached within the prescribed period (two months after validation date or any agreed extension) – deemed refusal.

## Statement of reasons for seeking review

You must state in full, why you are seeking a review of the planning authority's decision (or failure to make a decision). Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. If necessary this can be provided as a separate document in the 'Supporting Documents' section: \* (Max 500 characters)

Note: you are unlikely to have a further opportunity to add to your statement of appeal at a later date, so it is essential that you produce all of the information you want the decision-maker to take into account.

You should not however raise any new matter which was not before the planning authority at the time it decided your application (or at the time expiry of the period of determination), unless you can demonstrate that the new matter could not have been raised before that time or that it not being raised before that time is a consequence of exceptional circumstances.

The appellant disagrees with the Case Officer's reasoning for refusing planning permission and respectfully requests that the appeal is considered in light of the information detailed within this statement which we believe to justify approval of the proposed development having regard to the requirements of Section 25 of the Act.

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 the new matter, why it was not raised with the appointed officer before your application was determined and why you consider it should be considered in your review: \* (Max 500 characters)

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. You can attach these documents electronically later in the process: \* (Max 500 characters)

Application Forms, Existing Site Plan, Location Plan, Proposed Site Plan, Planning Statement, Report of Handling, Decision Notice, Proposed Site Plan with Landscaping, Existing Landscape Framework, Floor Risk Assessment, Appeal Statement

## Application Details

Please provide details of the application and decision.

What is the application reference number? \*

17/00840/IPL

What date was the application submitted to the planning authority? \*

12/05/2017

What date was the decision issued by the planning authority? \*

24/04/2018

## 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.

Can this review continue to a conclusion, in your opinion, based on a review of the relevant information provided by yourself and other parties only, without any further procedures? For example, written submission, hearing session, site inspection. \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Can the site be clearly seen from a road or public land? \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

Is it possible for the site to be accessed safely and without barriers to entry? \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

## Checklist – Application for Notice of Review

Please complete the following checklist to make sure you have provided all the necessary information in support of your appeal. Failure to submit all this information may result in your appeal being deemed invalid.

Have you provided the name and address of the applicant? \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

Have you provided the date and reference number of the application which is the subject of this review? \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you are the agent, acting on behalf of the applicant, have you provided details of your name and address and indicated whether any notice or correspondence required in connection with the review should be sent to you or the applicant? \*

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Have you provided a statement setting out your reasons for requiring a review and by what procedure (or combination of procedures) you wish the review to be conducted? \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: 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. 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.

Please attach a copy of all documents, material and evidence which you intend to rely on (e.g. plans and Drawings) which are now the subject of this review \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

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 (if any) from the earlier consent.

## **Declare – Notice of Review**

I/We the applicant/agent certify that this is an application for review on the grounds stated.

Declaration Name: Mr JON FRULLANI

Declaration Date: 19/07/2018



# **ERECTION OF DWELLINGHOUSE (IN PRINCIPLE) AT LAND 70M SOUTH EAST OF NEW MAINS FARMHOUSE, INCHTURE**

## **APPEAL STATEMENT**

### **Contents**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Application Site and Context
- 3.0 Proposed Development
- 4.0 Development Plan
- 5.0 Evaluation of Proposed Development
- 6.0 Conclusion

### **Appeal Documents**

- Document 1 Planning Application Ref: 17/00840/IPL
- Document 2 Case Officers Report of Handling
- Document 3 Planning Application Decision Notice
- Document 4 Revised Proposed Site Plan
- Document 5 Photographic Evidence of Site Containment

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Planning Appeal has been submitted on behalf of the applicant, Mr James Hamilton and relates to a Planning Application for the erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) at land 70m south east of New Mains Farmhouse, Inchture.

Perth and Kinross Council registered the application on 12 May 2017 under planning application reference: 17/00840/IPL.

The planning application was validated on 12 May 2017 and determined on 24 April 2018. The Planning Decision Notice (Document 3) cites the following reason for refusal of planning permission:

- 1. As the site does not have an acceptable landscape framework which provides suitable site containment for the development proposed, the proposal is contrary to Policy RD3 of Perth and Kinross Councils' adopted Local Development Plan 2014, and the Council's Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012. Both these policies only support new housing developments which extend existing building groups into definable sites which have a suitable site containment and landscape setting.*

In determining the planning application, the Planning Authority is required, under Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act, 1997 (as amended) (the "Act") to determine the application in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Planning application ref: 17/00840/IPL is one of five applications submitted to redevelop the remnants of New Mains Farm. After engaging in positive pre-application discussions with the Council's Planning Department our client was invited to submit 5 separate planning applications for the erection of 4 houses to the south of the original farmhouse and a house within the walled gardens to the east of the farmhouse as illustrated in the proposed site layout plan in Document 1. Planning applications ref: 17/00836/IPL, 17/00837/IPL, 17/00840/IPL and 17/00841/IPL were all refused for the same reason with planning application ref: 17/00745/IPL for the erection of a house within the walled garden still to be determined.

The appellant disagrees with the Case Officer's reasoning for refusing planning permission and respectfully requests that the appeal is considered in light of the information detailed within this statement which we believe to justify approval of the proposed development having regard to the requirements of Section 25 of the Act.

It is respectfully requested that this appeal is supported and planning permission granted for the reasons provided in this statement.

## 2.0 Application Site and Context

The appeal site is located on the west side of C401 (High Carse Road) and forms extended garden ground to the south east of the farmhouse at New Mains Farm.

The site is screened and enclosed by mature hedging, trees and shrubs on all four sides.

The appeal site is in an unkempt condition with the trees and shrubs occupying the periphery forming a dense landscape barrier between the site and the adjacent fields and C401 road.



There is a vehicular access to New Mains Farm to the north east of the appeal site. The access forms the driveway to the farmhouse from the C401.

The farmhouse to the north of the site is two storeys in height and is constructed from red sandstone with a pitched roof finished in natural slate. The farmhouse has timber framed sliding sash and case windows. The windows on the front (south) elevation have a different glazing pattern to those on the rear and side elevations.

There is a walled garden to the north east of the farmhouse that is currently the subject of an application for planning permission in principle for the erection of a dwellinghouse. The walled garden is also screened from public view through a combination of the walls bounding its curtilage and mature trees and shrubbery.

Beyond the farmhouse to the north of the site there is a group of former farm buildings. The farm buildings are of a traditional stone construction with modern additions to the north west.

The site is adjacent to the C401 public road and is outwith the settlement boundary of Inchture. The site is located within an area of countryside designated by the Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014.

### **3.0 Proposed Development**

It is shown in the proposed site plan in Document 1 that our client proposes to erect 4 dwellinghouses within the extended garden ground to the south east of the existing farmhouse at New Mains Farm and a house within the walled gardens to the north east of the farmhouse.

The proposed houses within the extended garden ground will be positioned closely together around a central courtyard that provides access to each plot. Each plot area will be between 2000sqm and 2300sqm with each house being of a traditional 1 1/2 storey design (single storey with accommodation in the roof space). The proposed houses will have floor areas of 350sqm and will have 4/5 bedrooms. The proposed houses will be served by three curtilage parking spaces and will benefit from no less than 500sqm of private useable garden ground.

The existing trees and shrubbery around the periphery of the site will be retained in situ to maintain screening between the proposed development and the existing farmhouse.

Taking account of the concerns raised by the case officer in assessing planning applications ref: 17/00836/IPL, 17/00837/IPL, 17/00840/IPL and 17/00841/IPL a revised site layout plan has been prepared and forms Document 4 of this appeal submission. The revised site layout plan has been prepared to demonstrate to the Local Review Body that if the case officer's concerns are supported they can be easily resolved by increasing the depth and density of the existing landscape buffer enclosing the site. However, the photographic evidence submitted as Document 5 to this appeal shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Review Body that the existing depth and density of the landscape buffer enclosing the appeal site is suitably contained and set within a high quality landscape setting.

Access to the proposed houses will be formed through the northern boundary of the site utilising the driveway serving the farm house.

### **4.0 Development Plan**

The Development Plan for the area comprises the TAYplan Strategic Development Plan 2016-2036 and the Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014.

#### **TAYplan Strategic Development Plan 2016 – 2036 - Approved October 2017**

Whilst there are no specific policies or strategies directly relevant to this proposal the overall vision of the Tay Plan should be noted. The vision states *“By 2036 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 and visit and where businesses choose to invest and create jobs.”*

#### **Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014 – Adopted February 2014**

The Local Development Plan is the most recent statement of Council policy and is augmented by Supplementary Guidance.

The site lies within the landward area of the Local Development Plan and within an area at risk from flooding where the following policies would be applicable for a new housing development,

#### **Policy EP2 - New Development and Flooding**

There is a general presumption against proposals for built development or land raising on a functional flood plain and in areas where there is a significant probability of flooding from any source, or where the proposal would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. Built development should avoid areas at significant risk from landslip, coastal erosion and storm surges. Development should comply with the criteria set out in the policy.

#### **Policy RD3 - Housing in the Countryside**

The development of single houses or groups of houses which fall within the six identified categories will be supported. This policy does not apply in the Green Belt and is limited within the Lunan Valley Catchment Area.

#### **Policy PM1A - Placemaking**

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 Criteria**

Sets out the specific placemaking criteria.

#### **Policy PM3 - Infrastructure Contributions**

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.

### **OTHER COUNCIL POLICIES**

#### **Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012**

This is the most recent expression of Council policy towards new housing in the open countryside.

#### **Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing (2016)**

This policy outlines the Councils position in relation to developer contributions in relation to primary education, transport infrastructure and A9 junction improvements, as well as our Affordable Housing provision requirements.

## Flooding and Flood Risk Guidance Document (June 2014)

This document offers guidance to applicants and developers in relation to sites which are potentially affected by flood risk, and also the need for drainage impact assessments.

### 5.0 Evaluation of Proposed Development

The principal Development Plan land use policies directly relevant to this proposal are largely contained in the adopted Local Development Plan. Within that Plan, the site lies within the landward area where *Policies PM1A (general development)* and *RD3 (HITCP)* are directly applicable for a new residential proposal.

*Policy PM1A* seeks to ensure that all new developments contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment, respecting the character and amenity of the existing area, whilst *Policy RD3* relates to new Housing in the Countryside and states that the supplementary guidance will be applicable to new residential proposals in the landward area. The most recent SPG on Housing in the Countryside is the 2012 version, which was approved in 2014.

The site lies within the landward area of the adopted Local Development Plan, where *Policy RD3* is directly applicable for all new residential proposals. *Policy RD3* relates to the Housing in the Countryside Policy and is directly linked to the associated SPG, the Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012 (HITCG) which offers a more detailed policy background and is the most recent expression of Council opinion towards new housing in the open countryside.

To this end, the acceptability of the proposal in land use terms is ultimately an assessment of the proposal against the HITCG 2012.

The HITCG states that consent will generally be granted for new houses which extend an existing building group into a definable site(s) which is formed by existing topography and or well established landscape features, and which will provide a suitable setting for a new dwelling. The HITCG also requires all acceptable proposals to respect the character, layout and building pattern of the (existing) group and demonstrate that a high standard of residential amenity can be achieved for the existing and proposed house(s).

To this end, the key tests for assessing the acceptability of the proposed development are essentially,

1. whether or not the existing dwellings constituents an acceptable 'building group',
2. whether or not the development would take place in a suitable, contained site,
3. whether or not the development respects the character of the existing group and,
4. whether or not the proposal offers a suitable residential amenity for future occupiers.

In terms of establishing whether or not there is an existing building group in situ, it is a matter of fact that there are more than three existing buildings (some dwellings, some non-residential) located within the remaining New Mains Far complex. Therefore, the existing buildings constitute a building group, which is typically defined as three or more buildings in a close knit grouping. This interpretation of the New Mains Farm complex aligns with the Case Officer's understanding of the New Mains Farm complex as detailed within the Report of Handling forming Document 2 of this appeal submission. Therefore, we would contend that the proposal satisfies Test 1.

The site of the four dwellings is set within an area of established garden ground, which is self-contained and framed by existing boundary treatments comprising trees and hedges on all of its sides. To the east of the trees on the eastern side of the site is the public road, and to the north is the curtilage of the existing farmhouse dwelling. Further to the west and south, beyond the existing hedging / trees is open farmland.

The Report of Handling for application ref: 2018/00836/IPL states that the trees and hedging along the boundaries of the extended garden ground serving New Main Farm farmhouse were all planted around the time of the construction of the grade separated junction interchange further to the south of the site. The Case Officer states that this was largely to offer some visual screening from the raised road infrastructure, but also to provide noise mitigation from traffic movements.

It should be noted that these trees and hedges were in situ prior to the formation of the raised grade separated junction. However the Report of Handling goes on to conclude:

*There is no doubt that all the sites sides are contained by the existing boundary treatments which are a mix of existing trees and hedges, and that there is a clear physical definition between the residential area (the site) and the surrounding fields. Nevertheless whilst the trees and hedges are established, even a modest scale dwelling would be readily visible over the top of the existing boundary treatments.*

The photograph in Figure 1 was taken from the raised grade separated junction (the highest elevated area of ground) 100m south of the appeal site. The photograph shows a helium balloon tied at a height 15m above ground level. The purpose of this photograph is to disprove the Case Officer's assertion that *even a modest scale dwelling would be readily visible over the top of the existing boundary treatments*. The photograph actually demonstrates that even the existing farmhouse which is of a greater scale and massing than the proposed houses (the farmhouse is two storeys with a pitched roof while the proposed houses shall be single storey with a pitched roof) is not visible given the density and height of the existing trees, shrubs and hedging forming the landscape buffer containing the appeal site and the landscaping along the northern side of the slip roads to the grade separated junction. These trees were planted to screen the trunk road and grade separated junction from neighbouring farmland and house. The house that is visible in the photograph the Old Laundry House on Ballindean Estate to the north of the appeal site.



Figure 1: View of Site from Raised Grade Separated Junction to South



Figure 2: View of Site From C401 To South of New Mains Farm

The Report of Handling expands on the matter of site containment by stating that:

*...visibility alone is not a reason for refusal. The key issue is whether not the existing boundary treatments along the edges of the main garden offer suitable containment for the development proposed, and would provide for a suitable landscape setting.*

The Case Officer concedes that it is generally accepted that established tree belts and woodland areas are ordinarily considered to be suitable landscape features in the context of providing a landscape setting, and site containment. However, the main cause of concern relates to the scale of the existing landscaping which the Case Officer believes to be of a domestic scale which lacks substance and significance.

Contrary to the Case Officer's concerns relating to the scale and significance of the existing landscape buffer containing the appeal site, the photographs in Figures 1 and 2 (Taken in June 2018) demonstrate that the appeal site and existing farmhouse are screened from view by the landscape buffer when viewed from the south and south east of the appeal site. This is further evidenced by the photographs in Document 5 of this appeal submission which demonstrate the significance of the landscape buffer on all 3 sides (west, east and south) of the appeal site in winter and summer and how this forms a significant barrier between the appeal site and wider landscape setting as well as significant screening for the proposed houses.

The revised proposed site plan in Document 4 demonstrates that the existing landscape buffer is 5m wide and comprises of a combination of trees and shrubs at it's narrowest. Document 4 also illustrates our proposal to enhance the landscape buffer through additional tree planting which will increase the width and depth of the existing landscaping containing the site further addressing the Case Officers concerns.

Taking cognisance of the evidence presented in Figures 1 and 2 of this statement and Documents 4 and 5 the existing landscape buffer has been demonstrated to be more than domestic in scale and substance and constitutes a high quality landscape framework in the context of the requirements of the HITCG. In this respect we believe the proposal to satisfy Test 2.

It should be noted that without discussion on this matter 4 planning applications were refused planning permission nearly 12 months after their submission and several emails from the Case Officer confirming that planning permission would be granted. Nevertheless in satisfying Test 2 of the HITCG we believe we have demonstrated that the appeal site is suitably contained through the existing landscape buffer and that the density and significance of the landscape buffer provides the proposed development with a high quality setting and landscape framework.

Should the Local Review Body be of the view that the existing landscaping buffer requires to be reinforced in order to contain and enhance the landscape setting and framework of the site the implementation of the proposed enhancement of the landscape buffer shown in Document 4 can be controlled by condition. The proposed tree species, numbers and depth of the landscape buffer is a matter that can be controlled by condition to be approved

through the submission of an application for matters specified in conditions should the LRB by support to the approval of planning application ref: 17/00836/IPL.

In terms of Tests 3 and 4, the development of the garden area for a modest number of dwellings, would not affect the character or layout of the existing building group. This is because the existing building group comprises the farmhouse and a group of non-residential buildings. The proposed development of 4 dwellings to the south of the main farmhouse would replicate the building form of the non-residential dwellings to the north, with the New Mains Farm farmhouse being located in between the two. The Report of Handling supports this reasoning by stating:

*This planning application, and the others for both the main garden and the walled garden are only in principle, however I'm confident that the principle of development in the main garden area (for 4 dwellings) would not adversely the character, amenity of layout of the existing building group.*

All new proposals which are either part of an existing building or are extending the group must protect existing residential amenity, and also provide a suitable residential amenity for the future occupiers of the dwellings. This application (and the other three applications within the extended garden area to the south of the farmhouse) seeks planning permission in principle only. The scale and massing of the proposed houses, the position of windows, means of access and distance between buildings has been purposefully designed to ensure that existing residential amenity is protected, and a suitable level of residential amenity would be delivered for the future occupiers of the dwelling. This is also supported by the Report of Handling which states:

*Whilst this application (and the other three applications within the main garden area) is in principle only, I see no reason why suitable details cannot be advanced which would ensure that existing residential amenity is protected, and a suitable level of residential amenity would be delivered for the future occupiers of the dwelling.*

In this regard the proposal satisfies Tests 3 and 4 of the HITCG.

The above appraisal demonstrates the proposal to be in compliance with the Council's Housing in the Countryside Policies.

With regard to impact on residential amenity we agree with the Case Officers assessment of the proposed development. The Report of Handling concludes that the proposed development will have limited impact on the amenity of the existing farmhouse and the future occupiers of the proposed houses by virtue of loss of privacy, overshadowing, overlooking or loss of sunlight. This is principally due to the scale and massing of the proposed houses, the position of windows, means of access and distance between buildings as illustrated by the proposed site plan. As planning application ref: 18/00836/IPL seeks planning permission in principle, the detailed design of the proposed house would be the subject of an application for matters specified in conditions should this application be approved. This would allow the Council to further control the impact of the proposed house on the amenity of the existing farmhouse and other houses proposed.

In terms of accessibility the Case Officer agrees with our original assessment of the proposed development detailed within the Planning Statement contained in Document 1. This relates to the existing means of access to the site, visibility and the means of access and parking through the proposed development. The Case Officer concludes that any adaptations to the existing access can be controlled by conditions should planning permission in principle be approved while the detailed plot layout and internal access arrangements would be controlled through the submission and assessment of an application for matters specified in conditions if planning permission in principle is approved.

The Case Officer's assessment of impact on visual amenity although contradictory to the assessment of the proposal against the Council's HITCG concludes that subject to appropriate scaling and massing the proposed house(s) shall not adversely impact on the visual amenity or setting of the appeal site. Our client is agreeable to the proposed house(s) being restricted by condition to:

- single storey or one and half storey's in height (with a ridge height no greater than 8m above ground level);
- being positioned no less than 30m from the existing farmhouse;
- being positioned no less than 25m from the facing windows of habitable rooms;
- provide no less than 3 curtilage parking spaces; and,
- provide no less than 500sqm of private rear garden ground area.

These restrictions shall prevent the proposed house(s) from impacting on the visual and residential amenity of the existing farmhouse, future occupants of the proposed houses and the character and setting of the wider area surrounding the site.

In terms of flooding, drainage, loss of prime agricultural land and impact on trees and woodland we are in full agreement with the Case Officers assessment in the Report of Handling for application ref: 2018/00836/IPL and as detailed in the planning statement submitted in support of this planning application contained within Document 1 of this appeal submission.

The appellant is agreeable to making the necessary infrastructure contributions as specified by Policy PM3 of the adopted Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan should planning permission in principle be approved.

Taking cognisance of the reasoning outlined above we believe the proposed development to satisfy Policies PM1A, PM1B, RD3, PM3 and EP2 of the Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan as well as the Council's Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing 2016, Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012 and Flooding and Flood Risk Guidance 2014 documents.

It is acknowledged that objections were received from an individual, a local action group and Inchtute Community Council.

The issues raised within the representations are,

- Proposal is contrary to the Development Plan
- Proposal is contrary to the Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012
- Flooding concerns
- Drainage concerns
- Loss of prime agricultural land

The reasoning contained within this appeal statement as well as the Case Officer's Report of Handling demonstrates the proposal's full compliance with the Development Plan and as such the concerns of the objectors are not supported.

## **6.0 Conclusion**

The purpose of this statement has been to demonstrate that the proposal aligns with the aspirations of the Development Plan and satisfies the specific requirements of the adopted Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan.

The information contained within this statement combined with the application submission evidences the proposed development's compliance with the Development Plan. The concerns of the objectors are not supported.

Taking these matters into consideration it is respectfully requested that, having regard to the requirements of Section 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act, 1997, as amended, this appeal is supported and planning permission principle granted.





## PERTH AND KINROSS COUNCIL

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Mr James Hamilton<br>c/o Jon Frullani Architect<br>Unit 5, District 10,<br>25 Greenmarket<br>Dundee<br>DD1 4QB | Pullar House<br>35 Kinnoull Street<br>PERTH<br>PH1 5GD |
|  | Date 24th April 2018                                   |

### TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT

Application Number: **17/00840/IPL**

I am directed by the Planning Authority under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts currently in force, to refuse your application registered on 12th May 2017 for permission for **Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) Land 70 Metres South East Of New Mains Farmhouse Inchtute** for the reasons undernoted.

Interim Development Quality Manager

### Reasons for Refusal

1. As the site does not have an acceptable landscape framework which provides suitable site containment for the development proposed, the proposal is contrary to Policy RD3 of Perth and Kinross Councils' adopted Local Development Plan 2014, and the Council's Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012. Both these policies only support new housing developments which extend existing building groups into definable sites which have a suitable site containment and landscape setting.

### Justification

The proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no material reasons which justify departing from the Development Plan

## **Notes**

In the determination of this application, the lack of information on flood risk has been the only matter assessed. Accordingly the lack of any other reasons for refusal is without prejudice to any decision of the Council on receipt of a further formal application for this site which may include additional information on flood risk.

The plans relating to this decision are listed below and are displayed on Perth and Kinross Council's website at [www.pkc.gov.uk](http://www.pkc.gov.uk) "Online Planning Applications" page

### **Plan Reference**

**17/00840/1**

**17/00840/2**

**17/00840/3**

**17/00840/4**

**17/00840/5**

## REPORT OF HANDLING

### DELEGATED REPORT

|                        |                     |      |
|------------------------|---------------------|------|
| Ref No                 | 17/00840/IPL        |      |
| Ward No                | P1- Carse Of Gowrie |      |
| Due Determination Date | 11.07.2017          |      |
| Case Officer           | Andy Baxter         |      |
| Report Issued by       |                     | Date |
| Countersigned by       |                     | Date |

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle)

**LOCATION:** Land 70 Metres South East Of New Mains Farmhouse,  
Inchtute

#### SUMMARY:

This report recommends **refusal** of a planning in principle application for the erection of a new dwelling on an area of garden ground adjacent to New Mains Farmhouse, Inchtute as the proposal is considered to be contrary to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, and there are no material considerations apparent which justify setting aside the Development Plan.

**DATE OF SITE VISIT:** 27 June 2017

#### SITE PHOTOGRAPH



*Internal view of the existing enclosed garden area, looking south*

## **BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL**

This planning application seeks to obtain a planning in principle consent for the erection of a single dwelling on an area of garden ground at New Mains farm, Inchtute.

This planning application is part of a larger proposal which involves the erection of four dwellings within the garden area (of which one is subject of this planning application), as well as another new dwelling within a walled garden.

The planning site lies with an existing garden area which is located to the south of an existing dwelling and traditional steading buildings. The garden area is self-contained by existing boundary treatments which comprise mid-size trees and hedging, with a public road running adjacent to the site along its eastern boundary. To the north of the site is the existing dwelling and steadings, whilst to the south and west are agricultural fields. The steadings are not in commercial use, but I understand the applicant uses them for storage purposes.

The topography of the site is that it is dead flat and has been used for some time as a (well kept) domestic garden ground associated with the existing dwelling. Whilst there are some ornamental trees planted internally, the majority of the site is lawn grass.

The wider garden is approx. 90m in depth (SW to NE) x 100m in length (NW to SE). The area subject of this planning application, (as well as the other three plots) is approx.  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the larger garden area, and measures approx. 45m x 35m, excluding shared accesses/turning areas. The plot subject of this planning application is located at the SW quarter of the garden area.

The site has been identified as being at potential risk from flood waters and a flood risk assessment covering all the sites has been submitted by the applicant.

The three other planning in principle planning applications for dwellings within the garden are also recommended for refusal, whilst the planning application for the dwelling within the walled garden remains undetermined at this stage.

## **SITE HISTORY**

Four other planning in principle planning applications have been lodged by the applicant for four individual house plots. Three of these (17/00836/IPL, 17/00837/IPL and 17/00841/IPL) are in an area of garden ground to the south

of the main dwelling. This planning application is also within the main garden area.

A fourth planning in principle application (17/00745/IPL) relates to a dwelling within a walled garden area.

### **PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION**

General advice was offered to the applicant on a larger proposal, which suggested that some elements may comply with the Council's Housing in the Countryside Policies, however others would not be acceptable. A general concern over the total number of residential units proposed was also forthcoming.

### **NATIONAL POLICY AND GUIDANCE**

The Scottish Government expresses its planning policies through The National Planning Framework, the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), Planning Advice Notes (PAN), Creating Places, Designing Streets, National Roads Development Guide and a series of Circulars.

Of relevance to this planning application is,

#### **The Scottish Planning Policy 2014**

The Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) was published in June 2014 and it sets out national planning policies which reflect Scottish Ministers' priorities for operation of the planning system and for the development and use of land. The SPP promotes consistency in the application of policy across Scotland whilst allowing sufficient flexibility to reflect local circumstances. It directly relates to:

- the preparation of development plans;
- the design of development, from initial concept through to delivery; and
- the determination of planning applications and appeals.

Of relevance to this planning application are Paragraphs 74 - 83, which relates to Promoting Rural Development and Paragraphs 109 -134, which relates to Enabling Delivery of New Homes.

### **DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The Development Plan for the area comprises the TAYplan Strategic Development Plan 2016-2036 and the Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014.

**TAYplan Strategic Development Plan 2016 – 2036 - Approved October 2017**

Whilst there are no specific policies or strategies directly relevant to this proposal the overall vision of the Tay Plan should be noted. The vision states *“By 2036 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 and visit and where businesses choose to invest and create jobs.”*

## **Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014 – Adopted February 2014**

The Local Development Plan is the most recent statement of Council policy and is augmented by Supplementary Guidance.

The site lies within the landward area of the Local Development Plan, and within an area at risk from flooding where the following policies would be applicable for a new housing development,

### **Policy EP2 - New Development and Flooding**

There is a general presumption against proposals for built development or land raising on a functional flood plain and in areas where there is a significant probability of flooding from any source, or where the proposal would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. Built development should avoid areas at significant risk from landslip, coastal erosion and storm surges. Development should comply with the criteria set out in the policy.

### **Policy RD3 - Housing in the Countryside**

The development of single houses or groups of houses which fall within the six identified categories will be supported. This policy does not apply in the Green Belt and is limited within the Lunan Valley Catchment Area.

### **Policy PM1A - Placemaking**

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 Criteria**

Sets out the specific placemaking criteria.

### **Policy PM3 - Infrastructure Contributions**

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.

## **OTHER COUNCIL POLICIES**

### **Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012**

This is the most recent expression of Council policy towards new housing in the open countryside.

### **Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing (2016)**

This policy outlines the Council's position in relation to developer contributions in relation to primary education, transport infrastructure and A9 junction improvements, as well as our Affordable Housing provision requirements.

### **Flooding and Flood Risk Guidance Document (June 2014)**

This document offers guidance to applicants and developers in relation to sites which are potentially affected by flood risk, and also the need for drainage impact assessments.

## **EXTERNAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

**Scottish Water** have commented on the proposal and raised no concerns.

**Dundee Airport Ltd** have commented on the proposal in terms of aviation safety issues but have raised no concerns.

## **INTERNAL COUNCIL COMMENTS**

**Local Flood Prevention Authority** has commented on the proposal and indicated that a flood risk assessment was necessary. That assessment has been received, and subject to clarification on some matters they have no concerns over the proposal.

**Transport Planning** has commented on the proposal and raised no objections in terms of the proposed means of access or parking provision.

**Developer Negotiations Officer** has commented on the proposal and indicated that the Council's policies on Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing should apply to this proposal, and appropriate conditions should be attached to any permission.

## REPRESENTATIONS

Three letters of representations have been received, one from an individual party, one from a local action group and one from the Local Community Council (Inchtute Community Council).

The issues raised within the representations are,

- Proposal is contrary to the Development Plan
- Proposal is contrary to the Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012
- Flooding concerns
- Drainage concerns
- Loss of prime agricultural land

These issues are assessed below.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

|   |                                  |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Environment Statement                           | Not Required                     |
| Screening Opinion                               | Not Required                     |
| Environmental Impact Assessment                 | Not Required                     |
| Appropriate Assessment                          | Not Required                     |
| Design Statement or Design and Access Statement | Supporting Statement lodged      |
| Report on Impact or Potential Impact            | Flood Risk Assessment submitted. |

## APPRAISAL

Sections 25 and 37 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that planning decisions be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the area comprises the approved TAYplan 2017 and the adopted Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014.

In terms of other material considerations, consideration of the Council's Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012 and also the Developer Contribution and Affordable Housing 2016 document are material considerations.



## Policy Appraisal

The principal Development Plan land use policies directly relevant to this proposal are largely contained in the adopted Local Development Plan. Within that Plan, the site lies within the landward area where *Policies PM1A (general development)* and *RD3 (HITCP)* are directly applicable for a new residential proposal.

*Policy PM1A* seeks to ensure that all new developments contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment, respecting the character and amenity of the existing area, whilst *Policy RD3* relates to new Housing in the Countryside and states that the supplementary guidance will be applicable to new residential proposals in the landward area. The most recent SPG on Housing in the Countryside is the 2012 version, which was approved in 2014.

For reasons stated below, I consider the proposal to be contrary to the Council's Housing in the Countryside Policies.

## Land Use Acceptability

The site lies within the landward area of the adopted Local Development Plan, where *Policy RD3* is directly applicable for all new residential proposals. *Policy RD3* relates to the Housing in the Countryside Policy and is directly linked to the associated SPG, the Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012 (HITCG) which offers a more detailed policy background and is the most recent expression of Council opinion towards new housing in the open countryside.

To this end, the acceptability of the proposal in land use terms is ultimately an assessment of the proposal against the HITCG 2012.

The HITCG states that consent will generally be granted for new houses which extend an existing building group into a definable site(s) which is formed by existing topography and or well established landscape features, and which will provide a suitable setting for a new dwelling. The HITCG also requires all acceptable proposals to respect the character, layout and building pattern of the (existing) group and demonstrate that a high standard of residential amenity can be achieved for the existing and proposed house(s).

To this end, the key questions for the acceptability of this planning application are essentially,

- whether or not the existing dwellings constitutes an acceptable 'building group',
- whether or not the development would take place in a suitable, contained site,

- whether or not the development respects the character of the existing group and,
- whether or not the proposal offers a suitable residential amenity for future occupiers.

I shall address these issues in turn.

In terms of establishing whether or not there is an existing building group in situ, it is a matter of fact that there are more than three existing buildings (some dwellings, some non-residential) located to the area. To this end, collectively, I consider the existing buildings to constitute a building group, which is typically defined as three or more buildings in a close knit grouping – and which is clearly the case here.

It is however the second criteria which is critical to this proposal, and also the other three other applications within the garden area. That criteria being whether or not the site has a suitable site containment and landscape framework which is capable of absorbing the development proposed.

The site of the four dwellings is set within an area of established domestic garden ground, which is self-contained and framed by existing boundary treatments comprising trees and hedges on all of its sides. To the east of the trees on the eastern side is the public road, and to the north is the curtilage of the existing dwelling. Further to the west and south, beyond the existing hedging / trees is open farmland.

The applicant has indicated that the trees and hedging along the boundaries of the main garden were all planted around the time when of the construction of the grade separated junction interchange further to the south, largely to offer some visual screening from the raised road infrastructure, but also to provide some noise mitigation from traffic movements.

There is no doubt that all the sites sides are contained by the existing boundary treatments which are a mix of existing trees and hedges, and that there is a clear physical definition between the residential area (the site) and the surrounding fields. Nevertheless, it is the case that the site has been hived off, albeit a number of years ago, and that whilst the trees and hedges are established, even a modest scale dwelling would be readily visible over the top of the existing boundary treatments.

However, visibility alone is not a reason for refusal. The key issue is whether not the existing boundary treatments along the edges of the main garden offer suitable containment for the development proposed, and would provide for a suitable landscape setting.

The boundary treatment surrounding the main garden is very narrow, and it is this element which I do have some concerns over. Whilst it is generally accepted that established tree belts and woodland areas are ordinarily considered to be suitable landscape features in the context of providing a

landscape setting, and site containment I do have concerns with what is in existence here.

The landscape which is in place is essentially boundary treatments of a domestic scale, which do lack substance and significance. Even though the treatments do provide a clear physical and visual separation between the site and the surrounding agricultural fields, I'm not convinced that the narrow run of trees and hedging is sufficient to be classed as a suitable (existing) landscape framework in the context of what is ordinarily expected in terms of the requirements of the HITCG, and that what is currently in place would not provide suitable site containment or provide a landscape setting for the new dwellings.

Turning to other matters, for all new proposals which are extending an existing building group, acceptable proposals must also respect the character and layout of the existing building group. The development of the garden area for a modest number of dwellings, would not in my view affect the character or layout of the existing building group. The group at the moment comprises the main dwelling, and then a group of non-residential buildings. The development of dwellings in the area to the south of the main farmhouse would in my view replicate (to some degree) the building form of the non-residential dwellings to the north, with the dwelling being located in between the two.

This planning application, and the others for both the main garden and the walled garden are only in principle, however I'm confident that the principle of development in the main garden area (for 4 dwellings) would not adversely affect the character, amenity or layout of the existing building group.

Lastly, all new proposals which are either part of an existing building or are extending the group must protect existing residential amenity, and also provide a suitable residential amenity for the future occupiers of the dwellings. Whilst this application (and the other three applications within the main garden area) is in principle only, I see no reason why suitable details cannot be advanced which would ensure that existing residential amenity is protected, and a suitable level of residential amenity would be delivered for the future occupiers of the dwelling.

Based on the above, and after much consideration, the issue with the site's landscape framework and whether or not it is robust enough to offer suitable containment for the development proposed is a significant and major issue, and does cause me some concerns. Ultimately, whilst the proposal may accord with certain other individual aspects of the HITCG, I do not consider the existing landscape framework to be substantial enough to justify it being considered a suitable landscape framework, and what surrounds and defines the site is essentially domestic boundary treatments as opposed to an established landscape feature(s). To this end, I ultimately consider the proposal to be contrary to the Council's Housing in the Countryside Policies.

## **Impact on Residential Amenity**

In terms of the impact on existing residential amenity, the proposal will have limited impact. Whilst there is an existing dwelling in the vicinity of the development site, there would be sufficient distance between the new and existing dwellings to ensure that existing residential amenity is not compromised by any new overlooking, loss of privacy or loss of sunlight/daylight.

In terms of the proposed dwelling, and the other three within the garden area, the overall development site is large and fairly regular in its shape. In my view, this combination would mean that achieving suitable window to window distances and providing suitable amenity space for all future occupiers should be easily achievable through appropriate design.

To this end, I have no concerns over residential amenity issues.

## **Access and Road matters**

The proposal raises no issues in terms of the suitability of the new vehicular access which will be formed from the public road. There is already an existing access point and this would be reformed and upgraded, and be used to serve the other three proposed dwellings as well.

It may be the case that some of the hedge along the eastern boundary may need to be tapered back to proposed suitable sightlines, however in the event of any approval being forthcoming this can be conditioned and then advanced as part of any detailed proposal.

In terms of the internal arrangements shown, this is only a planning in principle application however I see no reason why suitable internal access and parking arrangements cannot be delivered.

## **Impact on Visual Amenity of the area**

This is only a planning in principle application, and to this end no design details are being considered at this stage. It would however be my view that the erection of 4 dwellings (including the other 3 within the garden area), would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area providing that their design is suitable and their scale is not overbearing. It would be the case that the dwellings would be visible, from both the top of the interchange, and also the public road, however visibility alone does not necessary render a proposal unacceptable.

To this end, whilst I do have an issue with the land use acceptability, I do not have any issue with the visual impact that a proposal may have on the area.

### **Flooding & Drainage**

A flood risk assessment has been carried out on the site, and the conclusions and recommendations have been agreed by the Council's flooding team. In the event of any approval being forthcoming suitable conditions in relation to flood risk / mitigation and drainage (surface water and foul) should be attached to any permission.

### **Impact on Bio-diversity**

There are no known protected species within the site.

### **Loss of Prime Agricultural Land**

Within the letters of representations, a concern has been raised that the proposal would result in a loss of prime agricultural land. The site is not now agricultural land, and has not been for some time. It is also the case that there is no default position for it to return to agricultural land anytime in the future. To this end, whilst the land maybe classed as prime land under the soil classifications, it is not agricultural and therefore I do not consider this issue to be relevant in the determination of the application.

### **Impact on Trees and hedging**

As stated above, there are a number of trees aligning the sites boundaries as well as mature (and attractive) hedging. In the event of any approval being forthcoming, these existing trees and hedges should be protected during construction, and their retention incorporated into any detailed proposals as much as possible. Both these matters can be controlled via appropriately worded conditions.

### **Archaeology Matters**

There are no known archaeological interests in the area.

### **Contaminated Land**

There is no known contaminated land issues associated with this site.

### **Developer Contributions**

### Affordable Housing

As this proposal is part of a larger development of 5 dwellings, the Council's policy on affordable housing would be applicable.

### Primary Education

As this is a planning in principle application only, a standard compliance condition should be attached to any permission.

### Transport Infrastructure

As this is a planning in principle application only, a standard compliance condition should be attached to any permission.

### A9 Junction Improvements

The site is located outwith the catchment area for A9 junction improvements.

## **Economic Impact**

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

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the application must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this respect, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the adopted Local Development Plan 2014. I have taken account of material considerations and find none that would justify overriding the Development Plan.

On that basis the application is recommended for refusal.

## **APPLICATION PROCESSING TIME**

The recommendation for this application has not been made within the statutory determination period.

## **LEGAL AGREEMENTS**

None required.

## **DIRECTION BY SCOTTISH MINISTERS**

None applicable to this proposal.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Refuse the planning application for the following reason,**

As the site does not have an acceptable landscape framework which provides suitable site containment for the development proposed, the proposal is contrary to Policy RD3 of Perth and Kinross Councils' adopted Local Development Plan 2014, and the Council's Housing in the Countryside Guide 2012. Both these policies only support new housing developments which extend existing building groups into definable sites which have a suitable site containment and landscape setting.

### **Justification**

The proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no material reasons which justify departing from the Development Plan.

### **Informatives**

None

### **Procedural Notes**

Not Applicable.

## **PLANS AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THIS DECISION**

17/00840/1 - 17/00840/5 (*inclusive*)

**Date of Report - 23 April 2018**







Pullar House 35 Kinnoull Street Perth PH1 5GD Tel: 01738 475300 Fax: 01738 475310 Email: [onlineapps@pkc.gov.uk](mailto:onlineapps@pkc.gov.uk)

Applications cannot be validated until all the necessary documentation has been submitted and the required fee has been paid.

Thank you for completing this application form:

ONLINE REFERENCE 100051841-001

The online reference is the unique reference for your online form only. The Planning Authority will allocate an Application Number when your form is validated. Please quote this reference if you need to contact the planning Authority about this application.

## Type of Application

What is this application for? Please select one of the following: \*

- ☐ Application for planning permission (including changes of use and surface mineral working).
- ☒ Application for planning permission in principle.
- ☐ Further application, (including renewal of planning permission, modification, variation or removal of a planning condition etc)
- ☐ Application for Approval of Matters specified in conditions.

## Description of Proposal

Please describe the proposal including any change of use: \* (Max 500 characters)

Sub division of existing curtilage within New Mains Farm to form 1 plot within large area of existing garden ground, facilitating the erection of a 1 1/2 storey dwelling.

Is this a temporary permission? \*

☐ Yes ☒ No

If a change of use is to be included in the proposal has it already taken place?  
(Answer 'No' if there is no change of use.) \*

☐ Yes ☒ No

Has the work already been started and/or completed? \*

☒ No ☐ Yes – Started ☐ Yes - Completed

## Applicant or Agent Details

Are you an applicant or an agent? \* (An agent is an architect, consultant or someone else acting on behalf of the applicant in connection with this application)

☐ Applicant ☒ Agent

## Agent Details

Please enter Agent details

|   |                        |  |                      |
|---|------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Company/Organisation:   | JON FRULLANI ARCHITECT |  |                      |
| Ref. Number:  |                        | You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: * |                      |
| First Name: *   | JON                    | Building Name:                                       | UNIT 5, DISTRICT 10, |
| Last Name: *  | FRULLANI               | Building Number:                                     |                      |
| Telephone Number: *   | 0138224828             | Address 1 (Street): *                                | 25 GREENMARKET       |
| Extension Number:   |                        | Address 2:   |                      |
| Mobile Number:  |                        | Town/City: *   | DUNDEE               |
| Fax Number:   |                        | Country: *   | UNITED KINGDOM       |
|   |                        | Postcode: *  | DD1 4QB              |
| Email Address: *  | jon@jfarchitect.co.uk  |  |                      |
| Is the applicant an individual or an organisation/corporate entity? *                                 |                        |  |                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Organisation/Corporate entity |                        |  |                      |

## Applicant Details

Please enter Applicant details

|                      |          |  |  |
|----------------------|----------|--|--|
| Title:               | Mr       | You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: * |  |
| Other Title:         |          | Building Name:                                       |  |
| First Name: *        | James    | Building Number:                                     |  |
| Last Name: *         | Hamilton | Address 1 (Street): *                                |  |
| Company/Organisation |          | Address 2:   |  |
| Telephone Number: *  |          | Town/City: *   |  |
| Extension Number:    |          | Country: *   |  |
| Mobile Number:       |          | Postcode: *  |  |
| Fax Number:          |          |  |  |
| Email Address: *     |          |  |  |

## Site Address Details

Planning Authority:

Perth and Kinross Council

Full postal address of the site (including postcode where available):

Address 1:

New Mains Farmhouse

Address 2:

Inchture

Address 3:

Address 4:

Address 5:

Town/City/Settlement:

Perth

Post Code:

PH14 9SE

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

Northing

728846

Easting

327280

## Pre-Application Discussion

Have you discussed your proposal with the planning authority? \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

## Pre-Application Discussion Details Cont.

In what format was the feedback given? \*

☐

Meeting

☐

Telephone

☐

Letter

☒

Email

Please provide a description of the feedback you were given and the name of the officer who provided this feedback. If a processing agreement [note 1] is currently in place or if you are currently discussing a processing agreement with the planning authority, please provide details of this. (This will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently.) \* (max 500 characters)

Perth and Kinross Council has been engaged in pre-application discussions regarding the redevelopment of New Mains Farm. Positive discussions have taken place with the Planning Department. The appointed case officer has confirmed that the principle of the erection of four houses in the gardens to the south east of the farm house at New Mains Farm is acceptable and would accord with the Local Development Plan.

Title:

Mr

Other title:

First Name:

Andy

Last Name:

Baxter

Correspondence Reference  
Number:

Date (dd/mm/yyyy):

30/01/2017

Note 1. A Processing agreement involves setting out the key stages involved in determining a planning application, identifying what information is required and from whom and setting timescales for the delivery of various stages of the process.

## Site Area

Please state the site area:

2100.00

Please state the measurement type used:

☐

Hectares (ha)

☒

Square Metres (sq.m)

## Existing Use

Please describe the current or most recent use: \* (Max 500 characters)

Garden Ground

## Access and Parking

Are you proposing a new altered vehicle access to or from a public road? \*

☒

Yes

☐

No

If Yes please describe and show on your drawings the position of any existing. Altered or new access points, highlighting the changes you propose to make. You should also show existing footpaths and note if there will be any impact on these.

Are you proposing any change to public paths, public rights of way or affecting any public right of access? \*

☐

Yes

☒

No

If Yes please show on your drawings the position of any affected areas highlighting the changes you propose to make, including arrangements for continuing or alternative public access.

## Water Supply and Drainage Arrangements

Will your proposal require new or altered water supply or drainage arrangements? \*

☒

Yes

☐

No

Are you proposing to connect to the public drainage network (eg. to an existing sewer)? \*

☒

Yes – connecting to public drainage network

☐

No – proposing to make private drainage arrangements

☐

Not Applicable – only arrangements for water supply required

Do your proposals make provision for sustainable drainage of surface water?? \*  
(e.g. SUDS arrangements) \*

☒

Yes

☐

No

Note:-

Please include details of SUDS arrangements on your plans

Selecting 'No' to the above question means that you could be in breach of Environmental legislation.

Are you proposing to connect to the public water supply network? \*

☒

Yes

☐

No, using a private water supply

☐

No connection required

If No, using a private water supply, please show on plans the supply and all works needed to provide it (on or off site).

## Assessment of Flood Risk

Is the site within an area of known risk of flooding? \*

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Don't Know

If the site is within an area of known risk of flooding you may need to submit a Flood Risk Assessment before your application can be determined. You may wish to contact your Planning Authority or SEPA for advice on what information may be required.

Do you think your proposal may increase the flood risk elsewhere? \*

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Don't Know

## Trees

Are there any trees on or adjacent to the application site? \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, please mark on your drawings any trees, known protected trees and their canopy spread close to the proposal site and indicate if any are to be cut back or felled.

## All Types of Non Housing Development – Proposed New Floorspace

Does your proposal alter or create non-residential floorspace? \*

☐ Yes ☒ No

## Schedule 3 Development

Does the proposal involve a form of development listed in Schedule 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure (Scotland) Regulations 2013? \*

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Don't Know

If yes, your proposal will additionally have to be advertised in a newspaper circulating in the area of the development. Your planning authority will do this on your behalf but will charge you a fee. Please check the planning authority's website for advice on the additional fee and add this to your planning fee.

If you are unsure whether your proposal involves a form of development listed in Schedule 3, please check the Help Text and Guidance notes before contacting your planning authority.

## Planning Service Employee/Elected Member Interest

Is the applicant, or the applicant's spouse/partner, either a member of staff within the planning service or an elected member of the planning authority? \*

☐ Yes ☒ No

## Certificates and Notices

CERTIFICATE AND NOTICE UNDER REGULATION 15 – TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (SCOTLAND) REGULATION 2013

One Certificate must be completed and submitted along with the application form. This is most usually Certificate A, Form 1, Certificate B, Certificate C or Certificate E.

Are you/the applicant the sole owner of ALL the land? \*

☒ Yes ☐ No

Is any of the land part of an agricultural holding? \*

☐ Yes ☒ No

## Certificate Required

The following Land Ownership Certificate is required to complete this section of the proposal:

Certificate A

# Land Ownership Certificate

Certificate and Notice under Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013

Certificate A

I hereby certify that –

(1) - No person other than myself/the applicant was an owner (Any person who, in respect of any part of the land, is the owner or is the lessee under a lease thereof of which not less than 7 years remain unexpired.) of any part of the land to which the application relates at the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the accompanying application.

(2) - None of the land to which the application relates constitutes or forms part of an agricultural holding

Signed: JON FRULLANI

On behalf of: Mr James Hamilton

Date: 12/05/2017

☒ Please tick here to certify this Certificate. \*

## Checklist – Application for Planning Permission

Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013

Please take a few moments to complete the following checklist in order to ensure that you have provided all the necessary information in support of your application. Failure to submit sufficient information with your application may result in your application being deemed invalid. The planning authority will not start processing your application until it is valid.

a) If this is a further application where there is a variation of conditions attached to a previous consent, have you provided a statement to that effect? \*

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable to this application

b) If this is an application for planning permission or planning permission in principle where there is a crown interest in the land, have you provided a statement to that effect? \*

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable to this application

c) If this is an application for planning permission, planning permission in principle or a further application and the application is for development belonging to the categories of national or major development (other than one under Section 42 of the planning Act), have you provided a Pre-Application Consultation Report? \*

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable to this application

Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013

d) If this is an application for planning permission and the application relates to development belonging to the categories of national or major developments and you do not benefit from exemption under Regulation 13 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013, have you provided a Design and Access Statement? \*

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable to this application

e) If this is an application for planning permission and relates to development belonging to the category of local developments (subject to regulation 13. (2) and (3) of the Development Management Procedure (Scotland) Regulations 2013) have you provided a Design Statement? \*

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable to this application

f) If your application relates to installation of an antenna to be employed in an electronic communication network, have you provided an ICNIRP Declaration? \*

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable to this application

g) If this is an application for planning permission, planning permission in principle, an application for approval of matters specified in conditions or an application for mineral development, have you provided any other plans or drawings as necessary:

- ☒ Site Layout Plan or Block plan.  
☐ Elevations.  
☐ Floor plans.  
☐ Cross sections.  
☐ Roof plan.  
☐ Master Plan/Framework Plan.  
☐ Landscape plan.  
☐ Photographs and/or photomontages.  
☐ Other.

If Other, please specify: \* (Max 500 characters)

Provide copies of the following documents if applicable:

A copy of an Environmental Statement. \*

☐ Yes ☒ N/A

A Design Statement or Design and Access Statement. \*

☒ Yes ☐ N/A

A Flood Risk Assessment. \*

☐ Yes ☒ N/A

A Drainage Impact Assessment (including proposals for Sustainable Drainage Systems). \*

☐ Yes ☒ N/A

Drainage/SUDS layout. \*

☐ Yes ☒ N/A

A Transport Assessment or Travel Plan

☐ Yes ☒ N/A

Contaminated Land Assessment. \*

☐ Yes ☒ N/A

Habitat Survey. \*

☐ Yes ☒ N/A

A Processing Agreement. \*

☐ Yes ☒ N/A

Other Statements (please specify). (Max 500 characters)

## Declare – For Application to Planning Authority

I, the applicant/agent certify that this is an application to the planning authority as described in this form. The accompanying Plans/drawings and additional information are provided as a part of this application.

Declaration Name: Mr JON FRULLANI

Declaration Date: 28/04/2017

## Payment Details

Cheque:



Created: 12/05/2017 14:06





**Job 5542**

**New Mains Farm**

Inchtute,  
PH14 9SE.

**Erection of one of four dwelling houses**

**Planning Permission in Principle Application**

---

**Supporting Statement**



View of proposal site and existing farmhouse from North-Eastern Boundary

### **Site Description**

The application site is located on the west side of C401 (High Carse Road) and forms extended garden ground to the south east of the farmhouse at New Mains Farm.

The site is largely screened and enclosed by mature hedging on all four sides.

The application site is in an unkempt condition with the trees and shrubs occupying the periphery being overgrown.

There is a vehicular access to New Mains Farm to the north east of the application site. The access forms the driveway to the farmhouse from the C401.

The farmhouse to the north of the application site is two storeys in height and is constructed from red sandstone with a pitched roof finished in natural slate. The farmhouse has timber framed sliding sash and case windows. The windows on the front (south) elevation have a different glazing pattern to those on the rear and side elevations.

There is a walled garden to the north east of the farmhouse that is currently the subject of an application for planning permission in principle for the erection of a dwellinghouse. The walled garden is also screened from public view through a combination of the walls bounding its curtilage and mature trees and shrubbery.

Beyond the farmhouse to the north of the site there is a group of former farm buildings. The farm buildings are of a traditional stone construction with modern additions to the north west.

The application site is adjacent to the C401 public road and is outwith the settlement boundary of Inchture. The application site is located within an area of countryside designated by the Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014.

### **Proposal**

It is proposed to erect 4 dwellinghouses within the extended garden ground to the south east of the existing farmhouse. Please note that for the purposes of reducing the application fee involved, we have been advised by Planning Officer Alison Belford of Perth and Kinross Council to submit 4 separate applications for each plot.

The proposed houses will be positioned closely together around a central courtyard that provides access to each plot. Each plot area will be between 2000 sqm and 2300sqm with each house being of a traditional 1 1/2 storey design with accommodation in the roof space. The proposed houses will have floor areas of 350sqm and will have 5 bedrooms. The proposed houses will be served by three curtilage parking spaces and will benefit from no less than 500sqm of private useable garden ground.

The existing trees and shrubbery around the periphery of the site will be retained in situ to maintain screening between the proposed development and the existing farmhouse. Access to the proposed houses will be formed through the northern boundary of the site utilising the driveway serving the farm house.

### ***Property History***

Perth and Kinross Council has been engaged in pre-application discussions regarding the redevelopment of New Mains Farm. Positive discussions have taken place with the Planning Department. The appointed case officer has confirmed that the principle of the erection of four houses in the gardens to the south east of the farm house at New Mains Farm is acceptable and would accord with the Local Development Plan.

### ***Policy Framework***

#### *National Policy and Guidance*

The Scottish Government expresses its planning policies through The National Planning Framework, the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), Planning Advice Notes (PAN), Creating Places, Designing Streets, National Roads Development Guide and a series of Circulars.

#### *The Development Plan*

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 - Approved June 2012*

Whilst there are no specific policies or strategies directly relevant to this proposal the overall vision of the Tay Plan should be noted. The vision states “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 and visit and where businesses choose to invest and create jobs.”

#### *Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014 – Adopted February 2014*

The Local Development Plan is the most recent statement of Council policy and is augmented by Supplementary Guidance.

The principal policies are, in summary:

##### *Policy PM1A - Placemaking*

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*

All proposals should meet all eight of the placemaking criteria.

##### *Policy PM3 - Infrastructure Contributions*

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.

**Job 5542**

*Policy RD3 - Housing in the Countryside*

The development of single houses or groups of houses which fall within the six identified categories will be supported. This policy does not apply in the Green Belt and is limited within the Lunan Valley Catchment Area.

*Policy NE2B - Forestry, Woodland and Trees*

Where there are existing trees on a development site, any application should be accompanied by a tree survey. There is a presumption in favour of protecting woodland resources. In exceptional circumstances where the loss of individual trees or woodland cover is unavoidable, mitigation measures will be required.

*Policy TA1B - Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements*

Development proposals that involve significant travel generation should be well served by all modes of transport (in particular walking, cycling and public transport), provide safe access and appropriate car parking. Supplementary Guidance will set out when a travel plan and transport assessment is required.

*Policy EP2- New Development and Flooding*

There will be a general presumption against proposals for built development or land raising on a functional flood plain and in areas where there is a significant probability of flooding from any source, or where the proposal would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. In addition, built development should avoid areas at significant risk from landslip, coastal erosion and storm surges.

*Policy EP3B- Foul Drainage*

Foul drainage from all developments within and close to settlement envelopes that have public sewerage systems will require connection to the public sewer.

In settlements where there is little or no public sewerage system, a private system may be permitted provided it does not have an adverse effect on the natural and built environment, surrounding uses and amenity of the area. For a private system to be acceptable it must comply with the Scottish Building Standards Agency Technical Handbooks.

*Policy EP3C- Surface Water Drainage*

All new development will be required to employ Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) measures.

Supplementary Guidance

Housing in the Countryside Guide (HICG) 2012

Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing Guide 2016

## Evaluation

Sections 25 and 37 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that planning decisions be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The determining issues in this case are whether; the proposal complies with development plan policy; or if there are any other material considerations which justify a departure from policy.

### Principle of Development

As the site lies within the landward area within the adopted Local Development Plan 2014, the proposal falls to be principally considered against Policy RD3: Housing in the Countryside and its associated SPG on Housing in the Countryside, which is the most recent expression of Council policy towards new housing in the open countryside. Policy PM1 'Placemaking' and PM3 'Infrastructure Contributions' of the adopted Local Development Plan and the recently adopted Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing Guide 2016 are also relevant.

The proposed development is compliant with Policy RD3: Housing in the Countryside and its associated SPG on Housing in the Countryside. This is because Section 1 of the SPG states that:

*"Consent will be granted for houses within building groups provided they do not detract from both the residential and visual amenity of the group. Consent will also be granted for houses which extend the group into definable sites formed by existing topography and or well established landscape features which will provide a suitable setting. All proposals must respect the character, layout and building pattern of the group and demonstrate that a high standard of residential amenity can be achieved for the existing and proposed house(s)."*

The existing building group at New Mains Farm comprises of 4 main buildings, the farmhouse and the 3 former agricultural buildings to the north and north west of the farmhouse. The former agricultural buildings are of a traditional single storey pitched roof design commensurate with the scale and massing of terraced cottages. These buildings have been built around a courtyard.

The proposed houses shall be of a scale and design that is subservient to the main farmhouse adjoining the site to the south west and that is similar to the former agricultural buildings to the north and north west of the farm house. The finishing materials of the new houses will blend with the stone finish of the farmhouse and former agricultural buildings. Similar to the courtyard arrangement to the north of the farmhouse, the proposed houses will also be positioned around a central courtyard that provides access to each plot. The proposals therefore respect the character, layout and building pattern of the existing group.

The retention of the mature hedging and trees delineating the periphery of the site will screen the development from the existing farmhouse and B953 while the distance between the proposed development and the existing farmhouse will ensure that there is no adverse impact on its amenity. Each of the proposed plots will be afforded extensive areas of private garden ground with the open southern, eastern and western aspects of the application site ensuring that each house is afforded an exceptional level of residential amenity.

In this instance the proposal presents an opportunity to extend the existing building group into a definable site without impacting on the residential or visual amenity of the group.

For the reasons outlined above it has been demonstrated that the proposed development complies with the requirements of Policy RD3 and the HICG 2012.

### ***Design and Layout***

The site is required to be assessed against the 'Placemaking' policies of the adopted local plan. Although the detailed design of the proposed houses has not yet taken place the indicative site layout plan accompanying this application demonstrates that the proposed houses can be accommodated on the site.

The indicative site layout plan demonstrates that the proposed development by virtue of the number of houses proposed, their scale, size of plots and position on the site will not adversely impact on the density of development within the established building group or the amenity and character of the surrounding area.

The proposed houses will be served by 3 curtilage parking spaces. Access to the site will be taken from the driveway serving the existing farmhouse from the B953 to the north of the site. The boundaries of the site are formed by stone walls, mature hedging, trees and shrubs. Therefore, taking access from the north will maintain the integrity of the eastern boundary wall and prevent the creation of a new vehicular access from the B953. This will further preserve the integrity and character of the site.

In terms of design, to minimise any impact on visual amenity the proposed houses will take the form of 1 1/2 storey buildings with upper floor accommodation provided in the roof space. The houses will have a north east to south west orientation with extensive private gardens. The proposed houses by virtue of their single storey design and positioning on the application site as well as the retention of the trees and shrubs reinforcing the boundaries of the site will not overlook or impact on the privacy of the farmhouse to the north.

Taking cognisance of the above reasoning the proposals satisfy Policy PM1A.

### ***Residential Amenity***

The formation of residential development 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 dwelling and those that live in the neighbouring farmhouse. Planning control has a duty to future occupiers not to create situations of potential conflict between neighbours.

As this is an application for planning permission in principle the exact impact on existing amenity and also the proposed residential amenity of future occupiers of the proposed houses cannot be fully determined.

The Indicative Site Layout Plan demonstrates that the proposed houses will be afforded generous internal and external space standards and off street parking facilities. The proposed houses will be positioned no less than 18m from each other and the neighbouring farmhouse. This will prevent the proposed houses from overlooking, over shadowing and physically impacting on each other and the existing farm house. Taking account of the indicative site layout plan and suggested restrictions relating to the design of the proposed house we believe that the proposals would not compromise the amenity of the existing farmhouse and will equally provide a suitable level of residential amenity for future occupiers of the new house. For the reasons outlined above the proposals satisfy Policy PM1B.

## **Access**

The site sits immediately adjacent to the public road and benefits from an existing access and driveway serving the farmhouse to the north of the site. It is proposed to utilise the existing access and driveway to access the application site on its northern boundary.

It is recognised that the existing access to the site may require to be upgraded to meet the standards required by the Council to ensure safe access and egress from the property whilst maintaining safety levels associated with other roads users and residents. These matters can be controlled by condition and incorporated into a detailed planning application should planning permission in principle be granted. The proposed upgrading of the existing vehicle access in compliance with the Council's transportation development standards accord with Policy TA1B of the adopted Local Development Plan.

## **Developer Contributions**

In terms of Policy PM3 and the approved Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing Guide 2016, it is recognised that contributions require to be paid to mitigate the impact of development on essential infrastructure. However, as this application is "in principle" only and will be located adjacent to a proposal for the erection of a house in the walled garden to the north east of the farm house it is not possible to assess the impact of the proposal in accordance with the guidance document at this stage. Therefore, the applicant is agreeable to a condition being applied to the approval of planning permission in principle to ensure that any future application for the matters specified in conditions fully complies with the requirements of Policy PM3 and the SPG.

## **Landscape**

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 siting of the proposed houses on the application site and the formation of the vehicular access may require some of the existing trees and hedges on site to be lopped or removed. However, there is scope to replant given the extent of the application site. In this instance it is proposed to create natural boundaries between the building plots in the form of hedge rows. These measures will enhance arboreal interest and rural character of the application site.

Should planning permission in principle be granted, the applicant is agreeable that any future application would provide a tree impact assessment, if matters specified in conditions prescribe so. For these reasons we believe the proposals to satisfy Policy NE2B.

The above assessment has demonstrated that the proposals satisfy Policies PM1, PM1A, NE2B, PM3, RM3, EP2, EP3B, EP3C and TA1B of the adopted Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014 as well as the associated developer contributions and affordable house and housing in the countryside supplementary guidance documents.




**Job 5542**

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, this statement has demonstrated the reasons that the proposed development complies with the approved TAYplan Strategic Development Plan 2012 and the adopted Local Development Plan 2014. There are no material considerations immediately obvious that would justify overriding the adopted Development Plan. Therefore, we believe that this application for planning permission in principle for the erection of four dwellinghouses within the extended garden to the south east of New Mains farmhouse should be supported by the Council.





**Legend**

land under ownership of the client

application site

**new mains farm, inchture**

location plan 5542.1250.02



1:1250 @ A2

This drawing is protected by copyright. It may not be reproduced in any form or by any means for any purpose, without gaining prior written permission from Jan Trulland Architects Ltd

jon fruliani architect


**e:** jon@jarchitect.co.uk **t:** 01362 224626  
**w:** jonfrullanjarchitect.co.uk **m:** 07806726306

W: [jonfrulieniarchitect.co.uk](http://jonfrulieniarchitect.co.uk) m: 07806726306

Legend

Land under ownership of the client

Application area



Architect  
JF

all plans to be submitted by postmarked on day  
should any delays arise, please contact the architect to confirm

jon frulliani architect  
e: jon@jonfrulliani.co.uk t: 01585 224329  
w: jonfrulliani.co.uk m: 07807 25206

new mains farm, inchture  
existing site plan 6642.000.06  
1500 @ A2  
this drawing is protected by copyright. it may not be reproduced in any form or by any means for any purpose, without gaining prior written permission from jon frulliani architect LLP

proposed dwelling footprint - 172m²

proposed dwelling footprint - 172m²

land under ownership of the client - 16,130m<sup>2</sup>

application site : area of proposed plot 3 - 2,168m<sup>2</sup>  
shared access - 1165m<sup>2</sup>




unit 3 - 350m<sup>2</sup> 5 bedroom, 1 1/2 storey (plot 2100m<sup>2</sup>)

proposed dwelling footprint - 176m²

land under ownership of the client - 16,130m<sup>2</sup>

application site : area of proposed plot 3 - 2,160m<sup>2</sup>  
shared access - 1185m<sup>2</sup>



480

## DOCUMENT 5: EXISTING LANDSCAPE FRAMEWORK PHOTOGRAPHS

August 2017- Photographs Taken From Within Site Showing Southern, Eastern and Western Aspects of Landscape Buffer







**November 2017- Photographs Taken From 1st Floor South Facing Windows of Farmhouse**











# Millard

More than civil engineers



**Proposed Residential  
Development, New Mains,  
by Inchtute, Perth and  
Kinross**

## **Flood Risk Assessment**

Ref: 14233/AB/467

September 2017



---

CLIENT: James Hamilton

ENGINEER: Millard Consulting  
Inveralmond Business Centre  
Auld Bond Road  
Perth  
PH1 3FX


Tel: 01738 646750  
Fax: 01738 646747

Report Prepared By:



.....  
Andrew Braid

Report Checked By:



.....  
Brian Coghlan (Technical Director)

#### COPYRIGHT

Copyright of this report is vested in T A Millard Scotland Ltd and no part of it may be reproduced or copied by any means without prior written permission from T A Millard Scotland Ltd. If you have received this report in error, please destroy all copies in your possession and notify T A Millard Scotland Ltd immediately.

The findings and recommendations of this report are for the use if the client named on the cover and relate to the project described in this report only. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by T A Millard Scotland Ltd no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of this report. No liability is accepted by T A Millard Scotland Ltd for any use of this report, other than the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided.

Opinions and information provided in the report are on the basis of T A Millard Scotland Ltd using due skill, care and diligence in the preparation of the same. No independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to T A Millard Scotland Ltd had been made.

## **CONTENTS**

|            |   |           |
|------------|---|-----------|
| <b>1.0</b> | <b>Introduction .....</b>                                     | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>2.0</b> | <b>General Description of Site .....</b>                      | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>General Observations .....</b>                             | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>Estimation of Flood Flows.....</b>                         | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>Predicted Flood Levels.....</b>                            | <b>15</b> |
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>Proposed Mitigation and Management of Flood Risk .....</b> | <b>20</b> |
| <b>7.0</b> | <b>Conclusions .....</b>                                      | <b>21</b> |
| <b>8.0</b> | <b>References .....</b>                                       | <b>22</b> |

**Appendix A: Results from Flood Modeller Flow Analysis (FEH Rainfall Runoff Method)**

**Appendix B: Results from ReFH2 Flow Analysis (Revitalised Flood Hydrograph Method – Version 2)**

**Appendix C: Results from WINFAP Flow Analysis (FEH Statistical Method)**

**Appendix D: Output from HECRAS Model**

## **PLANS**

**14233/21/001 FLOOD EXTENT AND CROSS SECTION LOCATION PLAN**

**14233/21/002 PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES**

## **1.0 Introduction**

Millard Consulting have been instructed by James Hamilton to carry out a Flood Risk Assessment in relation to a proposed residential development at New Mains, by Inchtute. The development includes the construction of 5 houses on the site. The site is currently garden ground associated with an existing house.

The planning authority have requested a Flood Risk Assessment be carried out for the proposed development. For a development such as is proposed, it is normal to assess flood risk for a return period of 1 in 200 years.

### **1.1 Scope and Methodology**

The scope of this Flood Risk Assessment is to assess and quantify flood risk to the proposed development. Flood risk to the development will be assessed for a 1 in 200 year flood event.

To assess flood risk to the development a topographical survey has been undertaken by Benchmark Land Surveys. They have also surveyed cross sections through the watercourse adjacent to the site to enable a hydraulic model to be constructed. The survey was preceded by a site walkover to confirm the extent of survey required, and to assess the catchment of the Erskine Pow which flows in a westerly direction to the north of the site.

Using several methods, the Q200 flood flow for the Erskine Pow will be assessed and applied in the hydraulic model. The results provided by the hydraulic model will then be utilised with the topographical survey to assess flood risk to the site.

Once flood risk to the site has been assessed and quantified, recommendations for the site from the perspective of flood risk will then be made.

The assessment is prepared using our best engineering judgement but there are levels of uncertainty implicit in the historical data and methods of analysis. Details of the range of possible error in the methods of flood estimation are given in the Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH).

This Flood Risk Assessment is carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (Scottish Government, 2014). This assessment uses a set of procedures originally set out in the Flood Estimation Handbook (Institute of Hydrology, 1999) and embodied in the FEH and WINFAP software packages currently used.



## 2.0 General Description of Site

The site is located at grid reference 327291, 728862, approximately 0.5km northwest of the village of Inchture in Perth and Kinross. Please see Figure 1 below which indicatively shows the site location bounded in red. Figure 2 below shows an excerpt from the architect's site layout plan.




Figure 1 – Site location plan




Figure 2 – Architects site layout

The site is approximately 1ha in size and is set in a rural location. Farmland is the predominant land use in the area. The site is bounded by farmland to the South West and South East, by the existing house at New

Mains to the North West and by a public road to the north east. The topography of the site and the surrounding area is generally flat.

The main source of flood risk to the site is from the Erskine Pow which flows in a south westerly direction approximately 80m North West of the site. In the vicinity of the site the watercourse is culverted to facilitate a crossing by the aforementioned public road. Immediately upstream of the culvert, an existing house is located on the left bank. The remaining land in the vicinity of the site is arable farmland. Approximately 90m northwest of the site (i.e. aligned with the upstream end of the site), there is an old masonry arch culvert.

In the reach adjacent to the site, the channel of the Erskine Pow is straight, with a shallow gradient. The banks of the watercourse are vegetated with a mix of high grass, weeds, scattered brush and trees. Adjacent to the site the channel of the Erskine Pow widens out, before returning to a narrower cross section a short distance downstream. Approximately 650m downstream of the site the Erskine Pow changes course to flow in a south easterly direction, flowing below the A90 dual carriageway some 470m further downstream.

The site has been topographically surveyed with reference to Ordnance Datum by Benchmark Land Surveys. The topographical data from this survey has been incorporated into Drawing Number 14233/21/001.



Photograph 1 – Looking upstream along the Erskine Pow from approximately the location of cross section 1.





Photograph 2 – looking westwards along a track between the site and the Erskine Pow. The watercourse channel is to the right of the picture, beyond the line of trees.



Photograph 3 – looking south east along the road running along the frontage of the site.



Photograph 4 – Looking in a southerly direction across the site. The south eastern boundary of the site is formed by the hedge in the centre of the picture. The road is located to the left of the picture.



Photograph 5 – Taken from approximately the south western boundary of the site, looking in a northerly direction across the site towards the existing house.





Photograph 6 – a view of the downstream end of the culvert adjacent to the site



Photograph 7 – Looking downstream from the culvert location in the vicinity of the site.

### 3.0 General Observations

The catchment of the Erskine Pow includes Ballindean House, within the grounds of which a large amenity pond is located. A site walkover was undertaken which included an assessment of the grounds of Ballindean House where applicable, and a meeting was held with the owner of Ballindean House to discuss the pond and the associated infrastructure. It was established that the pond was filled by a watercourse flowing from the Braes of the Carse to the North West. The owner of Ballindean House was not aware of any formal outlet structure from the pond and no formal outlet was found during the site walkover. Following the findings of the site walkover, it was clear the catchment should be treated as a conventional catchment with no additional allowance for attenuation of flows.

A second watercourse is located adjacent to the grounds of Ballindean House, flowing in a southern direction. The channel of this unnamed watercourse was found to be dry during the site walkover, however no evidence was found to confirm the channel was now disused.

The unnamed watercourse is culverted below a public road approximately 800m north west of the site. The culvert is 0.45m in diameter. There is potential for flood flows from this watercourse to flow overbank and into the catchment of the Erskine Pow during a flood event, should the capacity of the 0.45m diameter culvert be exceeded. The capacity of the culvert has been assessed in this report, as outlined in Sections 4 and 5.

Some mapping assessed as part of this report showed two crossings over the Erskine Pow in the vicinity of the site, downstream of the old masonry arch bridge. During the site walkover it was confirmed that these structures had now been removed, presumably by the neighbouring landowner.

## 4.0 Estimation of Flood Flows

In order to define the extent and water surface level of the 200 year (0.5% annual probability) floodplain, we have made an assessment of flood flows and flood levels in the Erskine Pow and the unnamed watercourse, using both the FEH Statistical Method and the FEH Rainfall Runoff Method outlined in the Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH), and the Revitalised Flood Hydrograph Method. The estimated flood levels in the watercourse have then been factored up by 20% to allow for the potential influence of climate change (following established practice, and in line with guidance from the UK Climate Impacts Programme).

### 4.1 Erskine Pow

#### 4.1.1 FEH Rainfall Runoff Method

We have made an assessment of flood flows and flood levels in the watercourse using the rainfall runoff methods outlined in the Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH).

This method relies on plentiful rainfall records rather than sometimes scarce river flow records. Hence, if catchment characteristics are known or estimated, the method converts the theoretical design rainfall event of a known return period into a design flood event, with a peak of a known return period.

By selecting the catchment using the FEH Web Service, the catchment descriptors unique to the catchment can be established. Also, by selecting the catchment the design rainfall for the catchment can be established as the software determines the depth-duration-frequency (DDF) relationships for the catchment.

Following obtainment of catchment descriptors for the Erskine Pow from the FEH Web Service, the catchment size was checked manually by the inspection of Ordnance Survey mapping. It was found that the actual catchment of the Erskine Pow at the site is larger than suggested by the FEH Web Service (FEH Web Service Area = 0.87km<sup>2</sup>; OS Area = 1.64km<sup>2</sup>). The larger area provided by the inspection of OS mapping has therefore been applied. In addition the DPLBAR figure has been adjusted as required by the FEH due to the change in catchment size. DPLBAR has been adjusted to 1.31 ( $1.64^{0.548} = 1.31$ ).

The catchment descriptors are subsequently entered into Flood Modeller software to produce a hydrograph showing the peak flow rate during a specified flood return period. A storm duration is also required, and involves trial and error to determine the duration of the peak flow.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.1 below (see Flood Modeller output, Appendix A):

| Return Period | Flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s) |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| Q200          | 1.77                     |
| Q200+20%      | 2.12                     |

Table 4.1 Flow calculation results using the Rainfall Runoff Method

Output from the Rainfall Runoff analysis is enclosed within Appendix A.

Proposed Development at New Mains, by Inchtute, Perth and Kinross  
Flood Risk Assessment

| VERSION     | "FEH CD-ROM" | Version | 3      | exported 16:28:49 |
|-------------|--------------|---------|--------|-------------------|
| CATCHMENT   | GB           | 327200  | 728950 | NO 27200 28950    |
| CENTROID    | GB           | 327321  | 729818 | NO 27321 29818    |
| AREA        | 1.64         |         |        |                   |
| ALTBAR      | 31           |         |        |                   |
| ASPBAR      | 177          |         |        |                   |
| ASPVAR      | 0.67         |         |        |                   |
| BFIHOST     | 0.668        |         |        |                   |
| DPLBAR      | 1.31         |         |        |                   |
| DPSBAR      | 69.1         |         |        |                   |
| FARL        | 0.943        |         |        |                   |
| FPEXT       | 0.2161       |         |        |                   |
| FPDBAR      | 1.406        |         |        |                   |
| FPLOC       | 0.459        |         |        |                   |
| LDP         | 2.16         |         |        |                   |
| PROPWET     | 0.46         |         |        |                   |
| RMED-1H     | 8            |         |        |                   |
| RMED-1D     | 36.5         |         |        |                   |
| RMED-2D     | 45.8         |         |        |                   |
| SAAR        | 708          |         |        |                   |
| SAAR4170    | 754          |         |        |                   |
| SPRHOST     | 25.3         |         |        |                   |
| URBCONC1990 | -999999      |         |        |                   |
| URBEXT1990  | 0            |         |        |                   |
| URBLOC1990  | -999999      |         |        |                   |
| URBCONC2000 | -999999      |         |        |                   |
| URBEXT2000  | 0            |         |        |                   |
| URBLOC2000  | -999999      |         |        |                   |
| C           | -0.01701     |         |        |                   |
| D1          | 0.49266      |         |        |                   |
| D2          | 0.41766      |         |        |                   |
| D3          | 0.25169      |         |        |                   |
| E           | 0.25279      |         |        |                   |
| F           | 2.13818      |         |        |                   |
| C(1km)      | -0.017       |         |        |                   |
| D1(1km)     | 0.491        |         |        |                   |
| D2(1km)     | 0.416        |         |        |                   |
| D3(1km)     | 0.25         |         |        |                   |
| E(1km)      | 0.252        |         |        |                   |
| F(1km)      | 2.132        |         |        |                   |

Figure 3 – Descriptors for Erskine Pow catchment






Figure 4 – Catchment Plan

#### 4.1.2 Revitalised Flood Hydrograph Method – Version 2

The second method utilised for the assessment of flood flows in the Erskine Pow was the Revitalised Flood Hydrograph Method. This method is the second version of a method which was originally established as an update to the FEH Rainfall Runoff method.

The ReFH2 model is comprised of three components; a loss model, a routing model and a baseflow model. The total rainfall, less the losses is input into the routing model, with results from the routing and baseflow models combined to provide a prediction of flow. The ReFH2 model is used in conjunction with a depth-duration-frequency model, either the FEH99 model or FEH13 model. In this instance, the FEH13 model was used to provide the rainfall input.

Using the ReFH2 software, the flood flow estimate for the Erskine Pow was as follows:

| Return Period | Flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s) |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| Q200          | 0.79                     |
| Q200+20%      | 0.95                     |

Table 4.2 Flow calculation results using ReFH2

Output from the ReFH2 analysis is enclosed within Appendix B.

#### 4.1.3 FEH Statistical Method

In order to define the extent and water surface level of the 0.5% annual probability floodplain, we must first estimate the Index Flood,  $Q_{MED}$ , for the Erskine Pow using the methods outlined in the Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH).

There are no observed records for the Erskine Pow, hence flows for the watercourse will be estimated using Catchment Descriptors, and adjusted using flow records from suitable analogue sites.

An initial estimate of the flood flows for the Erskine Pow was made using the Catchment descriptor Method. This method is described in Volume 3, Chapter 13, of the FEH. The catchment descriptors define various physical and hydrological properties and characteristics of the land that forms the catchment upstream of the point of interest. The formula also includes variables that define the statistical rainfall pattern within the catchment. There is a further adjustment to the formula that accounts for the degree of urbanisation of the catchment.

The method produces the mean annual flood  $Q_{MED}$  – the index flood – which is the flood flow along the river or floodplain that is statistically “exceeded on average every other year”. It is roughly equivalent to the two-year flood. The exercise is done using the FEH web service and WINFAP software.

The WINFAP-FEH estimation of  $Q_{MED}$  from catchment descriptors is  $0.19\text{m}^3/\text{s}$  ( $Q_{200} = 0.61\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ).

Following the estimation of the  $Q_{MED}$  flood flow using catchment descriptors, it is normal to adjust the estimated flow using data from gauged sites to provide a “corrected”  $Q_{MED}$  figure, then to estimate the  $Q_{200}$  flood flow using a pooling group and associated statistical analysis. In this case the FEH Statistical method has predicted a flood flow significantly lower than the FEH Rainfall Runoff method at the initial stage, hence to match the Rainfall Runoff flow, a correction factor of 2.9 would be required. Following an assessment of suitable analogue catchments it was deemed that a correction factor significantly below this was likely, hence no further analysis was undertaken using the Statistical method. The potential unreliability of analogue catchments for the estimation of flows in very small catchments was also considered.

#### 4.1.4 Applicable Flowrate

The largest estimated flowrate will be applied in the hydraulic model. In this instance the largest  $Q_{200}$  flow estimate was provided by the FEH Rainfall Runoff method, with a  $Q_{200}$  flow estimate of  **$1.77\text{m}^3/\text{s}$** .

### 4.2 Unnamed Watercourse

The  $Q_{200}$  flood flow has been estimated for the unnamed watercourse at the location of the culvert where floodwater could potentially flow into the catchment of the Erskine Pow. The flow calculations undertaken are outlined below.

#### 4.2.1 FEH Rainfall Runoff Method

We have made an assessment of flood flows and flood levels in the watercourse using the rainfall runoff methods outlined in the Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH).

Following obtainment of catchment descriptors for the unnamed watercourse from the FEH Web Service, the catchment size was checked manually by the inspection of Ordnance Survey mapping. It was found that the actual catchment of the unnamed watercourse at the location of the culvert is smaller than suggested by the FEH Web Service (FEH Web Service Area =  $0.74\text{km}^2$ ; OS Area =  $0.476\text{km}^2$ ). The smaller area provided by the inspection of OS mapping has been applied in this assessment. In addition the DPLBAR figure has been adjusted as required by the FEH due to the change in catchment size. DPLBAR has been adjusted to 0.666 ( $0.476^{0.548} = 0.666$ ).

The catchment descriptors are subsequently entered into Flood Modeller software to produce a hydrograph showing the peak flow rate during a specified flood return period. A storm duration is also required, and involves trial and error to determine the duration of the peak flow.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.1 below (see Flood Modeller output, Appendix A):

| Return Period   | Flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s) |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Q200</b>     | <b>0.98</b>              |
| <b>Q200+20%</b> | <b>1.18</b>              |

Table 4.1 Flow calculation results using the Rainfall Runoff Method

Output from the Rainfall Runoff analysis is enclosed within Appendix A.

|             |              |         |        |          |          |
|-------------|--------------|---------|--------|----------|----------|
| VERSION     | "FEH CD-ROM" | Version | 3      | exported | 12:03:16 |
| CATCHMENT   | GB           | 326650  | 729350 | NO 26650 | 29350    |
| CENTROID    | GB           | 326424  | 729956 | NO 26424 | 29956    |
| AREA        | 0.476        |         |        |          |          |
| ALTBAR      | 83           |         |        |          |          |
| ASPBAR      | 155          |         |        |          |          |
| ASPVAR      | 0.8          |         |        |          |          |
| BFIHOST     | 0.531        |         |        |          |          |
| DPLBAR      | 0.666        |         |        |          |          |
| DPSBAR      | 142.9        |         |        |          |          |
| FARL        | 1            |         |        |          |          |
| FPEXT       | 0.1044       |         |        |          |          |
| FPOBAR      | 0.502        |         |        |          |          |
| FPLOC       | 0.221        |         |        |          |          |
| LDP         | 1.69         |         |        |          |          |
| PROPWET     | 0.46         |         |        |          |          |
| RMED-1H     | 8.4          |         |        |          |          |
| RMED-1D     | 36.5         |         |        |          |          |
| RMED-2D     | 46.1         |         |        |          |          |
| SAAR        | 722          |         |        |          |          |
| SAAR4170    | 773          |         |        |          |          |
| SPRHOST     | 34.08        |         |        |          |          |
| URBCONC1990 | -999999      |         |        |          |          |
| URBEXT1990  | 0            |         |        |          |          |
| URBLOC1990  | -999999      |         |        |          |          |
| URBCONC2000 | -999999      |         |        |          |          |
| URBEXT2000  | 0            |         |        |          |          |
| URBLOC2000  | -999999      |         |        |          |          |
| C           | -0.017       |         |        |          |          |
| D1          | 0.48694      |         |        |          |          |
| D2          | 0.41734      |         |        |          |          |
| D3          | 0.25395      |         |        |          |          |
| E           | 0.25217      |         |        |          |          |
| F           | 2.15341      |         |        |          |          |
| C(1 km)     | -0.017       |         |        |          |          |
| D1(1 km)    | 0.491        |         |        |          |          |
| D2(1 km)    | 0.416        |         |        |          |          |
| D3(1 km)    | 0.25         |         |        |          |          |
| E(1 km)     | 0.252        |         |        |          |          |
| F(1 km)     | 2.132        |         |        |          |          |

Figure 5 – Descriptors for unnamed watercourse catchment

#### 4.2.2 Revitalised Flood Hydrograph Method – Version 2

The second method utilised for the assessment of flood flows in the unnamed watercourse was the Revitalised Flood Hydrograph Method. This method is the second version of a method which was originally established as an update to the FEH Rainfall Runoff method.

The ReFH2 model is comprised of three components; a loss model, a routing model and a baseflow model. The total rainfall, less the losses is input into the routing model, with results from the routing and baseflow models combined to provide a prediction of flow. The ReFH2 model is used in conjunction with a depth-duration-frequency model, either the FEH99 model or FEH13 model. In this instance, the FEH13 model was used to provide the rainfall input.



Using the ReFH2 software, the flood flow estimate for the unnamed watercourse was as follows:

| Return Period | Flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s) |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| Q200          | 0.54                     |
| Q200+20%      | 0.65                     |

Table 4.2 Flow calculation results using ReFH2

Output from the ReFH2 analysis is enclosed within Appendix B.

#### 4.2.3 FEH Statistical Method

In order to define the extent and water surface level of the 0.5% annual probability floodplain, we must first estimate the Index Flood,  $Q_{MED}$ , for the unnamed watercourse using the methods outlined in the Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH).

There are no observed records for the unnamed watercourse, hence flows for the watercourse will be estimated using Catchment Descriptors, and adjusted using flow records from suitable analogue sites.

An initial estimate of the flood flows for the unnamed watercourse was made using the Catchment descriptor Method. This method is described in Volume 3, Chapter 13, of the FEH. The catchment descriptors define various physical and hydrological properties and characteristics of the land that forms the catchment upstream of the point of interest. The formula also includes variables that define the statistical rainfall pattern within the catchment. There is a further adjustment to the formula that accounts for the degree of urbanisation of the catchment.

The method produces the mean annual flood  $Q_{MED}$  – the index flood – which is the flood flow along the river or floodplain that is statistically “exceeded on average every other year”. It is roughly equivalent to the two-year flood. The exercise is done using the FEH web service and WINFAP software.

The WINFAP-FEH estimation of  $Q_{MED}$  from catchment descriptors is 0.14m<sup>3</sup>/s ( $Q_{200} = 0.45\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ).

Following the estimation of the  $Q_{MED}$  flood flow using catchment descriptors, it is normal to adjust the estimated flow using data from gauged sites to provide a “corrected”  $Q_{MED}$  figure, then to estimate the  $Q_{200}$  flood flow using a pooling group and associated statistical analysis. In this case the FEH Statistical method has predicted a flood flow significantly lower than the FEH Rainfall Runoff method at the initial stage, hence to match the Rainfall Runoff flow, a correction factor of 2.18 would be required. Following an assessment of suitable analogue catchments it was deemed that a correction factor significantly below this was likely, hence no further analysis was undertaken using the Statistical method. The potential unreliability of analogue catchments for the estimation of flows in very small catchments was also considered.

#### 4.2.4 Applicable Flowrate

The largest estimated flowrate will be applied in the hydraulic model. In this instance the largest  $Q_{200}$  flow estimate was provided by the FEH Rainfall Runoff method, with a  $Q_{200}$  flow estimate of **0.98m<sup>3</sup>/s**.

## 5.0 Predicted Flood Levels

### 5.1 Hydraulic Modelling

Having estimated the flood flows in the watercourses in the vicinity of the site, it is necessary to analyse the watercourse channel to see what level the floodwater would reach during the critical 0.5% annual probability flood event.

The watercourse between the sections is analysed using the HEC-RAS river analysis software, which is generally recognised by the relevant authorities as producing verifiable results. The watercourse has been surveyed on site over the length adjacent to the site and for some distance upstream and downstream (see drawing 14233/21/001).

#### 5.1.1 Assessment of Flow Contribution from the Unnamed Watercourse

Prior to modelling the Erskine Pow adjacent to the site, the capacity of the culvert on the unnamed watercourse was assessed. Using HECRAS software the culvert was modelled to ascertain its capacity. The results showed the capacity of the culvert was approximately  $0.2\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ . It has therefore been assumed that the remainder of the flood flow in the watercourse ( $0.78\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ) would enter the Erskine Pow catchment. In reality this assumption is conservative as it is likely a proportion of the floodwater would overtop the road above the culvert and return to the channel of the unnamed watercourse.

With the inclusion of the additional flow from the unnamed watercourse, the Q200 flood flow modelled in the Erskine Pow past the site was  $2.55\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ .

#### 5.1.2 Erskine Pow Model

Manning's n coefficients were selected for the site based on inspection of existing conditions, and comparison with tabulated descriptors in tables of Manning's values. Hence the following were selected:

- Main channels: Clean, straight, full, no rifts or deep pools, but more stones and weeds (normal value of  $n = 0.035$ )
- Flood plains and banks: mature field crops (normal value of  $n = 0.04$ ), short grass (normal value of  $n = 0.03$ ), high grass (normal value of  $n = 0.035$ ), scattered brush, heavy weeds (normal value of  $n = 0.05$ ), light brush and trees, in summer (normal value of  $n = 0.06$ ), heavy stand of timber, few down trees, little undergrowth, flow below branches (normal value of  $n = 0.1$ )

Once appropriate Manning's values had been selected, boundary conditions at the downstream and upstream ends of the modelled length were modelled based on normal depth commensurate with the average channel gradients of the modelled reach.

Results of the analysis are contained in Appendix D.

The initial analysis shows the level of the 0.5% (Q200) flood level using the flood flow derived above:

| Location      | Flood Level<br>(m AOD) |
|---------------|------------------------|
| Section 1     | 9.51                   |
| Section 2     | 9.55                   |
| Section 3     | 9.59                   |
| Section 4     | 9.6                    |
| Section 4.9   | 9.54                   |
| Section 5     | 9.55                   |
| Section 5.5D  | 9.51                   |
| Section 5.5 U | 9.61                   |
| Section 6     | 9.7                    |
| Section 7     | 9.79                   |
| Section 8     | 9.79                   |

Table 5.1 - Flood levels (0.5% (Q200) flow)

The analysis shows that the banks of the watercourse would be overtopped at the upstream end of the model, and on the right bank adjacent to the site. The results also show that floodwater would build up upstream of the road, however floodwater is not predicted to flow over the road. The site is predicted to be flood free during a 1 in 200 year flood event.

Appendix D contains details of the HECRAS analysis, including plots of the watercourse cross-sections and the water surface levels appropriate to the values above.

## 5.2 Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity analyses were carried out to check the effect of a variation in flow rate, of variation in Manning's 'n' values, and of variation on downstream boundary conditions.

The values of height versus flowrate shown below relate to the water surface profile for all the cross sections modelled. In this instance the

| Location      | Level (m)      |                      | Variation in level<br>(m) |
|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
|               | Flow =<br>Q200 | Flow =<br>Q200 + 10% |                           |
| Section 1     | 9.51           | 9.62                 | 0.11                      |
| Section 2     | 9.55           | 9.65                 | 0.1                       |
| Section 3     | 9.59           | 9.68                 | 0.09                      |
| Section 4     | 9.6            | 9.68                 | 0.08                      |
| Section 4.9   | 9.54           | 9.62                 | 0.08                      |
| Section 5     | 9.55           | 9.63                 | 0.08                      |
| Section 5.5D  | 9.51           | 9.58                 | 0.07                      |
| Section 5.5 U | 9.61           | 9.69                 | 0.08                      |
| Section 6     | 9.7            | 9.81                 | 0.11                      |
| Section 7     | 9.79           | 9.89                 | 0.1                       |
| Section 8     | 9.79           | 9.89                 | 0.1                       |

Table 5.2 Sensitivity Analysis: Variation in Flowrate

The above results show a consistent increase in flood levels throughout the model with an increase in flow of 10%.

As discussed above, sensitivity of the model to changes in Manning's n were tested, by increasing the initial (normal) values by 0.01. This was carried out for all cross sections.

| Location      | Level (m) |                    | Variation in level (m) |
|---------------|-----------|--------------------|------------------------|
|               | Q200      | Q200 with n + 0.01 |                        |
| Section 1     | 9.51      | 9.75               | 0.24                   |
| Section 2     | 9.55      | 9.78               | 0.23                   |
| Section 3     | 9.59      | 9.8                | 0.21                   |
| Section 4     | 9.6       | 9.8                | 0.2                    |
| Section 4.9   | 9.54      | 9.75               | 0.21                   |
| Section 5     | 9.55      | 9.76               | 0.21                   |
| Section 5.5D  | 9.51      | 9.72               | 0.21                   |
| Section 5.5 U | 9.61      | 9.88               | 0.27                   |
| Section 6     | 9.7       | 10.03              | 0.33                   |
| Section 7     | 9.79      | 10.03              | 0.24                   |
| Section 8     | 9.79      | 10.03              | 0.24                   |

Table 5.3 Sensitivity Analysis: Variation in Manning's n

The above results again show a relatively consistent variation in predicted flood level with an increase in roughness of 0.01. With the flood levels predicted above for the increased roughness values, floodwater would likely flow over the road at the south eastern end of the site.

As discussed above, sensitivity of the model to changes in the downstream boundary conditions were tested. This was done by decreasing the downstream gradient by 20%, i.e. changing the initial slope value from 0.00057 to 0.000456. The results of this analysis are shown below.

| Location      | Level (m)               |                     | Variation in level (m) |
|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
|               | Initial Gradient (Q200) | Gradient = 0.000456 |                        |
| Section 1     | 9.51                    | 9.62                | 0.11                   |
| Section 2     | 9.55                    | 9.65                | 0.1                    |
| Section 3     | 9.59                    | 9.68                | 0.09                   |
| Section 4     | 9.6                     | 9.68                | 0.08                   |
| Section 4.9   | 9.54                    | 9.63                | 0.09                   |
| Section 5     | 9.55                    | 9.63                | 0.08                   |
| Section 5.5D  | 9.51                    | 9.59                | 0.08                   |
| Section 5.5 U | 9.61                    | 9.68                | 0.07                   |
| Section 6     | 9.7                     | 9.77                | 0.07                   |
| Section 7     | 9.79                    | 9.85                | 0.06                   |
| Section 8     | 9.79                    | 9.85                | 0.06                   |

Table 5.4 Sensitivity Analysis: Variation in Downstream Boundary Conditions

The above indicates a limited variation in levels with a 20% decrease in downstream slope.

### 5.3 Potential impact of Siltation on Flood Levels

Due to the location of the Erskine Pow, in a low lying valley with a significant area farmland in its vicinity, there is potential for gradual siltation to occur over time. The hydraulic model has therefore been run with two further scenarios to assess the potential impact of this – the first models an increase in bed level of 0.2m at the culvert, and the second models an increase in bed level of approximately 0.2m throughout the model. The figure of 0.2m has not been derived from specific data, however is suggested as a reasonable estimate of future siltation which could potentially occur.

The results of the first additional model (with bed levels raised by 0.2m at the culvert only) are shown in Table 5.5 below.

| Location      | Level (m)                              |   | Variation in level (m) |
|---------------|--|---|------------------------|
|               | Q200 Flood Level (existing bed levels) | Q200 Flood Levels with bed levels raised by 0.2m at culvert |                        |
| Section 1     | 9.51                                   | 9.51  | 0                      |
| Section 2     | 9.55                                   | 9.55  | 0                      |
| Section 3     | 9.59                                   | 9.59  | 0                      |
| Section 4     | 9.6                                    | 9.60  | 0                      |
| Section 4.9   | 9.54                                   | 9.54  | 0                      |
| Section 5     | 9.55                                   | 9.51  | 0.04                   |
| Section 5.5D  | 9.51                                   | 9.44  | 0.07                   |
| Section 5.5 U | 9.61                                   | 9.65  | 0.04                   |
| Section 6     | 9.7                                    | 9.8   | 0.1                    |
| Section 7     | 9.79                                   | 9.89  | 0.11                   |
| Section 8     | 9.79                                   | 9.9   | 0.11                   |

Table 5.5 Siltation impact: Q200 flood levels comparison with and without bed levels raised at culvert by 0.2m

The results above show that Q200 flood levels would increase upstream of the road, however they are not predicted to flow over the road.

| Location      | Level (m)                              |   | Variation in level (m) |
|---------------|--|---|------------------------|
|               | Q200 Flood Level (existing bed levels) | Q200 Flood Levels with bed levels raised by 0.2m (approx.) throughout model |                        |
| Section 1     | 9.51                                   | 9.65  | 0.14                   |
| Section 2     | 9.55                                   | 9.68  | 0.13                   |
| Section 3     | 9.59                                   | 9.71  | 0.12                   |
| Section 4     | 9.6                                    | 9.71  | 0.11                   |
| Section 4.9   | 9.54                                   | 9.63  | 0.09                   |
| Section 5     | 9.55                                   | 9.64  | 0.09                   |
| Section 5.5D  | 9.51                                   | 9.58  | 0.07                   |
| Section 5.5 U | 9.61                                   | 9.74  | 0.13                   |
| Section 6     | 9.7                                    | 9.89  | 0.19                   |
| Section 7     | 9.79                                   | 9.97  | 0.18                   |
| Section 8     | 9.79                                   | 9.97  | 0.18                   |

Table 5.6 Siltation impact: Q200 flood levels comparison with and without bed levels raised by 0.2m throughout model

As with Table 5.5, the results in Table 5.6 above show that Q200 flood levels would increase upstream of the road, however they are not predicted to flow over the road.

#### 5.4 Flood Levels including Culvert Blockage

The potential for blockage of the culvert has been considered in the assessment and therefore the effect of a large blockage of 50% of the full length culvert has been modelled. It should be noted that this extent of blockage is highly unlikely and the analysis is therefore very conservative.

The flood levels predicted by the hydraulic model for the above noted blockage are outlined in the table below.

| Location      | Level (m)        |  | Variation in level (m) |
|---------------|------------------|--|------------------------|
|               | Q200 Flood Level | Q200 Flood Level with 50% Culvert Blockage |                        |
| Section 1     | 9.51             | 9.51                                       | 0                      |
| Section 2     | 9.55             | 9.55                                       | 0                      |
| Section 3     | 9.59             | 9.59                                       | 0                      |
| Section 4     | 9.6              | 9.6  | 0                      |
| Section 4.9   | 9.54             | 9.54                                       | 0                      |
| Section 5     | 9.55             | 9.55                                       | 0                      |
| Section 5.5D  | 9.51             | 10.02                                      | 0.51                   |
| Section 5.5 U | 9.61             | 10.09                                      | 0.48                   |
| Section 6     | 9.7              | 10.11                                      | 0.41                   |
| Section 7     | 9.79             | 10.11                                      | 0.32                   |
| Section 8     | 9.79             | 10.11                                      | 0.32                   |

Table 5.7 Predicted Q200 Flood Levels with 50% Culvert Blockage

The above table shows that flood levels would increase by almost 0.5m immediately upstream of the bridge in the event of a bridge blockage of approximately 50%, with floodwater flowing over the road at the south eastern end of the site. At its current levels, the site would be impacted by this event.

### 5.5 Flood Levels including Climate Change

The potential impact of climate change on predicted flood levels has been assessed, with an additional allowance of 20% added to the 1 in 200 year flood flow. This results in a Q200 + 20% flow of 3.1m<sup>3</sup>/s (1.77 x 1.2) + ((0.98 x 1.2) – 0.2).

The flood levels predicted by the hydraulic model for the climate change analysis are outlined in the table below.

| Location      | Level (m)        |                        | Variation in level (m) |
|---------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|               | Q200 Flood Level | Q200 + 20% Flood Level |                        |
| Section 1     | 9.51             | 9.71                   | 0.2                    |
| Section 2     | 9.55             | 9.75                   | 0.2                    |
| Section 3     | 9.59             | 9.77                   | 0.18                   |
| Section 4     | 9.6              | 9.77                   | 0.17                   |
| Section 4.9   | 9.54             | 9.7                    | 0.16                   |
| Section 5     | 9.55             | 9.71                   | 0.16                   |
| Section 5.5D  | 9.51             | 9.64                   | 0.13                   |
| Section 5.5 U | 9.61             | 9.79                   | 0.18                   |
| Section 6     | 9.7              | 10.01                  | 0.31                   |
| Section 7     | 9.79             | 10.01                  | 0.22                   |
| Section 8     | 9.79             | 10.01                  | 0.22                   |

Table 5.7 Comparison between predicted Q200 and Q200 + 20% Flood Levels

The above table shows that flood levels would increase by approximately 0.3m immediately upstream of the road during a Q200 + 20% flood event. Floodwater would likely flow over the road adjacent to the south eastern end of the site during this event.

Existing ground levels could not be surveyed within the field adjacent to the site, however from ground levels surveyed along the south eastern boundary of the site, and along a track approximately 260m south east along the south eastern field boundary, it is indicated that floodwater which flows over the road at the south eastern corner of the site would then flow over land in a southerly direction.

## **6.0 Proposed Mitigation and Management of Flood Risk**

The results of the flow modelling exercise discussed in Section 5 are summarised in drawing 14233/21/001. The results indicate that the banks of the watercourse would be overtopped at upstream of the road adjacent to the site, while the right bank would be overtopped adjacent to the site. The site however is predicted to be flood free during a 1 in 200 year flood event. The site is therefore developable with respect to flood risk.

In the design of the scheme, the potential for culvert blockage and an increase in flows due to climate change needs to be taken into account. Both of these scenarios could result in flood water rising high enough to flow over the road at the south eastern end of the site. It is therefore recommended that the access road into the site be set at a minimum level of 10.1m (this includes the length of existing access). In addition ground levels around the houses should be raised to a minimum level of 10.2m for a minimum width of 2m. Finished floor levels for the new houses should be set at, or above a level of 10.61m, providing a 0.6m freeboard above the Q200 + 20% flood level predicted immediately upstream of the road. The proposed mitigation measures are shown on drawing 14233/21/002, enclosed within the "Plans" section of this report.

Providing the access road is set at, or above a level of 10.1m as suggested, flood free access should be maintained during a 1 in 200 year flood event, including climate change.

In order to avoid any increase in flood risk, surface water runoff generated by the site should be dealt with following the principals of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.

## 7.0 Conclusions

It is concluded that the site is outwith the 1 in 200 year flood extent of the Erskine Pow and is therefore developable with respect to flood risk. The predicted 1 in 200 year flood extent is shown on drawing 14233/21/001, enclosed within the "Plans" section of this report.

It is recommended that the access road into the site be set at a minimum level of 10.1m (this includes the length of existing access). In addition ground levels around the houses should be raised to a minimum level of 10.2m for a minimum width of 2m. Finished floor levels for the new houses should be set at, or above a level of 10.61m, providing a 0.6m freeboard above the Q200 + 20% flood level predicted immediately upstream of the road. The proposed mitigation measures are shown on drawing 14233/21/002, enclosed within the "Plans" section of this report.

Providing the access road is set at, or above a level of 10.1m as suggested, flood free access should be maintained during a 1 in 200 year flood event, including climate change.

We have used our best engineering judgement in this Assessment, and our calculations have been carried out using the Flood Estimation Handbook, WINFAP, HEC-RAS and other standard hydrological methods. We note that as with all such Flood Risk Assessments the accuracy of the results is only as good as the data and statistical techniques used.



## **8.0 References**

- i. Flood Estimation Handbook, Duncan Reed, CEH Institute of Hydrology, Wallingford, 1999.
- ii. FEH Web Service, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, 2017
- iii. WINFAP-FEH, Version 3, Wallingford Hydrosolutions and NERC, 2009
- iv. HEC-RAS, Version 5.0.3, September 2016, US Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Centre.
- v. Flood Modeller, CH2M Hill and Others, 2013
- vi. UK Climate Projections for UK Climate Impacts Programme, July 2009.
- vii. Scottish Planning Policy, Scottish Government, Crown Copyright, June 2014



**Appendix A: Results from  
Flood Modeller Flow  
Analysis (FEH Rainfall  
Runoff Method)**

ERSKINE POW

## Q200 Data

FILE=22D6.dat Flood Modeller VER= 4.0.0.156

\*\*\*\*\*  
Flood Modeller  
\*\*\*\*\*

### HYDROLOGICAL DATA

Catchment: Watercourse

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Catchment Characteristics

\*\*\*\*\*

|              |   |         |          |   |        |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|---|--------|
| Easting      | : | 327200  | Northing | : | 728950 |
| Area         | : | 1.640   | km2      |   |        |
| DPLBAR       | : | 1.310   | km       |   |        |
| DPSBAR       | : | 69.100  | m/km     |   |        |
| PROPWET      | : | 0.460   |          |   |        |
| SAAR         | : | 708.000 | mm       |   |        |
| Urban Extent | : | 0.000   |          |   |        |
| c            | : | -0.017  |          |   |        |
| d1           | : | 0.493   |          |   |        |
| d2           | : | 0.418   |          |   |        |
| d3           | : | 0.252   |          |   |        |
| e            | : | 0.253   |          |   |        |
| f            | : | 2.138   |          |   |        |
| SPR          | : | 25.300  | %        |   |        |

\*\*\*\*\*

Summary of estimate using Flood Estimation Handbook rainfall-runoff method

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Estimation of T-year flood

=====

|                                |   |         |           |
|--------------------------------|---|---------|-----------|
| Unit hydrograph time to peak   | : | 2.138   | hours     |
| Instantaneous UH time to peak  | : | 2.088   | hours     |
| Data interval                  | : | 0.100   | hours     |
| Design storm duration          | : | 3.700   | hours     |
| Critical storm duration        | : | 3.652   | hours     |
| Return period for design flood | : | 200.000 | years     |
| requires rain return period    | : | 246.667 | years     |
| ARF                            | : | 0.971   |           |
| Design storm depth             | : | 55.854  | mm        |
| CWI                            | : | 104.960 |           |
| Standard Percentage Runoff     | : | 25.300  | %         |
| Percentage runoff              | : | 23.404  | %         |
| Snowmelt rate                  | : | 0.000   | mm/day    |
| Unit hydrograph peak           | : | 0.169   | (m3/s/mm) |
| Quick response hydrograph peak | : | 1.747   | m3/s      |
| Baseflow                       | : | 0.024   | m3/s      |
| Baseflow adjustment            | : | 0.000   | m3/s      |
| Hydrograph peak                | : | 1.771   | m3/s      |
| Hydrograph adjustment factor   | : | 1.000   |           |

#### Flags

=====

|                        |   |       |
|------------------------|---|-------|
| Unit hydrograph flag   | : | FSRUH |
| Tp flag                | : | FEHTP |
| Event rainfall flag    | : | FEHER |
| Rainfall profile flag  | : | WINRP |
| Percentage Runoff flag | : | FEHPR |
| Baseflow flag          | : | F16BF |
| CWI flag               | : | FSRCW |

\*\*\*\*\*

# Q200 Hydrograph Data

FILE=22D6.dat Flood Modeller VER= 4.0.0.156

\*\*\*\*\*

Flood Modeller

\*\*\*\*\*

Catchment: Watercourse

\*\*\*\*\*

Rainfall Profile - Unit and Flow Hydrograph Using

FEH rainfall-runoff method

\*\*\*\*\*

Hydrograph adjustment factor = 1.000

=====

## TABULAR RESULTS

| time<br>(hours) | areal<br>rainfall<br>(mm) | net<br>rainfall<br>(mm) | unit<br>hydrograph<br>(m3/s/mm) | flow<br>hydrograph<br>(m3/s ) |
|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0.000           | 0.300                     | 0.070                   | 0.000                           | 0.024                         |
| 0.100           | 0.350                     | 0.082                   | 0.008                           | 0.025                         |
| 0.200           | 0.407                     | 0.095                   | 0.016                           | 0.026                         |
| 0.300           | 0.475                     | 0.111                   | 0.024                           | 0.028                         |
| 0.400           | 0.555                     | 0.130                   | 0.032                           | 0.031                         |
| 0.500           | 0.645                     | 0.151                   | 0.039                           | 0.034                         |
| 0.600           | 0.751                     | 0.176                   | 0.047                           | 0.040                         |
| 0.700           | 0.877                     | 0.205                   | 0.055                           | 0.046                         |
| 0.800           | 1.018                     | 0.238                   | 0.063                           | 0.054                         |
| 0.900           | 1.182                     | 0.277                   | 0.071                           | 0.064                         |
| 1.000           | 1.378                     | 0.323                   | 0.079                           | 0.076                         |
| 1.100           | 1.598                     | 0.374                   | 0.087                           | 0.091                         |
| 1.200           | 1.849                     | 0.433                   | 0.095                           | 0.108                         |
| 1.300           | 2.145                     | 0.502                   | 0.103                           | 0.129                         |
| 1.400           | 2.482                     | 0.581                   | 0.111                           | 0.154                         |
| 1.500           | 2.857                     | 0.669                   | 0.118                           | 0.184                         |
| 1.600           | 3.279                     | 0.768                   | 0.126                           | 0.219                         |
| 1.700           | 3.756                     | 0.879                   | 0.134                           | 0.260                         |
| 1.800           | 4.045                     | 0.947                   | 0.142                           | 0.308                         |
| 1.900           | 3.756                     | 0.879                   | 0.150                           | 0.363                         |
| 2.000           | 3.279                     | 0.768                   | 0.158                           | 0.425                         |
| 2.100           | 2.857                     | 0.669                   | 0.166                           | 0.493                         |
| 2.200           | 2.482                     | 0.581                   | 0.166                           | 0.567                         |
| 2.300           | 2.145                     | 0.502                   | 0.160                           | 0.643                         |
| 2.400           | 1.849                     | 0.433                   | 0.155                           | 0.723                         |
| 2.500           | 1.598                     | 0.374                   | 0.150                           | 0.804                         |
| 2.600           | 1.378                     | 0.323                   | 0.145                           | 0.887                         |
| 2.700           | 1.182                     | 0.277                   | 0.140                           | 0.970                         |
| 2.800           | 1.018                     | 0.238                   | 0.134                           | 1.054                         |
| 2.900           | 0.877                     | 0.205                   | 0.129                           | 1.136                         |
| 3.000           | 0.751                     | 0.176                   | 0.124                           | 1.218                         |
| 3.100           | 0.645                     | 0.151                   | 0.119                           | 1.297                         |
| 3.200           | 0.555                     | 0.130                   | 0.114                           | 1.374                         |
| 3.300           | 0.475                     | 0.111                   | 0.108                           | 1.447                         |
| 3.400           | 0.407                     | 0.095                   | 0.103                           | 1.515                         |
| 3.500           | 0.350                     | 0.082                   | 0.098                           | 1.578                         |
| 3.600           | 0.300                     | 0.070                   | 0.093                           | 1.635                         |
| 3.700           |                           |                         | 0.088                           | 1.684                         |
| 3.800           |                           |                         | 0.082                           | 1.723                         |
| 3.900           |                           |                         | 0.077                           | 1.751                         |
| 4.000           |                           |                         | 0.072                           | 1.767                         |
| 4.100           |                           |                         | 0.067                           | 1.771                         |
| 4.200           |                           |                         | 0.062                           | 1.765                         |
| 4.300           |                           |                         | 0.056                           | 1.750                         |
| 4.400           |                           |                         | 0.051                           | 1.726                         |
| 4.500           |                           |                         | 0.046                           | 1.696                         |
| 4.600           |                           |                         | 0.041                           | 1.659                         |
| 4.700           |                           |                         | 0.036                           | 1.617                         |
| 4.800           |                           |                         | 0.031                           | 1.571                         |
| 4.900           |                           |                         | 0.025                           | 1.521                         |

# Q200 Hydrograph Data


|       |       |       |
|-------|-------|-------|
| 5.000 | 0.020 | 1.468 |
| 5.100 | 0.015 | 1.412 |
| 5.200 | 0.010 | 1.353 |
| 5.300 | 0.005 | 1.292 |
| 5.400 | 0.000 | 1.230 |
| 5.500 |       | 1.166 |
| 5.600 |       | 1.102 |
| 5.700 |       | 1.036 |
| 5.800 |       | 0.971 |
| 5.900 |       | 0.905 |
| 6.000 |       | 0.841 |
| 6.100 |       | 0.778 |
| 6.200 |       | 0.715 |
| 6.300 |       | 0.654 |
| 6.400 |       | 0.594 |
| 6.500 |       | 0.536 |
| 6.600 |       | 0.480 |
| 6.700 |       | 0.426 |
| 6.800 |       | 0.375 |
| 6.900 |       | 0.327 |
| 7.000 |       | 0.283 |
| 7.100 |       | 0.243 |
| 7.200 |       | 0.207 |
| 7.300 |       | 0.176 |
| 7.400 |       | 0.149 |
| 7.500 |       | 0.127 |
| 7.600 |       | 0.108 |
| 7.700 |       | 0.092 |
| 7.800 |       | 0.078 |
| 7.900 |       | 0.067 |
| 8.000 |       | 0.057 |
| 8.100 |       | 0.050 |
| 8.200 |       | 0.043 |
| 8.300 |       | 0.038 |
| 8.400 |       | 0.034 |
| 8.500 |       | 0.031 |
| 8.600 |       | 0.028 |
| 8.700 |       | 0.026 |
| 8.800 |       | 0.025 |
| 8.900 |       | 0.024 |
| 9.000 |       | 0.024 |

\*\*\*\*\*

## Volumetric analysis of results

\*\*\*\*\*

|                              |   |         |    |
|------------------------------|---|---------|----|
| Total volume of rainfall     | : | 91600.5 | m3 |
| Total volume of net rainfall | : | 21438.1 | m3 |
| Total volume of rain loss    | : | 70162.4 | m3 |
| Total volume of baseflow     | : | 780.1   | m3 |
| Total volume of quick runoff | : | 21387.6 | m3 |
| Total volume of runoff       | : | 22167.7 | m3 |





UNNAMED WATERCOURSE

## Q200 Data

FILE=DF6C.dat Flood Modeller VER= 4.0.0.156

\*\*\*\*\*  
Flood Modeller  
\*\*\*\*\*

### HYDROLOGICAL DATA

Catchment: Watercourse

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Catchment Characteristics

\*\*\*\*\*

|              |   |         |          |   |        |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|---|--------|
| Easting      | : | 326650  | Northing | : | 729350 |
| Area         | : | 0.476   | km2      |   |        |
| DPLBAR       | : | 0.666   | km       |   |        |
| DPSBAR       | : | 142.900 | m/km     |   |        |
| PROPWET      | : | 0.460   |          |   |        |
| SAAR         | : | 722.000 | mm       |   |        |
| Urban Extent | : | 0.000   |          |   |        |
| c            | : | -0.017  |          |   |        |
| d1           | : | 0.487   |          |   |        |
| d2           | : | 0.417   |          |   |        |
| d3           | : | 0.254   |          |   |        |
| e            | : | 0.252   |          |   |        |
| f            | : | 2.153   |          |   |        |
| SPR          | : | 34.080  | %        |   |        |

\*\*\*\*\*

Summary of estimate using Flood Estimation Handbook rainfall-runoff method

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Estimation of T-year flood

=====

|                                |   |         |           |
|--------------------------------|---|---------|-----------|
| Unit hydrograph time to peak   | : | 1.174   | hours     |
| Instantaneous UH time to peak  | : | 1.124   | hours     |
| Data interval                  | : | 0.100   | hours     |
| Design storm duration          | : | 2.100   | hours     |
| Critical storm duration        | : | 2.021   | hours     |
| Return period for design flood | : | 200.000 | years     |
| requires rain return period    | : | 246.667 | years     |
| ARF                            | : | 0.977   |           |
| Design storm depth             | : | 45.165  | mm        |
| CWI                            | : | 106.640 |           |
| Standard Percentage Runoff     | : | 34.080  | %         |
| Percentage runoff              | : | 30.910  | %         |
| Snowmelt rate                  | : | 0.000   | mm/day    |
| Unit hydrograph peak           | : | 0.089   | (m3/s/mm) |
| Quick response hydrograph peak | : | 0.976   | m3/s      |
| Baseflow                       | : | 0.007   | m3/s      |
| Baseflow adjustment            | : | 0.000   | m3/s      |
| Hydrograph peak                | : | 0.983   | m3/s      |
| Hydrograph adjustment factor   | : | 1.000   |           |

#### Flags

=====

|                        |   |       |
|------------------------|---|-------|
| Unit hydrograph flag   | : | FSRUH |
| Tp flag                | : | FEHTP |
| Event rainfall flag    | : | FEHER |
| Rainfall profile flag  | : | WINRP |
| Percentage Runoff flag | : | FEHPR |
| Baseflow flag          | : | F16BF |
| CWI flag               | : | FSRCW |

\*\*\*\*\*

## Q200 Hydrograph Data

FILE=7A85.dat Flood Modeller VER= 4.0.0.156

\*\*\*\*\*

Flood Modeller

\*\*\*\*\*

Catchment: Watercourse

\*\*\*\*\*

Rainfall Profile - Unit and Flow Hydrograph Using

FEH rainfall-runoff method

\*\*\*\*\*

Hydrograph adjustment factor = 1.000

=====

### TABULAR RESULTS

| time<br>(hours) | areal<br>rainfall<br>(mm) | net<br>rainfall<br>(mm) | unit<br>hydrograph<br>(m3/s/mm) | flow<br>hydrograph<br>(m3/s ) |
|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0.000           | 0.454                     | 0.140                   | 0.000                           | 0.007                         |
| 0.100           | 0.595                     | 0.184                   | 0.008                           | 0.009                         |
| 0.200           | 0.779                     | 0.241                   | 0.015                           | 0.011                         |
| 0.300           | 1.019                     | 0.315                   | 0.023                           | 0.015                         |
| 0.400           | 1.334                     | 0.412                   | 0.030                           | 0.022                         |
| 0.500           | 1.741                     | 0.538                   | 0.038                           | 0.032                         |
| 0.600           | 2.263                     | 0.700                   | 0.046                           | 0.046                         |
| 0.700           | 2.933                     | 0.907                   | 0.053                           | 0.065                         |
| 0.800           | 3.787                     | 1.171                   | 0.061                           | 0.091                         |
| 0.900           | 4.838                     | 1.495                   | 0.068                           | 0.126                         |
| 1.000           | 5.677                     | 1.755                   | 0.076                           | 0.172                         |
| 1.100           | 4.838                     | 1.495                   | 0.084                           | 0.232                         |
| 1.200           | 3.787                     | 1.171                   | 0.088                           | 0.303                         |
| 1.300           | 2.933                     | 0.907                   | 0.083                           | 0.380                         |
| 1.400           | 2.263                     | 0.700                   | 0.078                           | 0.463                         |
| 1.500           | 1.741                     | 0.538                   | 0.073                           | 0.547                         |
| 1.600           | 1.334                     | 0.412                   | 0.068                           | 0.630                         |
| 1.700           | 1.019                     | 0.315                   | 0.063                           | 0.712                         |
| 1.800           | 0.779                     | 0.241                   | 0.058                           | 0.788                         |
| 1.900           | 0.595                     | 0.184                   | 0.053                           | 0.857                         |
| 2.000           | 0.454                     | 0.140                   | 0.048                           | 0.915                         |
| 2.100           |                           |                         | 0.043                           | 0.958                         |
| 2.200           |                           |                         | 0.038                           | 0.981                         |
| 2.300           |                           |                         | 0.033                           | 0.983                         |
| 2.400           |                           |                         | 0.028                           | 0.968                         |
| 2.500           |                           |                         | 0.023                           | 0.938                         |
| 2.600           |                           |                         | 0.018                           | 0.898                         |
| 2.700           |                           |                         | 0.013                           | 0.849                         |
| 2.800           |                           |                         | 0.008                           | 0.795                         |
| 2.900           |                           |                         | 0.003                           | 0.735                         |
| 3.000           |                           |                         | 0.000                           | 0.672                         |
| 3.100           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.606                         |
| 3.200           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.540                         |
| 3.300           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.474                         |
| 3.400           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.409                         |
| 3.500           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.347                         |
| 3.600           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.288                         |
| 3.700           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.232                         |
| 3.800           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.182                         |
| 3.900           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.139                         |
| 4.000           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.103                         |
| 4.100           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.076                         |
| 4.200           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.055                         |
| 4.300           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.040                         |
| 4.400           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.029                         |
| 4.500           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.021                         |
| 4.600           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.015                         |
| 4.700           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.011                         |
| 4.800           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.009                         |
| 4.900           |                           |                         |                                 | 0.008                         |


|       |                      |       |
|-------|----------------------|-------|
| 5.000 | Q200 Hydrograph Data | 0.007 |
|-------|----------------------|-------|

\*\*\*\*\*

volumetric analysis of results

\*\*\*\*\*

|                              |   |         |    |
|------------------------------|---|---------|----|
| Total volume of rainfall     | : | 21498.4 | m3 |
| Total volume of net rainfall | : | 6645.2  | m3 |
| Total volume of rain loss    | : | 14853.2 | m3 |
| Total volume of baseflow     | : | 134.1   | m3 |
| Total volume of quick runoff | : | 6628.3  | m3 |
| Total volume of runoff       | : | 6762.4  | m3 |



**Appendix B: Results from  
ReFH2 Flow Analysis  
(Revitalised Flood  
Hydrograph Method –  
Version 2)**

ERSKINE POW

# UK Design Flood Estimation

Generated on Friday, August 25, 2017 3:35:48 PM by abraiaid  
Printed from the ReFH Flood Modelling software package, version 2.2.5989.21032

## Summary of estimate using the Flood Estimation Handbook revitalised flood hydrograph method (ReFH)

### Site details

Checksum: C2E7-5169

Site name: FEH\_Catchment\_Descriptors\_327200\_728950

Easting: 327200

Northing: 728950

Country: Scotland

Catchment Area (km<sup>2</sup>): 1.64 [0.87]\*

Using plot scale calculations: No

Site description: None

## Model run: 200 year

### Summary of results

|                           |       |                                |       |
|---------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|
| Rainfall - FEH 2013 (mm): | 58.70 | Total runoff (ML):             | 9.98  |
| Total Rainfall (mm):      | 37.43 | Total flow (ML):               | 23.05 |
| Peak Rainfall (mm):       | 4.64  | Peak flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s): | 0.79  |

### Parameters

*Where the user has overridden a system-generated value, this original value is shown in square brackets after the value used.*

*\* Indicates that the user locked the duration/timestep*

#### Rainfall parameters (Rainfall - FEH 2013 model)

| Name                             | Value               | User-defined? |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Duration (hh:mm:ss)              | 03:30:00            | No            |
| Timestep (hh:mm:ss)              | 00:10:00 [00:30:00] | Yes           |
| SCF (Seasonal correction factor) | 0.66                | No            |
| ARF (Areal reduction factor)     | 0.97                | No            |
| Seasonality                      | Winter              | n/a           |

#### Loss model parameters

| Name                        | Value  | User-defined? |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------------|
| Cini (mm)                   | 80.16  | No            |
| Cmax (mm)                   | 608.36 | No            |
| Use alpha correction factor | No     | No            |
| Alpha correction factor     | n/a    | No            |

#### Routing model parameters



| Name    | Value | User-defined? |
|---------|-------|---------------|
| Tp (hr) | 2     | No            |
| Up      | 0.65  | No            |
| Uk      | 0.8   | No            |

#### Baseflow model parameters

| Name                    | Value | User-defined? |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|
| BF0 (m <sup>3</sup> /s) | 0.01  | No            |
| BL (hr)                 | 25.14 | No            |
| BR                      | 1.31  | No            |

#### Urbanisation parameters

| Name                               | Value | User-defined? |
|------------------------------------|-------|---------------|
| Urban area (km <sup>2</sup> )      | 0     | No            |
| Urbext 2000                        | 0     | No            |
| Impervious runoff factor           | 0.7   | No            |
| Imperviousness factor              | 0.3   | No            |
| Tp scaling factor                  | 0.5   | No            |
| Sewered area (km <sup>2</sup> )    | 0.00  | Yes           |
| Sewer capacity (m <sup>3</sup> /s) | 0.00  | Yes           |

## UNNAMED WATERCOURSE

# UK Design Flood Estimation

Generated on Monday, August 28, 2017 1:23:28 PM by abraid  
Printed from the ReFH Flood Modelling software package, version 2.2.5989.21032

## Summary of estimate using the Flood Estimation Handbook revitalised flood hydrograph method (ReFH)

### Site details

Checksum: 4C80-5858

Site name: Watercourse between Ballindean Farm and Ballindean House

Easting: 326650

Northing: 729350

Country: Scotland

Catchment Area (km<sup>2</sup>): 0.48 [0.74]\*

Using plot scale calculations: No

Site description: None

## Model run: 200 year

### Summary of results

|                           |       |                                |      |
|---------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|------|
| Rainfall - FEH 2013 (mm): | 53.32 | Total runoff (ML):             | 4.30 |
| Total Rainfall (mm):      | 33.03 | Total flow (ML):               | 8.86 |
| Peak Rainfall (mm):       | 3.21  | Peak flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s): | 0.54 |

### Parameters

*Where the user has overridden a system-generated value, this original value is shown in square brackets after the value used.*

*\* Indicates that the user locked the duration/timestep*

#### Rainfall parameters (Rainfall - FEH 2013 model)

| Name                             | Value               | User-defined? |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Duration (hh:mm:ss)              | 02:15:00            | No            |
| Timestep (hh:mm:ss)              | 00:05:00 [00:15:00] | Yes           |
| SCF (Seasonal correction factor) | 0.63                | No            |
| ARF (Areal reduction factor)     | 0.98                | No            |
| Seasonality                      | Winter              | n/a           |

#### Loss model parameters

| Name                        | Value  | User-defined? |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------------|
| Cini (mm)                   | 107.93 | No            |
| Cmax (mm)                   | 455.17 | No            |
| Use alpha correction factor | No     | No            |
| Alpha correction factor     | n/a    | No            |

#### Routing model parameters

| Name    | Value | User-defined? |
|---------|-------|---------------|
| Tp (hr) | 1.2   | No            |
| Up      | 0.65  | No            |
| Uk      | 0.8   | No            |

#### Baseflow model parameters

| Name                    | Value | User-defined? |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|
| BF0 (m <sup>3</sup> /s) | 0.01  | No            |
| BL (hr)                 | 21.34 | No            |
| BR                      | 1.06  | No            |

#### Urbanisation parameters

| Name                               | Value | User-defined? |
|------------------------------------|-------|---------------|
| Urban area (km <sup>2</sup> )      | 0     | No            |
| Urbext 2000                        | 0     | No            |
| Impervious runoff factor           | 0.7   | No            |
| Imperviousness factor              | 0.3   | No            |
| Tp scaling factor                  | 0.5   | No            |
| Sewered area (km <sup>2</sup> )    | 0.00  | Yes           |
| Sewer capacity (m <sup>3</sup> /s) | 0.00  | Yes           |

**Appendix C: Results from  
WINFAP Flow Analysis  
(FEH Statistical Method)**

ERSKINE POW

Fittings for FFC

---

Standardised by median

---

---

Return periods

|     | GL    |
|-----|-------|
| 2   | 0.186 |
| 5   | 0.251 |
| 10  | 0.301 |
| 25  | 0.376 |
| 50  | 0.442 |
| 100 | 0.520 |
| 200 | 0.612 |
| 500 | 0.759 |

## UNNAMED WATERCOURSE



Fittings for FFC

---

Standardised by median

---


---

Return periods

|     | GL    |
|-----|-------|
| 2   | 0.138 |
| 5   | 0.187 |
| 10  | 0.224 |
| 25  | 0.280 |
| 50  | 0.329 |
| 100 | 0.387 |
| 200 | 0.454 |
| 500 | 0.562 |

## **Appendix D: Output from HECRAS Model**


ERSKINE POW




Some schematic data outside default extents (see View/Set Schematic Plot Extents...)

HEC-RAS Plan: Plan 18 River: Watercourse Reach: 1 Profile: Q200 with add. f


| Reach | River Sta | Profile          | Q Total<br>(m3/s) | Min Ch El<br>(m) | W.S. Elev<br>(m) | Crit W.S.<br>(m) | E.G. Elev<br>(m) | E.G. Slope<br>(m/m) | Vel Chnl<br>(m/s) | Flow Area<br>(m2) | Top Width<br>(m) | Froude # Chl |
|-------|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 1     | 8         | Q200 with add. f | 2.55              | 8.11             | 9.79             |                  | 9.79             | 0.000197            | 0.29              | 11.87             | 39.73            | 0.09         |
| 1     | 7         | Q200 with add. f | 2.55              | 8.04             | 9.79             |                  | 9.79             | 0.000038            | 0.15              | 48.65             | 299.12           | 0.04         |
| 1     | 6         | Q200 with add. f | 2.55              | 8.48             | 9.70             | 9.10             | 9.77             | 0.003972            | 1.18              | 2.16              | 34.58            | 0.36         |
| 1     | 5.5       |                  | Bridge            |                  |                  |                  |                  |                     |                   |                   |                  |              |
| 1     | 5         | Q200 with add. f | 2.55              | 8.36             | 9.55             |                  | 9.65             | 0.006571            | 1.40              | 1.82              | 1.54             | 0.41         |
| 1     | 4.9       | Q200 with add. f | 2.55              | 8.36             | 9.54             |                  | 9.64             | 0.006677            | 1.41              | 1.81              | 1.54             | 0.41         |
| 1     | 4         | Q200 with add. f | 2.55              | 7.93             | 9.60             |                  | 9.60             | 0.000095            | 0.23              | 12.13             | 42.19            | 0.07         |
| 1     | 3         | Q200 with add. f | 2.55              | 7.97             | 9.59             |                  | 9.59             | 0.000176            | 0.24              | 21.69             | 144.78           | 0.07         |
| 1     | 2         | Q200 with add. f | 2.55              | 7.91             | 9.55             |                  | 9.57             | 0.000913            | 0.60              | 4.22              | 4.26             | 0.19         |
| 1     | 1         | Q200 with add. f | 2.55              | 7.92             | 9.51             | 8.53             | 9.53             | 0.000571            | 0.55              | 4.62              | 4.29             | 0.17         |

















## UNNAMED WATERCOURSE




HEC-RAS Plan: Plan 02 River: Watercourse Reach: 1 Profile: 0.2m3/s

| Reach | River Sta | Profile | Q Total<br>(m3/s) | Min Ch El<br>(m) | W.S. Elev<br>(m) | Crit W.S.<br>(m) | E.G. Elev<br>(m) | E.G. Slope<br>(m/m) | Vel Chnl<br>(m/s) | Flow Area<br>(m2) | Top Width<br>(m) | Froude # Chl |
|-------|-----------|---------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 1     | 4         | 0.2m3/s | 0.20              | 9.93             | 10.55            | 10.22            | 10.56            | 0.001046            | 0.39              | 0.52              | 1.35             | 0.20         |
| 1     | 3         | 0.2m3/s | 0.20              | 9.88             | 10.54            | 10.17            | 10.55            | 0.000787            | 0.35              | 0.57              | 1.39             | 0.17         |
| 1     | 2.5       |         | Culvert           |                  |                  |                  |                  |                     |                   |                   |                  |              |
| 1     | 2         | 0.2m3/s | 0.20              | 9.83             | 10.26            | 10.12            | 10.29            | 0.005003            | 0.70              | 0.29              | 1.06             | 0.43         |
| 1     | 1         | 0.2m3/s | 0.20              | 9.78             | 10.21            | 10.07            | 10.24            | 0.005006            | 0.70              | 0.29              | 1.06             | 0.43         |










## PLANS







Dundee | Perth | Aberdeen

Registered in Scotland No. SC220557

Registered Office: Seabraes, 18 Greenmarket, Dundee DD1 4OB

TA Millard Scotland Ltd trading as Millard Consulting

**TCP/11/16(547) – 17/00840/IPL – Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) on land 70 metres south east of New Mains Farmhouse, Inchture**

**PLANNING DECISION NOTICE** *(included in applicant's submission, see pages 455-456)*

**REPORT OF HANDLING** *(included in applicant's submission, see pages 457-459)*

**REFERENCE DOCUMENTS** *(included in applicant's submission, see pages 469-480 and 485-552)*



**TCP/11/16(547) – 17/00840/IPL – Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) on land 70 metres south east of New Mains Farmhouse, Inchtute**

## **REPRESENTATIONS**





**From:**Kirsteen MacDonald  
**Sent:**22 May 2017 12:02:15 +0100  
**To:**Development Management - Generic Email Account  
**Cc:**Anne Phillips  
**Subject:**17/00840/IPL - Erection of a Dwellinghouse, SE New Mains Farmhouse, Inchtute

**NO OBJECTION - HIAL**

**Your Ref: 17/00840/IPL**

Dear Sir/Madam

**PROPOSAL Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle)**

**LOCATION Land 70m South East of New Mains, Farmhouse Inchtute for Mr James Hamilton**

With reference to the above proposed development, it is confirmed that our calculations show that, at the given position and height, this development would not infringe the safeguarding surfaces for **Dundee Airport**.

Therefore, Highlands and Islands Airports Limited would have no objections to the proposal.

Kind regards

Kirsteen

**Safeguarding Team**

**on behalf of Dundee Airport Limited**

**c/o Highlands and Islands Airports Limited**  
Head Office, Inverness Airport, Inverness IV2 7JB  
☎ 01667 464244 (DIRECT DIAL)  
✉ [safeguarding@hial.co.uk](mailto:safeguarding@hial.co.uk) 🌐 [www.hial.co.uk](http://www.hial.co.uk)

---

This email has been scanned for email related threats and delivered safely by Mimecast.  
For more information please visit <http://www.mimecast.com>

---

## Comments to the Development Quality Manager on a Planning Application

|  |   |                             |   |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Planning Application ref.</b>         | 17/00840/IPL  | <b>Comments provided by</b> | Euan McLaughlin   |
| <b>Service/Section</b>                   | Strategy & Policy   | <b>Contact Details</b>      | <b>Development Negotiations Officer:</b><br>Euan McLaughlin<br>[REDACTED] |
| <b>Description of Proposal</b>           | Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle)  |                             |   |
| <b>Address of site</b>                   | Land 70 Metres South East Of New Mains Farmhouse, Inchture  |                             |   |
| <b>Comments on the proposal</b>          | <p><b>Primary Education</b></p> <p>With reference to the above planning application the Council Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance requires a financial contribution towards increased primary school capacity in areas where a primary school capacity constraint has been identified. A capacity constraint is defined as where a primary school is operating, or likely to be operating following completion of the proposed development and extant planning permissions, at or above 80% of total capacity.</p> <p>This proposal is within the catchment of Inchture Primary School.</p> <p><b>Transport Infrastructure</b></p> <p>With reference to the above planning application the Council Transport Infrastructure Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance requires a financial contribution towards the cost of delivering the transport infrastructure improvements which are required for the release of all development sites in and around Perth.</p> <p>The application falls within the identified Transport Infrastructure Supplementary Guidance boundary and a condition to reflect this should be attached to any planning application granted.</p> |                             |   |
| <b>Recommended planning condition(s)</b> | <p><b>Primary Education</b></p> <p><b>CO01</b> The development shall be in accordance with the requirements of Perth &amp; Kinross Council's Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance 2016 in line with Policy PM3: Infrastructure Contributions of the Perth &amp; Kinross Local Development Plan 2014 with particular regard to primary education infrastructure, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Council as Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>RCO00</b> Reason – To ensure the development is in accordance with the terms of the Perth and Kinross Council Local Development Plan 2014 and to comply with the Council's policy on Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance 2016.</p>  |                             |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><b>Transport Infrastructure</b></p> <p><b>CO00</b> The development shall be in accordance with the requirements of Perth &amp; Kinross Council's Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance 2016 in line with Policy PM3: Infrastructure Contributions of the Perth &amp; Kinross Local Development Plan 2014 with particular regard to transport infrastructure, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Council as Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>RCO00</b> Reason – To ensure the development is in accordance with the terms of the Perth and Kinross Council Local Development Plan 2014 and to comply with the Council's policy on Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance 2016.</p> |
| <b>Recommended informative(s) for applicant</b> | N/A   |
| <b>Date comments returned</b>                   | 24 May 2017   |

## Comments to the Development Quality Manager on a Planning Application

|   |   |                             |                                    |
|---|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Planning Application ref.</b>                | 17/00840/IPL  | <b>Comments provided by</b> | Gavin Bissett                      |
| <b>Service/Section</b>                          | TES/Flooding  | <b>Contact Details</b>      | ██████████<br>████████████████████ |
| <b>Description of Proposal</b>                  | Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) – Plot 3   |                             |                                    |
| <b>Address of site</b>                          | Land 70 Metres South East Of New Mains Farmhouse Inchtute   |                             |                                    |
| <b>Comments on the proposal</b>                 | <p>The proposed site as a whole (containing all 4 development plots) is shown to be partially flooded during the 1 in 200 year flood event, as per the SEPA Flood Hazard map. As such we would request that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken to identify the flood risk to the site, and the developable areas (i.e. those out with the 1 in 200 year flood plain). Please refer to the Flooding and Flood Risk Guidance document for what is required as part of the detailed FRA. We would object to plots 1 and 2 (separate applications) until this information is received.</p> <p>Regarding the plot covered by this application (Plot 3), this appears to be situated out with the 1 in 200 year flood envelope according to the flood maps. These are however indicative and the detailed FRA required for the 'at risk' plots will confirm whether or not this plot is acceptable, in terms of flood risk.</p> <p>If the site is shown to be suitable, we would require the details of the surface water drainage proposals to be provided alongside the full planning application.</p> |                             |                                    |
| <b>Recommended planning condition(s)</b>        |   |                             |                                    |
| <b>Recommended informative(s) for applicant</b> | PKC Flooding and Flood Risk Guidance Document (June 2014)   |                             |                                    |
| <b>Date comments returned</b>                   | 24/05/17  |                             |                                    |



30<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Perth & Kinross Council  
5 Whitefriars Crescent  
Perth  
PH2 0PA



Development Operations  
The Bridge  
Buchanan Gate Business Park  
Cumbernauld Road  
Stepps  
Glasgow  
G33 6FB

Development Operations  
Freephone Number - 0800 3890379  
E-Mail - DevelopmentOperations@scottishwater.co.uk  
www.scottishwater.co.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

**SITE: PH14 Perth Inchtute New Mains Farmhouse**  
**PLANNING REF: 17/00840/IPL**  
**OUR REF: 745552**  
**PROPOSAL: Erection of a dwelling house (in principle)**

**Please quote our reference in all future correspondence**

Scottish Water has no objection to this planning application; however, the applicant should be aware that this does not confirm that the proposed development can currently be serviced and would advise the following:

- There is currently sufficient capacity in the Clatto Water Treatment Works to service your development. Please note further investigations may be carried out once formal application submitted.
- There is currently sufficient capacity in the Hatton PFI Waste Water Treatment works to service your development. Please note further investigations may be carried out once formal application submitted.
- However, please note that according to our records the nearest public Scottish Water, waste water infrastructure is approximately over 550m to the east of this proposed development therefore we would recommend the applicant investigate other private treatment options.

**The applicant should be aware that we are unable to reserve capacity at our water and/or waste water treatment works for their proposed development. Once a formal connection application is submitted to Scottish Water after full planning permission has been granted, we will review the availability of capacity at that time and advise the applicant accordingly.**

## **Surface Water**

For reasons of sustainability and to protect our customers from potential future sewer flooding, Scottish Water will not normally accept any surface water connections into our combined sewer system.

There may be limited exceptional circumstances where we would allow such a connection for brownfield sites only, however this will require significant justification from the customer taking account of various factors including legal, physical, and technical challenges.

In order to avoid costs and delays where a surface water discharge to our combined sewer system is anticipated, the developer should contact Scottish Water at the earliest opportunity with strong evidence to support the intended drainage plan prior to making a connection request. We will assess this evidence in a robust manner and provide a decision that reflects the best option from environmental and customer perspectives.

## **General notes:**

- **Scottish Water asset plans can be obtained from our appointed asset plan provider:**

**Site Investigation Services (UK) Ltd**

**Tel: 0333 123 1223**

**Email: [plans@siteinvest.co.uk](mailto:plans@siteinvest.co.uk)**

**[www.sisplan.co.uk](http://www.sisplan.co.uk)**

- Scottish Water's current minimum level of service for water pressure is 1.0 bar or 10m head at the customer's boundary internal outlet. Any property which cannot be adequately serviced from the available pressure may require private pumping arrangements to be installed, subject to compliance with Water Byelaws. If the developer wishes to enquire about Scottish Water's procedure for checking the water pressure in the area then they should write to the Customer Connections department at the above address.
- If the connection to the public sewer and/or water main requires to be laid through land out-with public ownership, the developer must provide evidence of formal approval from the affected landowner(s) by way of a deed of servitude.
- Scottish Water may only vest new water or waste water infrastructure which is to be laid through land out with public ownership where a Deed of Servitude has been obtained in our favour by the developer.
- The developer should also be aware that Scottish Water requires land title to the area of land where a pumping station and/or SUDS proposed to vest in Scottish Water is constructed.



### **Next Steps:**

- **Single Property/Less than 10 dwellings**

For developments of less than 10 domestic dwellings (or non-domestic equivalent) we will require a formal technical application to be submitted directly to Scottish Water or via the chosen Licensed Provider if non domestic, once full planning permission has been granted. Please note in some instances we will require a Pre-Development Enquiry Form to be submitted (for example rural location which are deemed to have a significant impact on our infrastructure) however we will make you aware of this if required.

- **10 or more domestic dwellings:**

For developments of 10 or more domestic dwellings (or non-domestic equivalent) we require a Pre-Development Enquiry (PDE) Form to be submitted directly to Scottish Water. This will allow us to fully appraise the proposals.

Where it is confirmed through the PDE process that mitigation works are necessary to support a development, the cost of these works is to be met by the developer, which Scottish Water can contribute towards through Reasonable Cost Contribution regulations.

The applicant can download a copy of our PDE Application Form, and other useful guides, from Scottish Water's website using the following link.  
[www.scottishwater.co.uk/business/connections/connecting-your-property/new-development-process-and-applications-forms/pre-development-application](http://www.scottishwater.co.uk/business/connections/connecting-your-property/new-development-process-and-applications-forms/pre-development-application)

- **Non Domestic/Commercial Property:**

Since the introduction of the Water Services (Scotland) Act 2005 in April 2008 the water industry in Scotland has opened up to market competition for non-domestic customers. Non-domestic Household customers now require a Licensed Provider to act on their behalf for new water and waste water connections. Further details can be obtained at [www.scotlandontap.gov.uk](http://www.scotlandontap.gov.uk)

- **Trade Effluent Discharge from Non Dom Property:**

Certain discharges from non-domestic premises may constitute a trade effluent in terms of the Sewerage (Scotland) Act 1968. Trade effluent arises from activities including; manufacturing, production and engineering; vehicle, plant and equipment washing, waste and leachate management. It covers both large and small premises, including activities such as car washing and launderettes. Activities not covered include hotels, caravan sites or restaurants.

If you are in any doubt as to whether or not the discharge from your premises is likely to be considered to be trade effluent, please contact us on 0800 778 0778 or email [TEQ@scottishwater.co.uk](mailto:TEQ@scottishwater.co.uk) using the subject "Is this Trade Effluent?". Discharges that are deemed to be trade effluent need to apply separately for permission to discharge to the sewerage system. The forms and application guidance notes can be found using the following link <https://www.scottishwater.co.uk/business/our-services/compliance/trade-effluent/trade-effluent-documents/trade-effluent-notice-form-h>

Trade effluent must never be discharged into surface water drainage systems as these are solely for draining rainfall run off.

For food services establishments, Scottish Water recommends a suitably sized grease trap is fitted within the food preparation areas so the development complies with Standard 3.7 a) of the Building Standards Technical Handbook and for best management and housekeeping practices to be followed which prevent food waste, fat oil and grease from being disposed into sinks and drains.

The Waste (Scotland) Regulations which require all non-rural food businesses, producing more than 50kg of food waste per week, to segregate that waste for separate collection. The regulations also ban the use of food waste disposal units that dispose of food waste to the public sewer. Further information can be found at [www.resourceefficientscotland.com](http://www.resourceefficientscotland.com)

If the applicant requires any further assistance or information, please contact our Development Operations Central Support Team on 0800 389 0379 or at [planningconsultations@scottishwater.co.uk](mailto:planningconsultations@scottishwater.co.uk).


Yours sincerely

**Carole McLaughlin**  
Development Operations Analyst





# The Braes of the Carse Conservation Group



RECEIVED

CUSTOMER SERVICE  
PORT

05 JUN 2017

5th JUNE 2017

RECEIVED

ENTERED IN COMPUTER

- 6 JUN 2017

17/00836/1PL

**Land 70m SE and Land 30m NE of New Mains Farmhouse, Inchtute  
Five Applications 17/00745,00836,00837,00840 and 00841**

The Braes of the Carse Conservation Group (BCCG) was formed in 2009 to try and conserve the unique beauty, character and historical environment of the Braes of the Carse of Gowrie. Our Group's aim is to provide a voice for residents and interest groups in an area north of the Perth - Dundee dual carriageway (A90) approximately between Glendoick in the West and Knapp in the East. We have participated fully in the community involvement process for various strategic planning matters since our formation, in particular in relation to TAYPlan, the Local Development Plan (LDP and LDP2) and, more recently, the Landscape Supplementary Guidance. We wish to object to the above five planning applications for reasons consistent with views we have previously expressed.

We would wish to make it clear that our Group is supportive of development within the Braes of the Carse area and indeed has frequently issued letters of support to planning applications. Indeed if this application had related to the appropriate redevelopment of redundant existing stone farm buildings on the farm into residential units we would in principle support this. However we consider that the proposed five houses do not comply with the Development Plan comprising TAYplan and the Local Development Plan.

TAYPlan is in principle not supportive of the building of this volume of new houses in the Carse of Gowrie. The site is not designated a development site in the adopted Local Development Plan nor was it put forward as a potential development site in LDP2.

It is not within the settlement boundary of Inchtute and requires to be considered in terms of Policy RD3 Housing in the Countryside and its Supplementary Guidance. When previously commenting during and after the preparation of the LDP we have consistently expressed concern that any wavering by PKC in the rigorous enforcement of the policy in the Housing in the Countryside Policy might result in ribbon development and/or the suburbanisation of the countryside with the resultant loss of the distinctive character of the small villages and hamlets and the rural nature of the area. This is exactly the type of application that is of concern to our members.

The applicant's supporting statement indicates that the farm and its buildings comprise a "building group". This relies on the ancillary farm buildings being classed as individual units. We do not consider that a farmhouse and a few ancillary farm buildings should be classed as a "building



group" and if this is the case then all five of the applications would contravene RD3. However, even if it is classed as a building group we consider that the proposed five houses would result in overdevelopment and fail to comply with HCIP policy. If granted there would be six residential units rather than just one as at present, a sixfold increase, and even if the size of the site meant that the individual units had adequate space and landscaping this increase in the number of units would be inappropriate and not reflect the rural setting. As well as an unacceptable increase in the number of units the actual footprint of the building group would be doubled if permission were to be granted for the four units in front of the farmhouse. This would be an inappropriate increase in the size of the building group.

To comply with HCIP the proposal requires to respect the character, layout and building pattern of the building group. The supporting statement suggests that this is the case but we strongly disagree. The existing ancillary buildings are stone built single storey buildings. Four of the proposed houses would not only be one and a half storey but also located immediately in front of the farmhouse and would dominate it and certainly not be subservient to it. In our view any development at this location, other than the development of the existing buildings, would be out of keeping for the location and prejudicial to the existing character of the "building group" if it is indeed classed as such.


The farmhouse, although not a listed building, is a prominent building within the landscape of the Carse and its setting should be preserved. The farmhouse and existing buildings are located in a very open, flat setting, albeit partly screened by mature hedging, and are highly visible when approaching and then exiting on the slip road at the A90 Inchtuthill flyover. New build housing in this location would be out of place and detract from the views across the Carse land towards the Braes.

HCIP specifically states that proposals that contribute to ribbon development will not be supported. We consider that the four houses in front of the farmhouse would constitute ribbon development, be therefore contrary to policy and set a dangerous precedent.

The proposed development would also be contrary to the aims of the Landscape Supplementary Guidance which cover the Braes of the Carse and the flat Carse land to the A90.


For all of these reasons we would ask that all five applications are refused. If, however, it is considered that some development at this site could comply with HCIP we consider that application 17/00745 is less objectionable than the other four applications in that it would not result in ribbon development.

Yours faithfully



Marilyn Webb  
Secretary





8 June 2017

Andrew Baxter  
Development Management  
Perth and Kinross Council  
Pullar House  
35 Kinnoull Street  
PERTH  
PH1 5GD

Dear Mr Baxter,

**Objection to applications 17/00745/IPL, 17/00836/IPL, 17/00837/IPL, 17/00840/IPL and 17/00841/IPL, for erection of dwelling houses at New Mains, Inchture, PH14 9SE.**

I am lodging the present objection to each and all of the above planning applications for the reasons set out below. I discuss these in terms of the complete development proposal for five new dwelling houses as they have been grouped together within the larger site boundary outlined in the plans forming part of the applications.

Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance (HITC SG)

With reference to policy RD3 and associated Housing in the Countryside Guide (HITC) supplementary guidance of November 2012 (the "HITC SG"), the applicant's agent's argument that the four houses in the extended garden ground to the SE of the farmhouse is acceptable in terms of the HITC SG because they are within an existing building group, is not a valid one. The SG refers to proposals for the erection of houses within existing building groups. There is an existing building group which the agent correctly identifies as being built around a courtyard. However, what is proposed here is obviously not within that building group. It is separated from it by a large distance and is in different enclosed area of garden ground, entirely outwith the curtilage of the existing building group. The fact that it would reflect the form of the existing building group, in courtyard form, does have some positive points in design terms but the proposed four new houses cannot be argued to come within the definition of "building group" as set out in the HITC SG.

Neither can the four houses be said to meet the criteria for Infill Sites. It might have been possible to get away with saying they are New Houses in the Countryside proposed to be built in existing garden ground but that is restricted to established garden associated with "country/estate houses" within section 3.1 of the HITC SG, whereas this is not really an established garden and is not an estate/estate house but a former farmhouse. The description of the site within the curtilage of the farmhouse (17/00745/IPL) as a "walled garden", in terms of the HITC SG (Section 3.1), is not very convincing. It is stretching the definition of "walled garden" beyond

that which is implied by the HITC SG. The wall is only 1.5m high whereas the type of walled garden implicitly referred to in the HITC SG is the 3m+ high brick walls traditionally associated with landed estate fruit and vegetable gardens.

None of the proposed houses fit into any of the categories of acceptable new house types in the countryside in terms of the Council's policy RD3. If they had been eco-houses, they may have done, and likewise if there had been any proposal for conversion of the redundant farm steading buildings that could well have met the relevant criteria, but there are no such proposals. It is therefore very difficult to see how any of the new houses can be justified in terms of the requirements set out in the development plan, especially the group of four proposed for the extended garden ground SE of the farmhouse. Moreover, approval of a proposal for new "executive" housing in a small field some distance away from a group of former farm steading buildings, in the absence of any application for conversion of the disused buildings, would set a very undesirable planning precedent and should be strongly discouraged, unless there are sound planning reasons why the redundant buildings are unsuitable for conversion, in which case those reasons should be stated in support of the principle of new housing at the site. It should be pointed out that these applications fail to meet the central objective of the Council's HITC SG, namely "harnessing the potential of the numerous redundant traditional rural buildings which contribute to the character and quality of the countryside".

It is also necessary for any proposal for housing in the countryside not to conflict with any other policy in the development plan. Here again the proposal would fail to comply with a number of policies, which are outlined briefly below.

### Flooding

Part of the development site for the four houses to the SE of New Mains Farmhouse, and possibly part of the walled garden, appears to be on a functional floodplain (i.e. at medium or high risk of flooding, in terms of statutory definition of risk levels). Up to around a quarter of the land could be at medium risk of flooding from Erskine Pow, according to SEPA LIDAR data. While the catchment of the Pow is quite small and the length of the watercourse upstream is relatively short, it is a tributary of an extensive network of inland surface water bodies with very shallow gradient of flow. The Pow has a shallow depth of banks and narrow width, meaning that there is a risk of downstream flood peaks causing water in the Pow near the site to "back up" and potentially flood the site. Climate change will exacerbate that risk in the future. Lack of maintenance of the ditch may also impede flow while outfalls of land drains that are below the level of the water in the Pow would lead to impaired drainage of the land on which the houses are proposed to be built. There is also no discussion of surface water drainage in the application, and a satisfactory SuDS at the site would need to be provided in order for the principle of the proposal to be acceptable. The number of properties that would be affected by any flooding is too low to be of concern to the local flood risk authority. A simple safeguard may be to require detailed flood risk and drainage impact assessment to be satisfactorily conducted with positive results prior to commencement of any development.

### Foul drainage

None of the new houses would be connected to a public sewer. There are no details in the application of any private drainage system. This may be sufficient reason to refuse the applications, because a Standard Condition requiring submission of satisfactory proposals for private drainage would probably result in a proposal for individual septic tanks with soakaways for each of the 5 units, as they are too far away from the Pow for septic tanks to have a outfalls into it. The traditional practice in the Carse of Gowrie, of linking the septic tank overflow into the field drainage system, is also no longer a suitable option, especially given the size and number of the units proposed. Considerable problems of pollution may result and flood risk associated with the Pow and from surface water runoff, may also flood the private drainage system, and potentially cause pollution of the watercourses downstream. The heavy, impervious, clay subsoils of the entire site are also intrinsically unsuitable for satisfactory dispersal of the outflow. To ensure that the risk of pollution reaching sensitive receptors is minimised, the most reliable option would appear to be some form of private treatment plant, serving all five units collectively, with treated water passing into the Pow at an outfall, all to the satisfaction of SEPA as CAR supervisor.

Unfortunately the decision to submit five individual planning applications would appear to present an insurmountable obstacle to the planning authority, which is required to ensure that such collective private provision could be enforced if it were approved. The submission of separate applications for each plot indicates an intention to sell on the plots, making it just about impossible to see how the common infrastructure needed for foul drainage, but also for other common services including the access roads, surface water drainage, domestic water, power and lighting, as well as green space and planting, could be provided.

Consent in principle for the proposed five houses requires a satisfactory flood risk management plan and a sewage treatment plant, because otherwise it would be reinforcing the unwelcome precedent for development management in the Carse of Gowrie that was recently set by approval by the Interim Head of Planning, on 1 June 2017, of a detailed proposal for a new house on land at the demolished Charleston Farm, although contrary to the development plan (17/00569/FLL). Charleston is 3km W of New Mains Farm and is also situated on a functional floodplain.

### Siting and landscape fit

The site, both the walled garden and the extended garden ground, have well-defined boundaries and each has a good landscape fit with walls, mature trees and shrubbery screening the site. This is important because of the low-lying and open nature of the surrounding countryside and the fact that it is visible from the higher land of the Sidlaw Hills Special Landscape Area (not mentioned, unless I am mistaken, within the applications) as well as from the public roads (unfortunately frequently wrongly referenced in the applications; neither are the road improvement works at the A90 shown on the location plans). The low density and relatively low height of the 4 x 1.5 storey units in the extended garden ground is also appropriate.

However, garages or outbuildings, permission in principle for which may have been expected, are missing. It may not be in the interests of visual amenity to have lots of cars and 4x4s parked in the open at these houses, but increasing the built footprint

would also increase surface water runoff, which is not dealt with in the application. Perhaps these issues should be addressed and perhaps a condition placed on any permission, preventing further building within the curtilage of each plot.

Retaining all existing boundary walls, trees and shrubs should be a condition of any permission, and ideally additional planting around the curtilage of the site should be provided. The applications refer to the trees and shrubbery around the periphery of the site as "overgrown" whereas it would be more accurate to state that they are "mature" (as per the supporting statements for the four houses in the extended garden ground, 17/00836, 837, 840 & 841/IPL) and, as well as providing important habitat for wildlife, also provide crucial screening of the proposed development and are essential for achieving the necessary landscape fit and retention of existing visual amenity required by the HITC SG and RD3. A tree impact study (as per supporting statement) should be required as a condition of any permission.

To protect existing visual amenity and to safeguard the designated landscape of Rossie Priory (GDL00331: the "policies", about 700m NE of the site, are deemed to make an outstanding contribution to the surrounding scenery), new houses on the site should have appropriate external finishing and roof materials (slate ideally) that are in character with the existing farmhouse, existing steading buildings and stone walls. The building proposed for the walled garden (17/00745/IPL) is specially sensitive as it would be more visible from the public road and would be in close proximity to the existing buildings. The old red sandstone used in the existing buildings is typical of older buildings in the former area of Rossie Priory estate of which New Mains Farm was formerly a part. The proposed buildings may also be partially visible from Ballindean House (Teen Ranch) and Inchmartine House.

Finally on landscape fit, in light of the deprecation in Scottish Planning Policy 2014 (paras 76 & 81) of suburbanisation of the countryside in areas with high levels of accessibility and car-based commuting, approval of the principle of the proposed development may set an unwelcome precedent for land in the vicinity of the development site. There are at least two other houses very near the site, namely New Mains Farm cottage and Whitecroft (Howard's End, on the plans), which both have extended and enclosed garden ground, although without the same mature trees and shrubbery as at New Mains farm.

#### Prime agricultural land

If converted to its previous agricultural use, until it was enclosed during the 20th century, the land SE of the farmhouse would presumably be Class 3.1 in terms of the Macaulay Land Capability for Agriculture classification, i.e. prime agricultural land. Provided it is adequately drained and, it is very good soil, capable of a wide range of arable farming. Only a small percentage of arable land in Perth and Kinross has such flexibility. It would be a viable and straightforward option to return the garden ground to agricultural use, just by removal of one or more of the field boundaries and line of lower density shrubs. In light of this possibility, and of the importance of prime agricultural land expressed in SPP 2014 (para 80), there would need to be a very good reason why the principle of converting the land permanently to residential use should be approved, apart from the obvious financial difference between Class 3.1 agricultural land currently valued at around £5,500/acre (£13,750/ha) and residential land currently valued at around £300,000/acre (£750,000/ha).



### Developer contributions

I have saved the main objection to the proposed development for the last part of my representation. The supporting statement for each of the 5 applications states:

*"the applicant is agreeable to a condition being applied to the approval of planning permission in principle to ensure that any future application for the matters specified in conditions fully complies with the requirements of Policy PM3 and the SPG".*

It is not surprising that the applicant would agree to such a condition because it would mean that the applicant would not be liable for any contribution toward affordable housing, which only applies to residential developments, including conversions, consisting of 5 or more units, which should include provision of an affordable housing contribution equivalent to 25 per cent of the units proposed. Submitting a separate application for each proposed unit looks like a deliberate attempt to avoid being required to contribute towards affordable housing in terms of LDP Policy RD4: Affordable Housing, as implemented by the Council's September 2016 guidance on Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing (section 7). It is an unacceptable subversion of the aims of the Policy RD4 because it is clear from the submission of the five planning applications at the same time that the complete development proposal is for five new residential units. Moreover, that total may be added to by conversion of the former steading buildings.

Even if the five applications were considered to constitute one development of five units, and therefore in principle be liable for a contribution to meeting affordable housing need, each of the proposed houses has too many bedrooms to be a suitable type of affordable housing. If one of the units was smaller, or comprised 2 flats instead of one house, it may be acceptable. There is also scope within the HITC SG for the affordable housing element to be met by, for example, discounted sale of plots for self-building. Even if the unit in the walled garden is kept as a separate application, the extended garden ground is capable of accommodating more units than the 4, very low density, units currently proposed. It is recognised that this is a windfall site, but there is a very low allocation of housing land within the Perth and Kinross part of the Greater Dundee Housing Market Area and it would not be setting a good precedent for an opportunity for additional affordable housing to be wasted.

For the proposals to be acceptable, a Standard Condition for developer contributions should be also applied to each open market dwelling for primary education and transport infrastructure at the contribution rate per dwelling set out in the Council's September 2016 guidance on Developer Contributions and Affordable Housing.

I hope my comments above, objecting to the proposed applications for permission in principle, will be taken into account in deciding these applications.

Yours sincerely

Peter Symon.

[comments submitted by email]



# Inchture Area Community Council

Serving the parishes of Inchture, Abernyte, Kinnaird and Rait

8<sup>th</sup> June 2017

Dear Sir

**17/00836/IPL | Erection of a dwellinghouse (In principle) | Land 70 Metres South East of New Mains Farmhouse Inchture, and four related applications for dwelling house at the same location – 17/00837, 17/00840, 17/00841 and 17/00845 17/00745**

On behalf of Inchture Area Community Council (IACC) I wish to COMMENT and register the Community Council's OBJECTION to the above planning application.

In accordance with Schedule 5 (Consultation by the Planning Authority) of the Regulation 23 Development Management Procedure (Scotland) Regulations 2008) and the guidance in Planning Advice Note (PAN) 47 Community Councils should ascertain, co-ordinate and express the views of the local community and are advised to limit their attention to proposals which raise issues of genuine community interest. IACC considers that the proposed development raises issues that are relevant to the small villages within our Community Council area. From the comments we have received we believe this application is of genuine community interest, with potential to "affect the amenity" of the area.

IACC has previously written (03.04.2012) in support of the planning guidance provided with TAYPlan and Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan (LDP). The site identified for the five house in this clustered application was not identified in the adopted LDP. It is outwith the settlement boundary of Inchture, and should therefore be considered in terms of Policy RD3 Housing in the Countryside and Supplementary Guidance (HICG 2012). As we previously wrote in 2012, the principles in HICP should be consistently and rigorously applied to protect our residents from inappropriate ribbon development. We object to this proposal because we consider that it constitutes ribbon development contrary to HICP, and, if allowed, could permit similar proposals along the High Carse road (C401).

We also take issue with the developer's supporting statement that New Mains Farmhouse and the farm buildings comprise a building group. "Building groups" do not have an explicit definition in LDP, but it is arguable whether the arrangement at New Mains Farmhouse should be described as individual units. If it fails under HICG criterion (a) - building groups, all five of the above applications should be rejected.

PM1A – Placemaking. This policy requires a development to contribute "positively to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment respecting the character and amenity of the place". Without further details about the structure and layout of the proposed housing we cannot judge this part of the application, but would urge Development Management to consult with IACC at a later stage if the application is approved.

Yours faithfully,

pp. Lynsay McFarlane

Secretary, Inchtute Area Community Council

### Comments to the Development Quality Manager on a Planning Application

|   |  |                             |             |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Planning Application ref.</b>                | 17/00840/IPL   | <b>Comments provided by</b> | Niall Moran |
| <b>Service/Section</b>                          | Transport Planning   | <b>Contact Details</b>      | ██████      |
| <b>Description of Proposal</b>                  | Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle)   |                             |             |
| <b>Address of site</b>                          | Land 70 Metres South East Of New Mains Farmhouse<br>Inchtute   |                             |             |
| <b>Comments on the proposal</b>                 | Insofar as the Roads matters are concerned I do not object to the proposed development provided the condition indicated below is applied.  |                             |             |
| <b>Recommended planning condition(s)</b>        | <p>PP00 The development shall not commence until the following specified matters have been the subject of a formal planning application for the approval of the Council as Planning Authority: the siting, design and external appearance of the development, the hard and soft landscaping of the site, all means of enclosure, means of access to the site, vehicle parking and turning facilities, levels, drainage and waste management provision.</p> <p>RPP00 Reason - This is a Planning Permission in Principle under Section 59 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 as amended by Section 21 of the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006.</p> |                             |             |
| <b>Recommended informative(s) for applicant</b> |  |                             |             |
| <b>Date comments returned</b>                   | 13 June 2016   |                             |             |

