

**SUMMARY SHEETS**

## PLAN & POLICIES

### **Issue 1 A Successful, Sustainable Place**

The Reporter has recommended minor modifications to the introductory paragraphs, vision and key objectives to make specific reference to the natural environment, and arts and cultural facilities.

#### **Housing Land Supply**

The Reporter has recommended a number of modifications to the calculation of the housing land supply. This issue was the subject of a number of Further Information Requests and the Reporter's modifications reflect the figures provided by the Council in response to these requests. None of the modifications present any major issues. It is also relevant to note that Homes for Scotland were largely in agreement with the revised figures provided by the Council in response to the information requests.

Firstly, the Reporter has recommended the use of the 2018 Housing Land Audit rather than the 2016 Audit and extending the time period from 2028 to 2029. These modifications simply update the calculations to use the most up to date information available.

Secondly the Reporter has recommended the use of the upper end of the capacity range identified for each site in the Plan, rather than the mid-point. In light of the modifications recommended by the Reporter to Policy 1D Placemaking which will allow the capacity range on a site to be exceeded, the Reporter concluded that the use of the upper end of the capacity range in the calculation of the housing land supply will provide balance for any sites which are developed at the lower end of the range.

As a result of changing the calculations, shortfalls in supply were identified in the Highland and Strathmore Housing Market Areas. As proposed by the Council in response to the Further Information Requests, in the Highland Area the Reporter has recommended that the shortfall be addressed by the reallocation of 10% of the housing land requirement to the Greater Perth Housing Market Area (similar to that for the Kinross Housing Market Area). For Strathmore the Reporter has also accepted the Council's argument that there are various options available to address the identified shortfall including: the development of windfall sites and the bringing forward of the existing large scale long term sites.

In concluding on this issue the Reporter states "I am satisfied that the Council has potential solutions available to ensure that the TAYplan housing land requirements are met. There is no deficiency in the supply of land to meet the overall housing land

requirement for Perth and Kinross. The only issue is a small shortfall in the Strathearn Housing Market Area (138 homes). I am aware that the housing land requirement for Strathearn already includes 18% flexibility (332 homes) I also consider that Policy 24, as amended, would provide ample options to deal with situations where a 5 year supply of effective housing land is not being maintained. I, therefore, conclude that the proposed plan makes sufficient provision for land to meet the housing supply target in accordance with TAYplan and Scottish Planning Policy”.

The only other modification recommended by the Reporter on this issue is the inclusion of a new table which identifies an indicative split between market and affordable housing. For clarification, this is a presentational issue only and does not make any change to the overall housing land figures. The revised Table 1a would be as follows:

Table 1a – Housing Tenure Split

Housing Market Area	Housing Land Requirement 2016-2029	Indicative Market / Affordable split 2016-2029	
		Indicative Market Housing Land Requirement	Indicative Affordable Housing Land Requirement
Greater Perth	7,239	5,429	1,810
Highland	995	746	249
Kinross	983	738	245
Strathearn	1,846	1,384	462
Strathmore	1,859	1,394	465
Greater Dundee	78	59	19
PKC Total	13,000	9,750	3,250

Regarding the remaining issues relating to the housing land requirement and housing land supply which were the subject of Examination, the Reporter agreed with the Council’s position on the following:

- The housing land requirement and the figures upon which this is based – more up to date information now available will be taken into account in the next Plan;
- The level of development proposed for Scone and Dunning is appropriate;
- There is no justification for a higher generosity figure (over and above the housing supply target) in calculating the housing land requirement;
- There is no justification for removing the 10% reallocation from the Kinross to Greater Perth Housing Market Areas (to minimise the risk of adverse impact on the Loch Leven Catchment Area);

- The adoption of a 10% windfall allowance is appropriate;
- The 'unadjusted' totals from the Housing Land Audit should be used in the calculation of the housing land supply;
- The spatial strategy of the Plan, which directs the majority of growth to the principal settlements, accords with TAYplan and Scottish Planning Policy – it balances supporting rural areas with avoiding the suburbanisation of the countryside and unsustainable development;
- In the Greater Perth Housing Market Area, the allocation of the strategic development sites north and west of Perth is an appropriate approach to take and is in line with TAYplan, furthermore the generous land supply gives additional flexibility;
- In the Highland and Kinross Housing Market Areas, the allocation of more sites would not automatically result in a higher rate of completions, nor is it justified to meet a shortfall in supply;
- In the Strathearn Housing Market Area it is appropriate for limited growth to be directed to non-tiered settlements such as Comrie;
- In the Strathmore Housing Market Area the approach adopted in distributing additional housing land supply (the majority to Blairgowrie and modest additional growth to Alyth) is appropriate;
- The methodology for the calculation of the 5 year effective land supply is appropriate.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

## **Issue 02: Placemaking**

### **Policy 1: Placemaking**

This policy deals with the siting and design of new development. It particularly considers the relationship between new development and the character and amenity of its environs.

The Reporter recommended a modification suggested by Homes for Scotland in respect of the capacity ranges. This suggested that the capacity range for a site should not be fixed but indicative and determined by the design of the site. This moves away from the approach proposed by Council that applications that are submitted with a density above that proposed in the LDP should be refused. The Reporter concluded that the methodology for establishing site capacity was not robust enough, nor could it have been at this stage of the process, to prevent the capacity ranges being challenged.

### **Policy 2: Design Statements**

The Reporter did not recommend any modifications to this policy.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Policy 17 Residential Areas**

The Reporter did not agree to modify the Plan to add additional text in the Policy in relation to the recreational/amenity value of open space as the current policy framework is considered to be acceptable.

The Reporter did not agree to modify the Plan to add additional policy requirements in relation to protecting residential amenity including through proposed buffer zones between zones as the current policy framework is considered to be acceptable and it would be inappropriate to include such buffer zones for a variety of design reasons.

The Reporter did not agree to modify the Plan to add additional policy requirements in relation to protecting assets of community value as it is considered the Plan – as submitted – does as much as it can do and it would not be possible to alter policy in light of Land Reform Act 2003 and existing procedures in respect of this.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 3: Perth Area Transport Issues**

The Reporter recommends:

- various minor amendments in relation to this issue including acknowledging that 'Discussion with Transport Scotland is ongoing, as part of an agreed contribution strategy to establish which sites will be required to make additional contributions to the strategic road network, including at Broxden and/or Inveralmond junctions'
- more specific mention of the scope of the Comprehensive Transport Strategy to include public transport services
- but recommends no substantial changes to the Council's approach

### **Embargo**

The Reporter considers the development embargo on the A85, A93 and A94 corridors to be proportionate and reasonable and should be continued until the CTRL is committed.

### **Policy 4**

The Reporter agrees with the Council that the map should be deleted from Policy 4 to allow consultation on improvements to key routes through guidance

## **CTLR**

The Reporter agrees with the Council that:

- in view of the restrictions set by Policy 41 Green belt, the CTLR proposed junctions should be retained
- the CTLR does not need allocated and the polices are sufficient to guide the design stages
- it is appropriate for the CTLR route and junction points to be shown in LDP2 with opportunity for representations when a planning application is submitted
- capital finance is in place from the Council and Scottish Government to deliver the CTLR

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporters' recommendations have been identified.

## **Issue 4: Infrastructure Contributions**

### **Policy 5: Infrastructure Contributions**

The Reporter agreed in part with the suggested modified wording put forward by the Council to ensure the Policy reflects the content of the Supplementary Guidance. The Reporter made some modifications to the suggested wording which will allow for changes to the current Guidance and the introduction of future changes to the Guidance. The revised wording is helpful to the application of the Guidance. These changes clarify the policy in line with national policy, but do not change its main emphasis. No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

## **Issue 5: Settlement Boundaries**

### **Policy 6: Settlement Boundaries**

The Reporter has recommended a minor modification to reflect the outcome of the HRA Appropriate Assessment as proposed by SNH. This was supported by the Council in their submissions.

The Reporter has also recommended minor modifications to the policy wording to remove any doubt about when sites should be treated as being in the countryside.

The Reporter agreed that it is appropriate to include exceptions within Policy 6 concluding that ‘the proposed exceptions seek to restrict development in the countryside that would otherwise be unsustainable, whilst at the same time promoting rural development in line with the advice in Scottish Planning Policy..., the National Planning Framework and TAYplan.’

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 6 Economic Development**

#### **Policy 7 Employment and Mixed Use Areas & Policy 8 Rural Business & Diversification**

The Reporter recommends various minor amendments to these policies mainly to be consistent with the findings of the HRA, and agrees on key matters such as:

- that clause h of policy 8 Rural Business and diversification is not overly restrictive, and that retail development is inappropriate outwith settlement centres unless it is ancillary to an existing attraction or business to support and protect existing settlements centres.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporters' recommendations have been identified.

#### **Policy 9 – Caravan Sites, Chalets and Timeshare Developments**

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 9 to ensure HRA requirements are covered including specific reference to HRA requirements, changing terminology from ‘adverse impacts’ to ‘adverse effects’, and reference to the Dunkeld-Blairgowrie Lochs SAC.

The Reporter did not agree to modify the Policy to make specific reference to, and add additional supportive policy framework for, existing tourism developments within the Council area.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 7 Retail and Commercial Development**

The Reporter recommends various minor amendments to these policies but there would be no impact on the thrust of these policies.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporters' recommendations have been identified

### **Issue 8 Community Facilities, Sport and Recreation**

The Reporter recommends minor modification to the wording of the following policies.

#### **Policy 14 Open Space Retention and Provision**

In order to better reflect the Scottish Planning Policy, the Reporter recommends adding a reference to 'outdoor sport facilities' in Policy 14A and to 'community growing spaces' in Policy 14B. It has also been suggested to clarify that the policy applies to both within and outside settlement boundaries.

#### **Policy 15 Public Access**

The Reporter did not recommend any modifications to this policy or Policy Map A: Long Distance Routes.

#### **Policy 16: Social and Community Facilities**

The Reporter recommends a minor modification to rename the policy to "Social, Cultural and Community Facilities."

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 9 Housing in the Countryside**

#### **Policy 19 Housing in the Countryside**

The Reporter has recommended a minor modification to remind applicants of the requirement to provide information relating to appropriate assessment.

The Reporter agreed with the Council's approach to restricting the application of the Housing in the Countryside policy within the Green Belt concluding that: 'I am satisfied that Policy 19 is not unduly restrictive with respect to housing proposals within the Green Belt and that it complies with Scottish Planning Policy'.

The Reporter further agreed with the Council that the number of windfall housing completions in an area alone does not necessarily indicate a failure of the policy to control inappropriate housing in the countryside.



No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 10: Residential Development**

#### **Policy 20 Affordable Housing**

No modifications to the Policy are proposed.

#### **Policy 21 Gypsy Travellers**

The Reporter declined to make any modifications to the policy claimed by the respondent to be too broad and open door. The Reporter confirmed the policy as appropriate to address the needs of the community, and considered the policy a minimum to support the need for new sites.

#### **Policy 22 Particular Needs Housing Accommodation**

No modifications are proposed. The Reporter concluded that there is no evidence to justify the inclusion of retirement villages outwith residential areas.

#### **Policy 25 Housing Mix**

The Reporter agreed with the suggested modified wording put forward by the Council allowing the requirement for 10% smaller houses to be reduced or waived where it can be demonstrated that it would render a development economically unviable. It is not considered that this modification raises any specific issues in relation to the policy application. Significantly, the Reporter concluded that the 10% requirement on sites of 20+ houses is not excessive and the inclusion of a definite percentage rather than seeking an "appropriate mix" would avoid the need for a figure to be negotiated for each individual proposal.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 11: Delivery of Development Site**

#### **Policy 23 – Delivery of Development Sites**

The Reporter identified that the proposed Policy was too prescriptive and no evidence had been submitted that it would or would not have a negative impact on site delivery. Modified wording is put in place which sets out that developers should have consideration

for 'Self-Build' rather than being required to demonstrate this. While not a significant issue it is considered it waters down the Council's position slightly when seeking to ensure self-build plots.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 12 Policy 24 Maintaining an Effective Housing Land Supply**

#### **Policy 24 Maintaining an Effective Housing Land Supply**

The Reporter has recommended a minor modification to the policy wording to make explicit reference to the bringing forward of sites which are currently identified for longer term development. In accordance with the Council's submission, the Reporter makes a further minor modification to clarify that it is the Council which will identify any shortfall in housing land supply rather than developers.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 13: The Historic Environment**

#### **Policy 26: Scheduled Monuments and Non-Designated Archaeology**

The Reporter recommended the removal of "Non-Designated" from the policy title. The report also recommended the removal of the third paragraph within Policy 26B: Archaeology and the creation of a separate policy called "Other Historic Assets" where this paragraph would be placed. This was in response to a suggestion by the Scottish Government with regards to reflecting SPP.

#### **Policy 27: Listed Buildings**

No modifications are proposed.

#### **Policy 28: Conservation Areas – New Development**

The Reporter recommended a wording change to the sentence on enablement. This recommendation aims to be clear that the key aim of enablement is the conservation of a listed building rather than allowing development that happens to support the conservation of a listed building.

#### **Policy 29: Gardens and Designed Landscapes**

No modifications are proposed.

### **Policy 30: Protection, Promotion and Interpretation of Historic Battlefields**

No modifications are proposed.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 14 A Low Carbon Place**

#### **A Low Carbon Place**

The Reporter has recommended modifying the Plan to include a new policy on the requirements for developments to embed low and zero carbon generating technologies in line with the Council's suggested policy text.

The Reporter has recommended modifying the Plan to include additional text in the policy pre-ambble to specifically reference the role of native planting and woodland creation in contributing to the low carbon agenda.

The Reporter has recommended modifying the Plan to include an additional objective in the Low Carbon Place section specifically referencing the objective to promote renewable energy generation from a variety of sources.

The Reporter has recommended modifying the Plan to include an additional note to Strategy Map (Low Carbon Place) to specifically reference the purpose of the spatial framework.

The Reporter did not agree to modify the Plan to make specific reference to Local Landscape Areas (specifically the Ochil Hills LLA) in the Strategy Map (Low Carbon Place) as this would not be appropriate given SPP is prescriptive on what is to be included.

#### **Policy 31 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation)**

The Reporter has recommended modifying the Plan to make minor changes to Policy 31A (New Proposals for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation) generally in line with the Council's suggestions including: removing reference to tranquil and wildness qualities; adding reference to hazardous installations (pipelines); and adding reference to National Scenic Areas. The Reporter did not agree with suggestions to amend Policy 31A in relation to renewable energy targets, local landscape areas and the spatial framework for wind, net economic impacts, and borrow pits, and was overall generally satisfied with the criteria contained within Policy 31A.

The Reporter noted that it was not within the remit of the Examination to consider issues related to Supplementary Guidance.

The Reporter agreed with the Council and did not recommend any changes to the Plan in relation to suggestions to modify Policy 31B (Repowering and Extending Existing Facilities) to refer to current windfarms as a material consideration and that repowering/extension proposals should not be considered under same policy criteria as new proposals. The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 31B to make specific reference to strategic opportunities for repowering opportunities.

The Reporter did not agree to modify Policy 31C (Decommissioning and Restoration of Existing Facilities) as the term 'pristine' was considered to be difficult to enforce and restoration proposals should be dealt with on a case by case basis.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 31D (Spatial Framework for Wind) generally in line with Council's suggested changes to ensure HRA requirements are covered, and additional text and a separate table added to clarify the purpose and content of the Spatial Framework. The Reporter agreed with the Council and did not seek to modify Policy 31D to make specific reference to LLAs and in particular the Ochil Hills as this would be inappropriate (as prescribed by SPP) and policy coverage on landscape is provided under the landscape policy.

### **Policy 32 (Sustainable Heating & Cooling)**

The Reporter agrees with the Council on the principle of requiring a policy on sustainable heating and cooling referencing national policy and guidance and therefore did not recommend modifying the Plan to remove Policy 32.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 32 to highlight the challenges around district heating and issues around viability. The Reporter has also recommended modifying Policy 32 to make the requirements for development proposals clearer including the deletion of Policy 32D.

The Reporter noted that it was not within the remit of the Examination to consider issues related to Supplementary Guidance but agreed that Supplementary Guidance would be appropriate mechanism for the identification of Heat Network Zones.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 32 to further clarify the role of the Strategic District Heating Opportunity Areas (Perth, Crieff and Blairgowrie) including associated settlement summaries and site allocations.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 32 generally in line with Council's suggested changes to ensure HRA requirements are covered.

**Policy 33 (Electricity Transmission Infrastructure)**

The Reporter agreed with the Council and did not propose to modify Policy 33.

**Issue 15 Waste Management & Binn Eco Park****Policy 34A Existing Waste Management Infrastructure**

The reporter recommended a minor amendment to this policy to be consistent with the findings of the HRA. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the reporter's recommendation has been identified.

**Policy 34B New Waste Management Infrastructure**

The reporter recommended a minor amendment to this policy to be consistent with the findings of the HRA. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the reporter's recommendation has been identified.

Whilst the issues of restoration, after-use proposals and restoration bonds were raised in representations, the reporter considered it would be possible to address these matters in the supplementary guidance related to this policy and no modification was considered necessary.

**Binn Eco Park**

Although no recommendation for amendments were made, the reporter found a clear need for more land to be provided at Binn Eco Park to support the research and development of new processes and technologies relating to zero waste and the circular economy.

He noted that the Council and Binn Group agree that a considerable amount of environmental information is already available about a suggested expansion area. However he concluded that the lack of environmental information about potential new processes and technologies, and the absence of evidence of public consultation for a masterplan prevent an expanded area from being allocated in the plan.

He found that the plan provides a supportive policy environment for the suggested expansion of the Eco Park, and is satisfied that the plan forms a practical framework within which to assess any future masterplan or planning applications for expansion.

## **Issue 16 A Natural Resilient Place**

### **A Natural, Resilient Place**

The Reporter agreed with the Council and did not recommend modifying the Plan to include a new policy on the consideration of local nature conservation sites.

The Reporter has recommended modifying the policy pre-amble and Natural Resilient Place Strategy Map to include specific reference to international, national and local sites, but agreed with the Council that flood risk should not be included in the Map.

### **Policy 36 – Environment & Conservation**

The Reporter agreed with the Council and did not propose to modify Policy 36 in relation to commissioning of habitat reports.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 36A (International Conservation Sites) to add a further policy criterion in relation to compensatory measures to ensure compliance with legislation and policy.

The Reporter agreed with the Council and did not propose to modify Policy 36C (Local Designations) to make specific reference to landscape considerations in the context of renewable energy developments or for the extension of the Lomond Hills Regional Park boundary in to the Perth & Kinross area.

The Reporter has recommended moving sub-policy 36C (Local Landscape Areas) in to Policy 37 (Landscape).

The Reporter noted that it was not within the remit of the Examination to consider issues related to Supplementary Guidance on Local Landscape Areas.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 36C to include further policy coverage on geodiversity/local sites and these would be appropriately dealt with through Supplementary Guidance.

### **Policy 37 – Landscape**

The Reporter agreed that additional requirements regarding orchards, renewable energy and biodiversity, were too detailed to include in the policy.

The Reporter agreed not to modify Policy 37 to address impacts of hill tracks as the impacts are already covered by the wider policy.

The Reporter added a minor modification that landscape assessments should refer to landscape capacity studies.

The Reporter agreed to retain the criteria for wildness in the policy, agreeing that local areas exhibiting wildness are not necessarily protected by Wild Land Areas

The Reporter agreed to the suggested modification to the test for assessment of applications in Wild Land Areas. It had been pointed out that the test in the proposed plan did not reflect the test in Scottish Planning Policy. This has been rectified.

The Reporter agreed however that with the new Wild Land Area test referring to the SNH map of WLAs that it was not necessary to include a map of those areas in the LDP.

The Reporter agreed that the paragraph regarding Local Landscape Areas should be moved from Policy 36 into Policy 37.

### **Policy 38 – Forestry, Woodland and Trees**

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 38A to include specific reference to native woodland creation, including modifying site requirements for sites where tree planting is specified.

The Reporter agreed with the Council and did not propose to modify Policy 38 in relation to commissioning of tree reports, adding specific text on street trees, or adding a specific definition of woodlands.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 38B to provide flexibility for the undertaking of tree surveys by suitably qualified professionals.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 38B to clarify the policy on woodland removal to make specific reference to national policy on this issue.

The Reporter did not propose to modify Policy 38B to make specific reference to various forestry-related guidance and documents as well as suggestion to add specific reference to long-established woodland of plantation origin (LEPO).

The Reporter did not propose to modify Policy 38B in relation to tree protection and suitable mechanisms being in place as it is considered the Council's current approach is appropriate.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 38B to include a Policy Note clarifying the purpose and role of Policy Map E.

The Reporter did not proposed to modify site allocation maps to show location of ancient woodland.

The Reporter noted that it was not within the remit of the Examination to consider issues related to Forest & Woodland Strategy Supplementary Guidance.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 38 to include specific reference to orchards to ensure that these specific trees are considered as part of the policy.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Policy 39 Biodiversity**

The Reporter agreed with a proposed modification to a definition of developments that may require an EIA, changing the reference from "large" developments to a reference to the EIA regulations.

The Reporter agreed that a number of modifications requesting more detail of site specific biodiversity measures, either on maps or in requirements, as well as more detailed reference in policy to orchards, was not necessary as these were covered by the general policy.

The Reporter agreed that a reference to the Habitats Directive was not necessary as the policy already reflected the tests in the Directive. Similarly several minor changes to wording such as an addition of "unacceptable" to "adverse effects" were considered unnecessary.

In response to a request that forthcoming Planning for Nature guidance should be statutory the Reporter demurred from taking a position as outwith the scope of the examination.



### **Policy 40 Green Infrastructure**

The Reporter recommends a minor wording change to criterion (a) of Policy 40 Green Infrastructure by adding “and/” before “or” to clarify that depending on the nature of a specific site it may be necessary to create green infrastructure both to mitigate negative environmental impacts and/ or to create wider linkages.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter’s recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 17: Green Belt**

#### **Policy 41: Green Belt**

A minor word change has been recommended by the Reporter regarding *Criteria F* on Essential Infrastructure. This is to clarify the background evidence that might be needed as to why a proposal requires being located in the Green Belt. An explanatory note at the end of the policy provides further guidance in terms of the scope of a search area for locations.

The Reporter did not accept the suggestion by respondents that a new criteria should be added to the policy specifically for renewable energy developments concluding that: ‘...Policy 41 of the proposed plan does not rule out renewable energy developments in the green belt, but they must be assessed against other relevant development plan policies and all other material considerations, including Scottish Planning Policy.’

The Reporter agreed with the Council’s approach to housing in the Green Belt concluding that, “to extend more opportunities for housing development in the green belt to include categories from the Council’s Housing in the Countryside Guide...would diminish the differing policy basis for housing in the countryside and the green belt, potentially increasing the possibility of additional residential development within the green belt....contrary to the objective of Scottish Planning Policy of designating a green belt around a city to support the spatial strategy and directing development to the appropriate places”.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter’s recommendations have been identified.

#### **Policy Map F: Green Belt**

The Reporter did not recommend any modifications to the Green Belt Policy Map F. There is, however, a minor consequential change at Scone where an adjustment to the Scone Settlement Boundary at Newmains Steading has been recommended in accordance with a proposal to incorporate a piece of garden ground. This is consistent with the approach put forward by Council.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 18 Water Catchment Areas**

The Reporter agreed that it was unnecessary to include a link to the relevant guidance documents for the catchment areas as the documents are all mentioned and are available on the website.

The Reporter also agreed that more detailed maps were not necessary as they are included in the relevant guidance documents. It was noted that the Council had agreed to a non-notifiable modification to ensure Map G showed the River Tay catchment rather than just the SAC itself.

### **Policy 43 Lunan Valley Catchment Area**

No objections were received to this policy.

### **Policy 44 Loch Leven Catchment Area**

The Reporter agreed to amend the policy wording in line with the proposed modification. This was a result of collaboration between the Council, RSPB, SNH and SEPA to ensure the policy was clear. There is no change to the effect of the policy itself.

The Reporter declined to review a request to include a reference to the protocol or discuss its review as outwith the scope of the examination.

The Reporter agreed with the Council's position regarding a request to add additional settlements to those which may affect the catchment as it was shown that they either had existing public waste water infrastructure or drained outwith the catchment.

A further request to change references in settlement summaries from "Loch Leven SPA" to "Loch Leven catchment" will be addressed through non-notifiable modifications.

### **Policy 45 River Tay Catchment Area**

In line with the findings of the Habitat Regulation Appraisal (HRA), the Reporter recommends adding Fearnan and Kinloch Rannoch to the list of settlements included within the first paragraph of Policy 45 to highlight that the mitigation measures set out in the policy

apply to these areas. They also agreed with the technical amendment of adding the River Tay Catchment boundary to Policy Map G.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 19 Minerals**

#### **Policy 46A Sterilisation of Mineral Deposits**

The reporter has agreed with a suggestion from Scottish Government for a minor amendment to refer to '*mineral deposits of economic value*' instead of '*economically workable mineral resources*'. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the reporter's recommendation has been identified.

#### **Policy 47B Restoration**

The reporter has agreed with a suggested amendment from SNH for a minor amendment to conserve locally or nationally important geological sections. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion.

The production of new Supplementary Guidance to support this policy is recommended. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion from RSPB. The reporter concluded that Supplementary Guidance would assist potential developers if advice about the full range of financial mechanisms available to secure restoration were to be provided.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the reporter's recommendations have been identified, although the production of new supplementary guidance would be screened to determine if it is likely to have significant environmental effects.

### **Issue 20 – Prime Agricultural Land & Soils**

#### **Policy 48 – Prime Agricultural Land**

The Reporter did not propose to modify Policy 48 to make specific reference to orchards as this was considered to be more appropriately dealt with under Policy 38.

### **Policy 49 – Soils**

The Reporter generally agrees with the Council's approach to the protection of soils (including identified mitigation measures) and therefore does not propose to modify the Plan.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 49 to include a requirement for field surveys to be undertaken, where applicable. The Reporter did not propose to modify Policy 49 to include a specific map on soil resources as this is not appropriate at a council-wide scale.

The Reporter has recommended modifying Policy 49 to include additional text in relation to measuring carbon emissions and peatland restoration/enhancement proposals.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 21 Policy 50 New Development and Flooding**

#### **Policy 50 New Development and Flooding**

The Reporter recommends a few minor amendments on this issue which are either in line with the Council's hints or are considered to be minor clarifications.

SEPA's objection to our flooding policy and its implications for potential development sites particularly in the city centre and North Muirton along with limited areas within H319 Ruthvenfield and MU73 Almond Valley allocations was one of the key Examination concerns. It was a test case with potential to set precedent for residential development protected by Flood Protection Schemes (FPS) in Scotland. SEPA's objection sought to prevent new residential development behind FPS in Perth and Almondbank because the FPS doesn't include for climate change even although they were constructed to the appropriate standards (1 in 200 year plus freeboard). The Proposed Plan fully acknowledges the need to take account of climate change, and the Reporter agreed that it is appropriate in the context of the Scottish Government advice for this to be addressed by other means, such as raised finished floor levels. The Reporter disagreed with SEPA that for residential development that the FPS needs to include for climate change in addition to being 1 in 200 year (plus freeboard) standard. The Perth and Almondbank FPS both meet the appropriate standard of 1 in 200 year plus freeboard whilst the Council argued that climate change can be addressed in development design. Both the Council's policy approach and its potentially affected allocations were supported by the Reporter. Please note this only relates to flood protection schemes constructed to the appropriate 1:200 year standard plus a freeboard allowance and for example would not allow development behind the Milnathort scheme which was only built to a lesser 1:100 standard plus freeboard.

The Reporter also agrees with the Council (in response to an objection from SNH who sought a new coastal policy including identification of unspoiled coast considering that TAYplan indicates there might be some unspoiled areas):

- that whilst the TAYplan may illustrate areas of unspoiled coastline it is for LDP to define the nature and extent. The Reporter agrees the coastline from Invergowrie to Perth is undeveloped in nature rather than unspoiled and agrees with the Council that it would not be appropriate to identify areas as unspoiled coast.
- and supports the Council's suggested modification to highlight that a small part of the coastal area, at Kingoodie Invergowrie which is included within the national coastal change assessment as being vulnerable from coastal erosion is an area at risk

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporters' recommendations have been identified

### **Issue 22 Policy 51 (Water Environment and Drainage)**

#### **Policy 51 Water Environment and Drainage**

The Reporter recommends minor changes to the policy wording to ensure that it is up to date and provide clarity regarding requirements for temporary measures at the construction stage. The Reporter supported the Council's position that no additional supplementary guidance is necessary for this policy and suggested referring to the Flood Risk and Flood Risk Assessment Supplementary Guidance instead at the end of the policy.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.

### **Issue 23 Environmental Protection and Public Safety**

#### **Policy 52 Health and Safety Consultation Zones**

For the sake of clarity and consistency, the settlement summary for all settlements that lie wholly or partly within a pipeline consultation zone should contain wording drawing attention to the need to comply with this policy. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the reporter's recommendation has been identified.

#### **Policy 54 Noise Pollution**

The Reporter agreed it was unnecessary to modify the Policy to specifically address effects on residential areas and rural settings as the inclusion of “noise sensitive land uses” combined with national technical guidance adequately addresses the concerns

### **Policy 55 Air Quality Management Areas**

The reporter makes the points that Scottish Government policy requires air quality everywhere to be improved whenever possible, and therefore action to improve air quality should not be restricted to the existing Air Quality Management Areas. He agreed with SEPA’s suggestion to widen the scope of this policy to make it potentially relevant to all proposals, not just those within the Perth and Crieff AQMAs. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion.

The reporter also recommended that the policy be strengthened by stating that an air quality impact assessment will usually be required where the Council considers that there may be a risk of an air quality impact upon human health, and by providing a set of criteria to illustrate the main ways in which development may potentially impact upon air quality.

### **Policy 56 Contaminated Land**

While argued it was unnecessary the Reporter agreed to the Council’s proposed alternative wording to include a new subpolicy addressing unstable land. This new policy (now Contaminated and Unstable Land) now addresses those areas, in the south of the Council area, which may fall within the Coal Authority High Risk Areas.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the reporter’s recommendation has been identified.

## **Issue 24 A Connected Place**

### **Section 3.4 A Connected Place**

The reporter has agreed with a suggestion from TACTRAN for two minor amendments to terminology in the wording of the text in this section. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the reporter’s recommendation has been identified.

The lack of a rail service in Kinross-shire was considered by the reporter, and he highlighted that is not the only part of the proposed plan area with a similar lack of rail facilities. On that basis he considered that a specific reference to Kinross-shire was not necessary.

**Policy 57 Digital Infrastructure**

The issue of securing upgrades to broadband services within existing development was given consideration but the reporter concluded that the proposed plan is not the place for this, noting that national initiatives provide opportunities for improvements to service. No modification was recommended.

**Policy 58 Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements**

The issue of the provision of a safe cycling and walking link between three towns in Eastern Perthshire was given consideration and although no modification was recommended to show this on the proposals map, the reporter did recommend a minor addition making reference to the proposals in the introductory text to this section instead.

The reporter has agreed with a suggestion from TACTRAN for a minor amendment to the wording of this policy to include reference to car clubs and residential developments in this policy. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion.

A suggestion from SNH in respect of promoting active travel has been partially accepted by the reporter and he has recommended a modification to strengthen the policy with more positive wording to require provision for active travel in new developments, and to safeguard existing active travel routes. The Council had already indicated to the Reporter that it would be comfortable in accepting this suggestion.

No significant SEA or HRA implications arising from the reporter's recommendations have been identified.

**Policy 59 Airfield Safeguarding**

The reporter considered whether there was a need to require independent assessments and reports in respect of airfield safeguarding proposals. He concluded that the existing arrangements, where applicants, airfield operators and third parties commission their own reports prepared by suitable qualified persons, should not change. He noted that this is normal practice in the development management system, and that it is for the Council to assess the validity of such studies and their findings. And he further noted that planning authorities may also commission their own studies or assessments of submitted studies. No modification was recommended.

**Issue 50 Whole Plan Issues**

The Reporter largely agreed with the format of the plan. Recommendations include minor amendments in order to make the indicative site drawings clearer (e.g. adding north arrows, changing the legend) and some additional entries to the Glossary (e.g. Ramsar, SSSI). It has also been suggested that instead of reintroducing symbols for larger developments under construction, the Alyth settlement summary should include a reference to the Glenisla Golf Course Road site in order to highlight the ongoing development.

No SEA or HRA implications arising from the Reporter's recommendations have been identified.



## PERTH AREA

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
<b>25 Perth Strategic Development Area – West/North West Perth</b>	MU70 Perth West	<p>No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded minor modifications were supported to existing developer requirements covering active travel, and the battlefield conservation plan (to add requirement for interpretation proposals).</p> <p>Also additional developer requirements supported regarding groundwater with regard to cemetery provision, and specifying woodland survey requirement highlighting how this should inform proposals.</p>	<p>Reporter agrees with the council on the key issues and supports the minor amendments suggested.</p> <p>The Reporter considers that the allocation provides flexibility which is required when there is a reliance on larger strategic sites and that the pause and review is a reasonable way forward and that much will depend upon progress with the site and other influencing factors in respect of traffic and transportation and air quality in the plan area.</p> <p>With regard to the search area for the cemetery SNH and Woodland Trust objected but the Reporter agrees with the Council that there might be scope but considers this should be subject to survey and so agrees with the Council's hinted modification.</p> <p>The Reporter disagrees with the Council that the auction mart should be part of the wider Perth West allocation (argued for in case the permission lapses). Reporter</p>	<p>This is the major new allocation identified in LDP2 from LDP1 and it is welcomed that the Reporter supported the Council's position on all the key matters.</p> <p>The Council lost the argument that the auction mart site should be retained within Perth West but in any case given the subsequent progress on building out phase 1 it looks unlikely that the consent for the later phases will lapse.</p>	<p>There are no significant environmental impacts associated to this change as it was already allocated for development. However it has been assessed as a separate site and site specific developer requirement have been identified in accordance with that and the planning permissions now in place.</p>

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			considers this should be identified as a separate housing allocation.		
	MU73 Almond Valley, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	<p>Reporter recognises the planning permission and considers that issues raised by objectors were considered through the consented on appeal planning application whilst it will be for the planning authority to ensure that these conditions are met in detailed planning application/s to follow.</p> <p>The Reporter recommended amending the developer requirement on the flood risk to more fully reflect the planning permission condition and including an additional developer requirement on archaeology also to reflect a planning permission condition.</p>	Reporter's recommendation will include conditions included on the planning permission as developer requirements in LDP2.	Would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site. No further SEA requires to be carried out.
	MU345 Bertha Park Perth	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded the Council could modify the Site Specific Developer Requirements to reflect the HRA.	The Reporter recognised that a Bertha Park woodland management plan was prepared in response to a condition of the planning permission and that it would be overly restrictive to require that all planting in Bertha Park woodland should be of native species. Also the Reporter recommends the developer requirement to reflect the HRA.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council	The modification will not change the policy approach in relation to protecting the integrity of Natura sites

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
					and will therefore not give rise to any significant environmental effects.
	MU168 North of Bertha Park, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	The Reporter points to requirements regarding landscaping which will provide for a more robust green belt boundary, and to benefits from park and ride facility, and that it will be well placed to replace car journeys by public transport. However Reporter also recommends we modify the requirement to acknowledge that (additional text underlined) new native planting should also help with views <u>from core paths and surrounding hills</u> as well as views from the A9 and CTRLR, and considers there should be a requirement for a lighting impact assessment in view of the site's proximity to the countryside and that a further requirement to protect and enhance biodiversity is necessary given the proximity of Bertha Park Woods.	Welcome the Reporter's modifications which will better clarify reflect policy sensitivities in the developer site requirements (light pollution, and proximity of Bertha Park Woods) and should help lessen the impact of the proposal.	These changes would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
<b>26 Perth City</b>	Bughmuir Reservoir, Perth	No modification to the Plan	No modification	The Reporter agrees with the Council that the land at Viewlands road West should remain as unallocated in the Proposed Plan.	No
<b>27 Perth City Proposals</b>	H1 E38, OP2, OP4 and OP9, Perth	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded for allocations: H1 E38, OP2, OP4 and OP9 add a further bullet point:  "Area of archaeological potential, investigation required".	Agrees with the Council's hinted modification	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	These changes would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.
	H1 Scott Street/ Charles Street, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	SEPA objection to this allocation because it is residential development behind the FPS.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.  Reporter agrees with the Council on this general issue (see Policy 50 for more detail) and that it should not be deleted	No

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Council's Recommendation</b>	<b>Reporter's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>	<b>SEA/ HRA implications?</b>
	H3 Gannochy Road and MU336 Murray Royal Hospital, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter considers that the policies in the proposed plan, including their recommendations for Policy 55 regarding supplementary guidance for air quality, are sufficient to ensure that the matter is taken into account when assessing any development proposals which are of relevance	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	H71 Newton Farm, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees with the Council that the effect of potentially permitting retail development in this location, which is not within a defined centre, would be to circumvent the sequential approach to site selection as it would permit development solely on the basis of there being demonstrated capacity, without considering whether that need could be met by developing a sequentially preferable site.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	H319 Ruthvenfield Perth	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would be comfortable with modification identified through the HRA	Reporter rejects SEPA's suggested developer requirement regarding avoidance of residential development in areas protected by FPS in favour of Council's requirement that areas protected	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	Modification will not change the policy approach in relation to protecting the integrity of

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			<p>by the FPS should be subject to appropriate mitigation measures: including water resistance, and water resilience measures and evacuation procedures, and agrees with the Council regarding the modification hinted for HRA reasons.</p> <p>The Reporter also agrees with Council that the site is suitable and considers developer requirements appropriately address the sensitivities of the site (character of the area, existing tree cover and the green corridor of the town's lade, and the need for multiple accesses).</p>		Natura sites and will therefore not give rise to any significant environmental effects.
	E1 The Triangle, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	The Reporter considers that it would be inappropriate to include a specific reference to food and drink uses for this site, which is allocated for car sales only, as this may encourage applications for further such facilities, in conflict with development plan policy.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council and acknowledges the recently built Starbucks.	No
	E2 Broxden, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	The Reporter considers that sufficient flexibility is already included in the proposed plan policies which may offer scope for uses besides class 4 ones.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E3 Arran	No modification to the	Reporter agrees that this issue can	The Reporter's	These changes

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Road, Perth	Plan.	be addressed at planning application stage but considers it appropriate to add landscape proposals to the developer requirements, in view of comments regarding the visual impact of previous development for neighbouring residents.	recommendation provides additional clarity and is welcomed.	would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.
	E38 Ruthvenfield Road, Perth	The council defends its allocation for core employment uses generally and no modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded suggests that motor sales use could be an acceptable use and suggests a possible modification.	Reporter agrees that it has good accessibility to the road network making it an ideal location for core employment uses. However the Reporter considers that in view of the opportunities provided by its location there should be no greater flexibility on core employment uses beyond Class 4, 5 and 6 and the exceptions specified in Policy 7A. The Reporter considers that such uses would normally have a significant amount of car storage space and more intensive employment uses would be preferable on this strategic core site	The Council agrees that core uses are preferable but with limited locations for motor sales remaining and good demand within this sector this LDP2 position may be challenged if/when planning applications are considered for motor sales here.	No
	E165 Cherrybank, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees that although the site has been vacant for several years and marketed in line with a previous outline permission there should be no change to the	The Reporter considers a FRA is necessary.	These changes would not significantly change the original

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			proposed uses of core employment, hotel and non-residential institutions and it should not be designated as a mixed use site as suggested. This is because of the planning history of the wider mixed use allocation and the need to achieve an overall sustainable form of development. Moreover, there is potential to attract a quality development next to the existing Aviva site. However the Reporter considers that a FRA would be required and recommends a developer requirement for one.		assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.
	E340 Broxden, Perth	No modification proposed.	Reporter agrees and considers that this site is required in order to assist in an adequate supply of core employment land in the proposed plan area and there is no need at present for additional housing land within the Perth Housing Market Area	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E340 Broxden, Perth	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded the site has an approved flood risk assessment and drainage strategy as part of permission in principle for a wider area however the flood risk assessment will need updating and that	The Reporter agreed with the developer requirement requiring an updated FRA.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	These changes would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of



Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
		should be added to the developer requirements as requested by the Scottish Environment Protection Agency.			developing the site.
	MU171 Perth Quarry	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded support for SNH requirement regarding landscape and visual impact assessment.	Reporter considers that since the site is well screened from the A912 and Gleneagles Road because of the sloping quarry sides and tree cover considers it sufficient to modify the existing landscape framework requirement to ensure that screening is retained for its visual amenity and wildlife habitat benefits, rather than requiring a further landscape and visual impact assessment to be carried out. Other developer requirements are considered sufficient to ensure that biodiversity and habitats are protected and/or enhanced.	The Reporters recommendation is proportionate and is welcomed.	This Reporter recommendation would not significantly change the original assessment. No further SEA requires to be carried out.
	MU331 Perth Railway Station	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded although Policy sufficient for clarity the Council would be comfortable with modification to include developer requirement regarding play facilities	Reporter agrees with hinted modification regarding play space and suggests an additional one for a tree survey	Reporter's recommendations provide additional clarity and are welcomed.	Would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
					developing the site.
	MU336 Murray Royal Hospital, Perth	No modification proposed.	<p>Reporter considers restriction that only the conversion of the listed buildings will be allowed to be occupied prior to the opening of the Cross Tay Link Road, is not currently justified and should be removed. Reporter seeks deletion of the second bullet point regarding the conversion of the listed buildings to replace with the following:</p> <p>“The Transport Assessment and Masterplan will inform the level of development which would be permitted on the site prior to the opening of the Cross Tay Link Road”.</p>	<p>The Reporter considers that a balance is required between the need to ensure that the listed buildings do not deteriorate and that the level of traffic generation is acceptable in terms of the impact on the local road network and impact upon air pollution levels. This balance, and the phasing of development, would be informed through the requirement for a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>There is also a public local inquiry for the planning applications for new build residential in principle and for change of use and conversion of main listed hospital buildings which were appealed for non-determination</p>	<p>Would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.</p> <p>The Reporter was concerned the original developer requirement could lead to blight and impede redevelopment of the listed buildings. This balance, and the phasing of development,</p>

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
				which we are awaiting determination from.	would be informed through the requirement for a Transport Assessment. No further SEA required.
	MU337 Hillside Hospital, Perth	No modification proposed.	Reporter thinks temporary use could be determined through planning application and confirms that SEPA retracted their FRA requirement as there is no culvert below the site.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	OP2 Thimblerow, Perth	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded there could be amendment to the FRA requirement to make it consistent with other sites with areas protected by FPS to acknowledge mitigation measures.	Reporter acknowledges that developer requirements include 200 spaces minimum public car parking and agrees with the Council regarding the suggested amendment to the developer requirement for a FRA.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	Would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing these sites.
	OP4 Mill Street (south side), Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees with the council that the car park cannot be considered to be of strategic importance because of its size and location. Reporter also agrees with the council that the developer	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			requirements for flood risk are appropriate and an approach based upon mitigation would be acceptable.		
	OP8 Friarton Road, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Concern raised about impact on nearby residential neighbours. However there are policy protections in place for residential amenity and a developer requirement for landscaping improvements to southern and western edges which will provide a buffer. The Reporter agrees with the Council, acknowledging the policy and site requirements and the opportunity for comment on any future planning applications.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	OP9 Bus Station, Leonard Street, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	The Reporter supports the allocation. The site has been brought forward from the proposal in the adopted local development plan and considers there is no land use planning reason to delete it. It provides an opportunity to relocate the bus station if overall public benefits can be achieved, having regard to the issues raised in representations, including the lack of parking in the area and the facilities for the public that are provided and valued at the current bus station site.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	OP175 City	No modification proposed	With regard to pedestrian flows the	The Reporters	Would not

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Hall, Perth	but if the Reporter is so minded the Council was comfortable with addition of a developer requirement identifying the need for topographical flood level of site to compare to flood levels and ensure it is on higher ground.	Reporter notes that St John's Kirk of Perth have the opportunity to make representations on the planning application, and agreed that the additional developer requirement regarding flood risk is needed.	recommendation reflects that of the Council.	significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing these sites.
	OP338 St John's School, Stormont Street, Perth	SEPA objected and no modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded the Council acknowledged that although permission was already in place it was comfortable with adding a requirement for mitigation measures.	Reporter recommends addition of a further bullet point to say:  "Development should include a flood risk assessment and appropriate mitigation measures: including water resistance, and water resilience measures and evacuation procedures."	Reporter recommended an alternative modification. The Council had considered that since mitigation measures were definitely applicable FRA was unnecessary.	Would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing these sites.
	Cemetery Search Area Isla Road, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter considers that other preferable options may be available, including sites in the vicinity, or elsewhere, which may not be in a sensitive green belt location but it should be included as a cemetery search location.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
<b>28 Perth City new Sites</b>	6 Milne St, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees and acknowledges that consent was granted in May 2019 for the	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			demolition of an existing vacant former church building and that the council returned an application for the erection of 8 flats at the site because it was considered to be permitted development	Council.	
	Relocation of the bus station (printers building suggested), Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees: whether other property and land would be suitable for transport uses near the Station Hotel would be a matter for further investigation by the council in association with mixed use allocation MU331, based upon Perth railway station, rather than inclusion as an amendment in the proposed plan.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	South of the M9, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees because of green belt, visual impact, incursion into open countryside.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Access improvements (Moncrieffe island), Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees as the evidence submitted does not justify their inclusion in the proposed plan at this stage.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Mount Tabor Road, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees that allocation is not currently justified and that housing development would detract from the rural character of the area and the green network provided by the open space allocation and any intensive development would have an adverse effect on the setting of the category B listed Gean	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			Cottage.		
	Tarsappie, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees that development would be prominent in the landscape and visible from a wide area and considers the green belt boundary robust.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Town and Neighbourhood centre, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees and considers that the site is an appropriate location for a commercial use and that there is no quantitative retail impact assessment evidence to suggest that there is a shortfall in local centres and facilities in the wider area to meet the needs of the local community.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Land east of Corsiehill Road, Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees and considers any formalised housing layout would be out of character and would detract from the rural setting of Kinnoull Hill and its landscape designation in a locality that is popular for outdoor recreation.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Ruthvenfield Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees and whilst it is possible that much of the tree cover along the lade could be retained initially there would be pressure to remove or cut back trees where any future residents of any new build dwellings experienced overshadowing and/or loss of outlook. Also any loss of tree cover, providing vehicular access via a new bridge over the	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			lade and developing the land would have an adverse effect on the setting and appearance of the route of the lade and the footpath. There would also be loss of habitat for its associated wildlife in what is a relatively self-contained area of scrubland which would currently experience little disruption or disturbance.		
	Compound site at Huntingtower Perth	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees that any development on this site, such as the proposed employment use, would harm the setting of Huntingtower castle when viewed from the A85 Crieff Road near its junction with the A9. It would constitute an unduly prominent incursion into the swathe of open space that has been allocated in the proposed plan to protect the sensitive heritage assets and their setting.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Land east of College Mill Road, Almondbank	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees this is a brownfield site with potential for residential development. However there are outstanding issues, including any market evidence to demonstrate that the existing use is no longer viable and that the site would meet the effectiveness tests. The site is currently used by heavy goods vehicles which have to pass	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No



Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			through the narrow road of Main Street and the Reporter considers that this is a factor that would need to be taken into account in any assessment of an alternative use.		
	Open space north of East Drive, Almondbank	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees and considers that any public benefits from the proposal would be outweighed by the loss of woodland and the conflict with development plan and national planning policy. Also considers this would be a radical change to the outlook for these neighbours and the rural setting if the site was developed for housing. In addition, no compensatory planting has been identified.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	West of County Place, Almondbank	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter agrees and considers there to be no compelling evidence to demonstrate that the site would be effective and no convincing reason to allocate the site for housing at present. Also agrees that no detailed assessment has been submitted to clearly demonstrate that vehicular access would be suitable by these routes.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
<b>29 – Perth Core Settlements – Bridge of Earn / Oudenarde</b>	Balbeggie H13	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Developer requirements considered appropriate and the embargo should continue to apply.	None Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council. There is a consequential change in terms of the embargo	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
				which reflects the Council's view that the date is now expected to be 2021.	
	Bridge of Earn / Oudenarde Infrastructure Services	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter satisfied that the infrastructure of Bridge of Earn and surrounding area can be improved to cope with the developments at Bridge of Earn and Oudenarde.	Reporter's recommendation for no modification to the Plan reflects that of the Council.	No
	Site H14 Old Edinburgh Road / Dunbarney Avenue, Bridge of Earn	No modification to the Plan.	Amend Drainage Impact Assessment site requirement to include off-site properties at Dunbarney Avenue.	Reporter's recommendation largely reflects that of the Council however also recommends amending Drainage Impact Assessment to consider off-site properties.	No
	Site H14 Old Edinburgh Road / Dunbarney Avenue, Bridge of Earn	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Site should not be extended due to sensitive, edge-of-settlement location and proposed site developer requirements considered suitable.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Site H72 Kintillo Road Bridge of Earn	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan as there is no requirement to state details of planning permission as part of the Plan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Site H15 Oudenarde	No modification to the Plan	Reporter recommends modifying the Plan to include specific text (relating to Policy 52 – Health and	Council did not propose additional text but recommended	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			Safety Consultation Zones) to refer to presence of existing pipeline(s).	modification not considered to have any significant implications as the modification will clarify in which settlements there will be pipeline consultation requirements in line with Policy 52.	
	Luncarty South MU27	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Site is deemed suitable for development and developer requirements are considered appropriate.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Methven New Sites H418	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan as there is no shortfall in housing numbers, there is already a significant housing site being built out in the village and the site has not been subject to public consultation. Reporter was generally amenable to the site for future development and acknowledged our intention for further assessment including public consultation for LDP3.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Methven New Sites H412 & H221	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan as there is no shortfall in housing numbers, there is already a significant housing site being built out in the village and the site has not been subject to public	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			consultation. Reporter also commented on the elevated position of the sites and potential impact on landscape setting of the village.		
	Perth Airport settlement statement	No modification to the Plan.	Minor wording to change to sentence regarding Masterplanning Perth Airport in the future.	Reporter's recommendation simply clarifies the approach suggested by the Council rather than change it.	No
	Perth Airport Employment Safeguarded site	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Site is deemed appropriate as Employment Safeguarded rather than Mixed Use.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Perth Airport MU3	No modification to the Plan.	Update site requirements to consider flood risk and contaminated land issues in line with objection by SEPA.	Reporter's recommendation reflects updated information provided by SEPA about this site. The recommendation does not change the allocation in any other way.	SEA site assessment updated to reflect SEPA's information.
	Scone settlement statement	Update in line with CTRL embargo new date	Update in line with CTRL embargo new date,	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Scone Settlement boundary change	Minor change to boundary to incorporate piece of garden ground at Newmains Steading.	Minor change to boundary to incorporate piece of garden ground at Newmains Steading.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council. Not mentioned in recommendations	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
				but assumed that consequential change is minor adjustment to green belt boundary as well.	
	H29 Scone North	Update site requirements in terms of drainage and flood risk as well as an updated indicative site drawing.	Update site requirements in terms of drainage, flood risk and woodland protection and the updated indicative site drawing.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Op22 Glebe School Site	No modification to the Plan.	Update site requirements to protect woodland.	Reporter's recommendation reflects updated information provided by Woodland Trust about this site. The recommendation does not change the allocation in any other way.	No
	MU4 Angus Road, Scone	No modification to the Plan.	Update site requirements in terms of flood risk.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	H30, H32, H33 & H34 Stanley	No modification to the Plan	No modification to the Plan	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	H31 Stanley	No modification to the Plan.	Update site requirements to protect woodland.	Reporter's recommendation reflects updated information provided by Woodland Trust about	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
				this site. The recommendation does not change the allocation in any other way.	
	H332 Stanley New Site	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter does not consider it necessary to allocate this site.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
30 Greater Perth North and East – Outwith Core	Bankfoot New Site	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter does not consider it necessary to allocate this site.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	H17 Church Street, Burrelton & Woodside	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Open Space Burrelton & Woodside	Removal of open space designation.	Recommended removal of open space designation.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Burrelton & Woodside new sites - MU184, Whitelea Road, H358 Nethermill Farm	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter does not consider it necessary to allocate any new sites.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Cottown new sites – MU359 and H186	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter does not consider it necessary to allocate any new sites.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Council's Recommendation</b>	<b>Reporter's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>	<b>SEA/ HRA implications?</b>
	Errol Conservation Area	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. It is out of the Reporter's remit to change Conservation Areas but the Reporter notes that it is a logical change.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council. The Council notes this suggestion for future Conservation Area work.	No
	Errol New Sites – MU408 and H409	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter does not consider it necessary to allocate any new sites.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Grange & Errol Airfield settlement boundary	No modification to the Plan.	Change settlement boundary back to LDP1 boundary.	Reporter's recommendation retains site with planning permission within the LDP settlement boundary. This does not have any other implications for the Plan.	Site was assessed as part of the Proposed Plan.
	Grange & Errol Airfield New Sites – H190 and MU194	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter does not consider it necessary to allocate any new sites.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Grange & Errol Airfield H21	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter recommends updating site requirement in terms of drainage due to concerns regarding surface water and archaeology.	Reporter's recommendation reflects updated information provided by local resident and the Heritage Trust about this site. The recommendation does	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
				not change the allocation in any other way.	
	Kinfauns Removal of RT1	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter considers allocation of RT1 appropriate.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Kinfauns New site MU405	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Kinfauns Removal of open space	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter considers open space designation appropriate in this context.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Wolfhill settlement boundary	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter considers it unnecessary to adjust settlement boundary at this time.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Landward Sites - Abernyte	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E357 South Inchmichael Farm Errol	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
31 – Greater Perth South and West Settlements Outwith Core	MU8 Newburgh Road North Abernethy	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter recommends additional site specific requirement in relation to potential archaeological findings.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	MU8	No modification to the	No modification to the Plan - the	Reporter's	No



<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Council's Recommendation</b>	<b>Reporter's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>	<b>SEA/ HRA implications?</b>
	Newburgh Road North Abernethy	Plan.	existing MU8 allocation will not prohibit the development of the site and housing only allocation is not considered necessary.	recommendation reflects that of the Council.	
	MU8 Newburgh Road North Abernethy	Seek modification to the Plan for a technical change to update site size reference and housing capacity.	Reporter recommends change to site size reference and housing capacity in line with the approved planning application for the site.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	MU8 Newburgh Road North Abernethy	No modification to the Plan	No modification to the Plan – Reporter satisfied with the MU8 allocation and site requirements suitable to deal with certain issues at planning application stage.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E4 Newburgh Road Abernethy	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan - the existing E4 allocation will not prohibit the development of the employment site including potential ancillary uses.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Abernethy New Sties H289, H209, H210, H401	No modification to the Plan	No modification to the Plan. Reporter highlights there is no housing shortfall and raises number of issues with proposed sites including lack of public consultation.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Clathymore New Site H288	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter highlights there is no housing shortfall and sustainability credentials of site questioned i.e. isolated location.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Clathymore	Seek modification to the Plan to include additional HRA wording.	Recommend modification of the Plan to include additional wording in Clathymore settlement summary	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the	Supports HRA

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			to ensure HRA requirements are met.	Council.	
	E6 Cromwell Park	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter highlights there is no housing shortfall and inappropriateness of site for housing including incompatibility with existing employment land.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E6 Cromwell Park	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan – site specific development requirements considered to be appropriate and provide suitable framework for assessment of potential effects as part of any planning application.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E9 Dalcrue	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan – Reporter satisfied that existing employment proposal allocation is suitable and that requirement for developer contribution is suitable.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E9 Dalcrue	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter recommends modifying the Plan to add a site specific requirement to protect ancient woodland in the area.	Council did not propose additional text but recommended modification not considered to have any significant implications as the modification will clarify that ancient woodland will require to be considered as part of any application.	No
	H20 Auchterarder Road	No modification to the Plan.	Reporter generally in agreement with the Council regarding the principle of the H20 allocation and	Reporter's recommendation generally reflects that of	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Dunning		recommends modifying the Plan to add site specific requirement for additional landscaping and amend drainage impact assessment site requirement to include off-site property.	the Council for site H20 with the addition of extra requirements for landscaping and drainage.	
	H20 Auchterarder Road Dunning	Seek modification to the Plan for a technical change to amend site size reference and housing capacity.	Reporter recommends modifying the Plan in line with the Council.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Dunning New Site H375	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan – site not needed as no housing shortfall and various issues with site including impact on setting of village.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	OP23 Station Road Dunning	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan – developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment not considered necessary.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Site H376 (new site proposed but subsequently withdrawn)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Forgandenny New Site H219	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan – Reporter agrees with Council that the site should remain open space to protect setting of the village.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Forgandenny New Sites H402 & H220	No modification to the Plan	No modification to the Plan – Reporter highlights there is no housing shortfall so no requirement to identify new sites and	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Council's Recommendation</b>	<b>Reporter's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>	<b>SEA/ HRA implications?</b>
			Forgandenny already subject to development of number of sites.		
	Forgandenny New Site H220	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan – site H220 not recommended to be allocated for housing.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Glenfarg Settlement Boundary	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan – Reporter agrees with Council that the settlement boundary does not prohibit employment use(s) coming forward in the village.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
32 Greater Dundee HMA	H24 Moncur Road Inchtute	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. The Reporter considers the allocation of the site and the site capacity to be appropriate.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Inchtute New Site H197	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. The reporter considers H24 adequate in terms of Housing Land during this plan period.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E37 James Hutton Institute Invergowrie	Change to site requirements to include European designated site, Scheduled Monuments & native woodland.	Change to site requirements to include European designated site, Scheduled Monuments & native woodland.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Longforgan New Site	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Reporter does not consider it necessary to allocate any land at Longforgan during this plan period.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

## HIGHLAND AREA

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
<b>33 Highland Area – Aberfeldy</b>	E10 & H36 – Borlick, Aberfeldy	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would not object to including reference to woodland enhancement in the developer requirements.	No modification to the Plan. The type and level of enhancement is for the development design stage.	The Reporters recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
		No modification proposed but if the Reporter is minded to accept the modification the Council would wish that a requirement for multiple access to the site is retained for both vehicles and pedestrians.	Amend the sixth requirement to include: “or other suitable secondary route”.	Although the Reporter did not agree with the Council's position this is not an issue of concern as the requirement for multiple access is retained.	No
	Area of Employment Safeguarding (Core), Aberfeldy	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is minded to accept the modification and change the designation of the former Fishers Laundry site the Council would wish various requirements to be included.	No modification to the Plan. The evidence submitted does not justify the assertion that the site is not viable and there is no market demand.	While the suggested modification was not supported, planning permission for mixed use development has already been granted for the site through appeal (LRB). The Council did notify the DPEA of this prior to the publication of the	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
				Examination Report.	
	Aberfeldy New site H100	No modification proposed. The site has potential but the market in Aberfeldy is unlikely to be able to support three sites.	No modification to the Plan although the Reporter recognises that the site has long term potential for housing.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
<b>34 Highland Area – Dunkeld and Birnam</b>	Settlement boundary alteration at site H109, Dunkeld & Birnam	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The Garden and Designed Landscape designation is a matter for Historic Environment Scotland; it is not appropriate to either identify this as a housing site or to alter the settlement boundary to include it.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E12 & E13 – Tullymilly, Dunkeld & Birnam	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would not object to including reference to the ancient woodland in the developer requirements.	Amend fourth requirement to include "ancient woodland".	The Reporters recommendation reflects the potential wording change suggested by the Council.	No
	Removal of open space designation South of Jubilee Park, Dunkeld & Birnam	No modification proposed	No modification to the Plan. Although not publicly accessible the site contributes to amenity of the area and should therefore remain as open space.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
<b>35 Highland Area – Pitlochry</b>	Pitlochry settlement statement	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would not object to including reference to the ancient woodland in the settlement	Amend statement to include "the ancient woodlands adjoining or close to the settlement boundary".	The Reporters recommendation reflects the potential wording change suggested by the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
		statement.			
	H38 Middleton of Fonab, Pitlochry	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is minded to accept the modification the Council would wish that a requirement for pedestrian and cycle access to Logierait Road is retained.	The Reporter did not consider it necessary to remove the requirement for connections to Logierait Road but rather has amended the fourth requirement to add specific reference to pedestrian and cycle connections.	The Reporters recommendation reflects the potential wording change suggested by the Council.	No
	H39 Robertson Crescent, Pitlochry	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The site is suitable for inclusion as an allocation for residential development.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Pitlochry New Site H128	No modification proposed.	<p>Note: in relation to all four new sites proposed for Pitlochry the Reporter noted that, although Pitlochry is the largest settlement in the area it is more constrained and so the approach taken by the Council to allocate more housing land in Aberfeldy is appropriate.</p> <p>No modification to the Plan. The site forms an important part of the woodland setting of the town and should not therefore be allocated for housing.</p>	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Pitlochry New Site H129	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The site should be left as white land rather than be allocated for housing. This would not preclude housing development in the future if identified constraints can be overcome.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Pitlochry New Site E130	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The evidence submitted does not justify the suggestion that there is a need for additional employment land, and the site forms part of the wider open space designation in this area.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Pitlochry New Site H131	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The site should be left as white land rather than be allocated for housing. This would not preclude housing development in the future if identified constraints can be overcome.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
<b>36 Highland Area – Settlements with Proposals</b>	H40 Ballinluig North	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would not object to including reference to archaeological investigation, the mitigation of negative effects on the ancient woodland, and to incorporate measures from the HRA within the developer requirements.	Amend requirements to include reference to archaeological investigation, ancient woodland, and the River Tay SAC.	The Reporters recommendations reflect the potential wording changes suggested by the Council.	No
	H365 extension to H40 Ballinluig North	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. No detailed information has been provided as to how constraints can be overcome, particularly the impact on the ancient woodland and the landscape.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Kenmore settlement	No modification proposed but if the Reporter is	No modification to the Plan. The inclusion of site Op374 within the	The Reporter's recommendation	No



Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
		minded to accept the modification the Council would wish site Op374 be included within the tourism designation rather than left as white land.	settlement boundary would, in principle, support the development of houses on the site and could undermine the spatial strategy of the Plan; Policies 8 & 9 would support new tourism development on the site without a need to expand the settlement boundary.  Any proposed development at the southern end of Aberfeldy Road would be subject to Policy 50.	reflects that of the Council.	
	H45 West of Bridge Road Murthly	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The allocation would make a contribution to the housing land requirement; issues raised in representations are detailed matters which would be considered through a planning application.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Extension to H45 West of Bridge Road Murthly	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The proposed extension would change the character of the village and would not accord with TAYplan.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Murthly New SiteH122 land behind Druids Park	No modification proposed.	Note: in relation to all three new sites proposed for Murthly the Reporter found it to be significant that Murthly has experienced significant new development in the past and is not a principal settlement in TAYplan.  No modification to the Plan. The scale and position of the site would substantially alter the character of	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			the village.		
	Murthly New Site H123 land at Gellyburn field	No modification proposed but if the Reporter was minded to accept the modification the Council would prefer part of the site to instead be included within the settlement boundary.	No modification to the Plan. Development would change the character of the linear settlement of Gellyburn and would be excessive in relation to the size of Gellyburn. It could result in coalescence with Murthly.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Murthly New Site H124 land adjacent to pub on Station Road	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. No information has been provided to address the flooding concerns.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
<b>37 Highland Area – Settlements without Proposals</b>	Butterstone boundary amendment	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The scale of expansion could not be accommodated by the village or the surrounding countryside, and would not accord with TAYplan.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Camserney boundary amendment	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The existing settlement boundary already allows for appropriate infill development.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Croftinloan change to open space designation	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The site forms an important part of the amenity of the settlement; it is not appropriate or necessary to remove the open space allocation.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Fearnan boundary amendment and new sites	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The Plan already protects the traditional rigg layout.  The existing settlement boundary	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			already allows for appropriate infill development. There is no evidence that there is a specific need for housing to ease pressure for workers and support tourism in the area (as is the case in Kenmore). All three proposed sites are unacceptable due to potential landscape and ecological impacts.		
	Fearnan HRA	Amending the Plan to incorporate mitigation measures from the HRA would provide greater clarity and transparency.	Amend settlement summary in accordance with the appropriate assessment.	The Reporters recommendations reflect the potential wording changes suggested by the Council.	No
	Grandtully new sites E366 & E367	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. No evidence to suggest there is a need or a demand for the sites, in any event policies 6 and 8 already allow for employment land adjacent to settlement boundaries.	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Kinloch Rannoch HRA	Amending the Plan to incorporate mitigation measures from the HRA would provide greater clarity and transparency.	Amend settlement summary in accordance with the appropriate assessment.	The Reporters recommendations reflect the potential wording changes suggested by the Council.	No
	Strathtay	No modification proposed.	No modification to the Plan. The existing settlement boundary already allows for appropriate infill development and there is no evidence to suggest Strathtay has a specific need for additional	The Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			affordable dwellings.		

## KINROSS AND MILNATHORT

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
38 Kinross and Milnathort	Route Action Plans	Add in references to Route Action Plans in Balado, Blairingone, Crook of Devon & Drum, Powmill and Rumbling Bridge and in Connected Place introduction	Agrees to Council's proposed modification to ensure that developer requirements take cognisance of existing Route Action Plans	Reporter recommendation in line with Council's position with the exception of Portmoak villages (below).	No
	Route Action Plans	Add in references to potential pedestrian v traffic improvements in Scotlandwell & Kilmagadwood, and Kinnesswood	Reporter declines to include suggested modifications pointing out that without identification of improvements developers should not be asked to address these. The Reporter noted the Council's work with the community council to discuss pedestrian improvements in issue 24.	Reporter declines proposed modification	No
	Masterplan Approach	Unnecessary to add reference to community masterplans	Reporter agreed local plans are already a material consideration, but do not currently have statutory force. Recognised that Local Place Plans and Masterplan Consent Areas covered in the Planning Act.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Level of Development	Level of development appropriate	Reporter agrees no modification necessary	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position. The Reporter discusses housing numbers further in Issue 1	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Infrastructure Studies	Infrastructure studies carried out are appropriate	Reporter agrees no modification necessary agreeing the infrastructure studies, and existing policies address concerns from development	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Facility Mapping, Kinross	No need to identify park and ride	Reporter agrees no modification necessary pointing out the Plans purpose to identify development areas	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Cemetery search Milnathort	Specific concerns re sites are premature	Reporter agrees no modification necessary	This issue is largely superseded by ongoing investigations	No
	Junction 7, Milnathort	Recognised that argument for retaining slip roads is tenuous. Land should not be in settlement boundary	Reporter removes slip road safeguarding in line with alternative recommendation, given the lack of any firm plans and agreed with the Council that the best way to protect the land concerned was to retain the land outside the settlement boundary..	Reporter recommendation reflects Council's suggested recommendation	No
	H48 Pitdownie, Milnathort	Retain allocation as sufficient protection in place	Reporter agrees no modification necessary. Reporter visited site and reviewed existing planning permission noting that concerns were or would be addressed	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	H48 Pitdownie, Milnathort	Retain as housing, not employment site	Reporter agrees no modification necessary pointing out serious access issues ruling out any employment use	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	H48 Pitdownie, Milnathort	Detailed developer requirements re biodiversity not required	Reporter agrees no modification necessary agreeing that existing policy and conditions on PPP sufficient	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	H48 Pitdownie. Milnathort	Not appropriate to extend to land to south	Reporter agrees no modification necessary identifying flood risk, best use of land and lack of consultation as concerns	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	H49 Pacehill, Milnathort	Retain allocation with existing housing numbers as concerns are addressed	Reporter agrees no modification necessary	Noted that grant of full planning permission has overtaken plan making process	No
	H49 Pacehill, Milnathort	Amend site drawing to better reflect position	Reporter states no modification necessary	The Council had been prepared to provide a more accurate drawing but the Reporter considered it unnecessary	No
	H50 Old Perth Road, Milnathort	Retain allocation with existing numbers	Reporter agrees no modification necessary noting that concerns had been addressed or would be through the development process	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	H50 Old Perth Road, Milnathort	Retain requirements for landscaping	Reporter agrees no modification necessary confirming that retention of trees important along with additional landscaping	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Op24 Kinross Town Hall	No additional detailed requirement (swift boxes)	Reporter agrees no modification necessary	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position. Note that the development of this site has overtaken the plan process.	No
	E18 Station Road South, Kinross	Agree to changes from HRA and SEA regarding flood risk measures and protection of Loch Leven	Reporter agrees to modifications as proposed to require SUDS to address Loch Leven, and a flood risk assessment.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position These are minor amendments reflecting good practice. As already identified in the SEA they do not impact on the SEA itself.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	E18 Station Road South, Kinross	No need for specific swift measures to be detailed	Reporter agrees no modification necessary	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position Planning for Nature SG to be consulted on later this year will include specific requirements for swifts	No
	E21 Auld Mart Road, Milnathort	Retain site for employment use	Reporter agrees no modification necessary noting mixed use proposal resisted due to lack of evidence that employment allocation is inappropriate and is in use.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	E21 Auld Mart Road, Milnathort	Site should not be restricted to class 4 uses	Reporter agrees no modification necessary finding that no evidence that class 5 uses would be inappropriate	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	H136 Kinross1	Site should not be allocated for housing or employment	Reporter agrees no modification necessary due to impacts on park and better existing allocations	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	E137 Kinross 2 - Turfhill	Site not currently necessary – or safe – for development	Reporter agrees no modification necessary noting little change from previous plan – issues of access and contrary to town centres first.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	H142 Old Perth Road, Milnathort	Better sites allocated	Reporter agrees no modification necessary due to landscape and existing better allocations	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	H144 South Street, Milnathort	This area should be retained as safeguarded employment use	Reporter agrees no modification necessary finding no need for further residential and evidence of employment demand	Reporter finds no need for further residential and evidence of employment demand	No
39 Kinross-shire	Balado E35	Provisions	Reporter agrees no modification	Reporter recommendation	No



Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
Settlements with Proposals	and H51	regarding foul drainage appropriate	necessary agreeing that although preference for public solution is stated, site solutions are possible	reflects Council position	
	E35 Balado Bridge	Modification proposed for contamination assessment	Reporter agrees to modification as proposed	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position. This is a minor modification to address potential radioactivity from former MOD base.	No
	E35 Balado Bridge	Modification proposed for flood risk assessment	Reporter agrees to modification as proposed	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position Flood Risk Assessment was flagged in SEA	No
	E35 Balado Bridge	No need for source of air pollution to be identified	Reporter agrees no modification necessary. Nearby chicken farm not specified as source to ensure objectivity of test	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Blairingone	Allocation should remain despite ground conditions	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as issues of former mining land have been recognised in developer requirements	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Blairingone	Additional landscaping requirements and "organic growth" not necessary	Reporter agrees no modification necessary The Reporter agreed with the Council's position that the allocation was appropriate and concerns met	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position Note that the objector had not objected to the principle of the development	No
	Blairingone	Allocations accord with Fossoway Group's strategic map	Reporter agrees no modification necessary	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position Note the Reporter considered this map in some detail	No
	MU74 Blairingone	Modification to address potential contamination proposed	Reporter agrees to modification as proposed given history of infill on the land.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position .The history of infill has a low potential for contamination, so	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
				this is a precautionary measure	
	E22 Vicars Bridge Road, Blairingone	Retain site as employment land	Reporter agrees no modification necessary, as MU74 best for provision of community facilities	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Crook of Devon and Drum	No specific development for former fish farm	Reporter agrees speculative proposals should not be included in plan.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position. Note non-notifiable modification to address confusion about roadside development	No
	Crook of Devon and Drum	No need to identify proposed open space	Reporter states ground should be identified as open space.	Although contrary to council's position, the Council already maintains this land and is appropriate to include	No
	Crook of Devon and Drum	Developer requirements for open space maintenance addressed through developer contributions	Reporter agrees with Council position	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Crook of Devon and Drum	No need to move settlement boundary south of railway line	Reporter agrees modification not necessary for pedestrian access	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position. Note this is superceded by removal of MU266	No
	RT400 and H404 housing and road, Crook of Devon	No need for new road/parking and housing unjustified	Reporter agrees that proposed parking site is inappropriate for school drop off and that proposed housing not required.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	MU266 Crook Moss, Crook of Devon	Site allocation should be retained as issues can be addressed	Reporter removes allocation from plan owing to impact on landscape, lack of certainty of affordable housing delivery,	Reporter recommendation is contrary to Council position but does not result in shortfall of housing and has environmental	Slight Positive SEA

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			Fossway Group's map, and lack of need to deliver road improvements.	benefits	
	H389 Land North of Naemoor Road, Crook of Devon	No need for site and better sites available	Reporter agrees with Council position that large site contrary to Tayplan, existing opportunities, issues of access.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	H155/390 Land South of Naemoor Road, Crook of Devon	No need for site and better sites available	Reporter agrees with Council position that large site contrary to Tayplan, drainage and access issues.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Op19 Ochil Hills Hospital	Remove indicative landscaping outside development site and adjust settlement boundary	Reporter agrees with Council position and modifications to settlement boundary	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Op19 Ochil Hills Hospital	Increasing housing numbers inappropriate	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as contrary to Tayplan and withdrawal of the objection	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Op19 Ochil Hills Hospital	Existing provisions sufficient to protect woodland	Reporter agrees no modification necessary	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Op19 Ochil Hills Hospital	Drainage provision could be modified to ensure deliverability	Reporter agrees to proposed generic modification as original requirement was for a public system which is not feasible.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	Powmill	No modification necessary from Fossway Group map.	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as additional allocations for housing not needed and open space better protected	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position. Note the Reporter also pointed out the importance of maintaining	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			outside settlement boundary.	countryside gap between Powmill and Gartwhinzean Feus	
	E23 Powmill Cottage	Trees already protected or outside site	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as no trees on site and neighbouring woodland protected by policy.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council position	No
	H53 Gartwhinzean Hotel, Powmill	Phasing of development will address number of homes delivered	Reporter states housing should be restricted to 30 homes during life of the plan given limited services in Powmill.	Reporter recommendation does not reflect Council's position but adequate housing numbers in Kinross-shire remain	No
	H53 Gartwhinzean Hotel, Powmill	Access and residential amenity to be addressed through development management	Reporter agrees no modification necessary	Reporter reflects Council's position	No
	H53 Gartwhinzean Hotel, Powmill	Add contamination assessment	Reporter agrees contamination assessment required particularly given evidence seen on site visit.	Reporter recommendation reflects Council's position	No
	H53 Gartwhinzean Hotel, Powmill	Improvements to roundabout not necessary	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as junction improvements originally for 120 homes no longer justified. Settlement summary recognition of route action plans sufficient.	Reporter reflects Council's position	No
	H370 North of Powmill Steadings	No need for site	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as site outside settlement boundary, greenfield and not as good a site as H53.	Reporter reflects Council's position	No
	Rumbling Bridge	No need for adjustment due to Fossoway Group	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as some sites already in settlement boundary and no	Reporter reflects Council's position	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
		map	need for additional sites.		
	E24 Rumbling Bridge	Remove area of indicative landscaping adjoining E24	Reporter agrees extent of landscaping not required given topography shielding neighbouring houses. Also removes "landscape framework" from developer requirements	Reporter recommendation reflects Council's position with the exception of the removal of the landscape framework developer requirement as this may still be required to soften the impact on approach	No
	Scotlandwell & Kilmagadwood	Not appropriate to allocate open space between villages	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as important to maintain gap and footpaths can be delivered regardless	Reporter reflects Council's position	No
	H54 Scotlandwell	Add requirement for peat survey	Reporter agrees to modification as identified in SEA	Reporter reflects Council's position	No
	H161 Scotlandwell 1	No need for additional allocation	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as sufficient housing and effect on view to/from conservation area	Reporter reflects Council's position	No
	H163 Scotlandwell 3	No need for additional allocation	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as sufficient housing and effect on views to wider countryside	Reporter reflects Council's position	No
	Carnbo Settlement	Inappropriate to restrict boundary	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as inappropriate to exclude areas of settlement with previous planning permission including brownfield land.	Reporter reflects Council's position. Note that planning applications have now been approved on both areas in question	No
	Carnbo Settlement	Inappropriate to place moratorium on housing awaiting waste water treatment	Reporter agrees no modification appropriate; applications should be addressed on case by case	Reporter reflects Council position.	No
	Cleish	Unnecessary to	Reporter agrees no modification	Reporter reflects Council	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
		include Cleish conservation area	required	position. Note that the Cleish conservation appraisal was added to the website as a result of this representation	
	Drunzie H413, H414 H428	Sites should not be included in settlement boundary	Reporter agrees no modification required in line with Council's position regarding 1 site already in settlement boundary, 1 in HSE zone and 1 at sensitive entrance to village.	Reporter reflects Council position. Reporter also pointed out settlement unable to support further housing	No
	Greenacres	No need to add additional landscaping	Reporter agrees no modification required as landscaping to north not required to protect residential amenity.	Reporter reflects Council position. Note that recent application here in south is required to introduce/replace landscaping	No
	Maryburgh H317	No need and inappropriate to introduce additional site to north of Maryburgh	Reporter agrees no modification required given existing windfall opportunities and setting of site	Reporter reflects Council position	No
	Maryburgh settlement	Unnecessary to require development to reflect historic plan	Reporter agrees no modification necessary as summary already refers to history and development required to mirror existing settlement pattern	Reporter reflects Council position	No
	Kinnesswood H410	Inappropriate to include site allocation	Reporter agrees this large site would be contrary to Tayplan and affect the setting	Reporter reflects Council position	No
	Kinnesswood H311	Site not required and community opposition	Reporter states no modification necessary citing amenity and natural value of the site including contribution to landscape	Reporter consistent with Council position although places greater emphasis on recreation and setting of site	No



## STRATHEARN AREA

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
41 Auchterarder	Improved access to A9 trunk road and Gleneagles Railway Station	While the Council agrees with many of the points raised about the significant safety benefits if the existing at-grade trunk road junctions were removed and grade-separated junctions created, the Council accepts that such work can only be progressed by Transport Scotland.  No modification is proposed to the Plan.	It is not within the remit of the LDP examination to consider A9 trunk road junction improvements and the location of proposed junctions.  Existing access to Gleneagles Railway Station is neither unsafe nor lacks the capacity to accommodate additional traffic.  No modifications are therefore required.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Adverse impact of proposed development on quality of life	A temporary ban on further development, or halt to already-consented development would be counter to the aims of the Plan and of the Auchterarder Expansion Framework.  No modification is proposed to the Plan.	It is appropriate for the proposed plan to look to accommodate a significant proportion of the housing for the Strathearn Housing Market Area in Auchterarder. Through the preparation of the proposed plan, quality of life issues have been appropriately considered.  No modification to the Plan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No



Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Town centre issues – except parking	<p>The local development plan does not allocate funding for the implementation of town centre improvements.</p> <p>The plan's policies support making the school more accessible for active travel.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>With regard to the provision of funding for the delivery of projects identified within the Auchterarder charrette, this is not the role of the local development plan.</p> <p>The Plan provides an appropriate framework to ensure that new development will not exacerbate the existing access issues within the town centre and also will support proposals which improve the current conditions.</p> <p>No modification to the Plan.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Town centre issues – parking	<p>The issues raised in respect of off-street parking are acknowledged and a parking study is being progressed independently of the LDP.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>The Plan's policies reflect the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy.</p> <p>Some representations refer to the current parking controls operating in the town centre, which are not within the remit of the LDP examination.</p> <p>No modification to the Plan.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Land south of Windsole (Proposal E25)	<p>Proposal E25 has been assessed and is a better option than the alternatives suggested.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>Should the planning permission lapse, the site specific developer requirements defined within the proposed plan accompanied by other local development plan policies would ensure the issues identified would be fully considered.</p> <p>No modification to the Plan.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Auchterarder Development Framework sites - North West Kirkton (Proposal H228)	<p>The Plan's indicative capacity range already offers sufficient flexibility.</p> <p>The delivery of this proposal should be linked to the delivery of E25.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would be comfortable in accepting SEPA's recommendation to add a requirement for a flood risk assessment.</p>	<p>A modification is required to the site specific developer requirements to identify the need for a flood risk assessment.</p> <p>With regard to the linkages between employment development on site E25 and housing development on site H228, this requirement is set out within the Auchterarder Development Framework. It is not within the scope of this examination to amend the requirements set out within supplementary planning guidance.</p>	The Reporter's recommendation reflects the wording change suggested by the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Auchterarder Development Framework Site 3 - Townhead (Proposal H342)	<p>The Plan's indicative capacity range already offers sufficient flexibility.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>The adequacy of the council's approach for establishing a site's capacity range is dealt with in Issue 2 Placemaking (Policy 1D) where it is recommended that all site capacities should be clearly identified as "indicative".</p> <p>No modification to the Plan.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Auchterarder Development Framework sites - Land for sports facilities at Castleton Road	No modification is proposed to the Plan.	<p>The concerns raised within the representation will be addressed through the assessment of a future planning application against the policies within the local development plan</p> <p>No modification to the Plan.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Land north of Castle Mains (Site H230)	<p>Auchterarder has a large and effective housing land supply and to avoid adverse impact on the landscape setting of the town there is no need for additional allocations at this time.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan</p>	<p>Given its size and position I consider any future development of the site could be very prominent within the wider landscape.</p> <p>There is a generous supply of housing land within Auchterarder and I consider this is more than adequate to meet demand in the Auchterarder area into the next plan period.</p> <p>A housing shortfall has been identified for the Strathearn Housing Market Area as a whole. Regardless of the level of shortfall identified, I find that this site would nevertheless be unacceptable because the adverse impacts identified above would outweigh the benefits of addressing any shortfall. I conclude that the site should not be allocated for housing development.</p> <p>No modification to the Plan.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Land at Kincardine Road, Auchterarder (Site H287) and an extension to settlement boundary south of Cloan Drive	<p>The Adopted LDP already includes H287 inside the settlement boundary. The Proposed Plan brings the adjacent site south of Cloan Drive into the settlement boundary; this site could be developed and used to improve access to the neighbouring H287.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan</p>	<p>Site H287 is not allocated for development within the current local development plan, nor is the site identified for development within the proposed plan.</p> <p>The Council has stated that there is no plan to develop site H287 within the plan period. There is therefore no need to include the additional land within the settlement boundary to support access improvements, as these could be provided without the need to include the land. I therefore do not agree that the settlement boundary should be amended in this location. A modification is therefore required.</p>	The reporter's recommendation puts the settlement boundary back to that contained in the adopted Local Development Plan.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Land at Hunter Street, Auchterarder (Site H407)	<p>The site is inside the settlement boundary; it is the non-conforming use in a residential area. It could come forward as a windfall site.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>The suggested removal of the employment allocation and/or allocation for housing has not been subject to public consultation. The site is allocated as core employment land and any planning application would be assessed against policy 7A: Business and Industrial. This requires areas that are identified as core business and industrial to be retained for class 4, 5 and 6 uses.</p> <p>The evidence submitted does not justify the assertion that the site is not viable for employment purposes and there is no market demand. The loss of this site as employment land and its allocation for housing has not been adequately justified. This does not preclude its future consideration by the Council as a housing windfall site. I therefore conclude that the site should not be allocated for housing development at this time.</p> <p>No modification to the Plan.</p>	The reporter's comments place greater emphasis on protection of core employment land.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Community School of Auchterarder	<p>The school has capacity of the estimated increase to its catchment population.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>The proposed plan does not state that there is a need for increased capacity, but highlights that the infrastructure study identified that there was a need for capacity to keep pace with the housing development. As a result there is no need for the proposed plan to allocate land for school expansion. In addition, Policy 5 Infrastructure Contributions requires contributions to secure any additional infrastructure provision resulting from new development.</p> <p>No modification to the Plan.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Landscape setting of Auchterarder and Gleneagles	No modification is proposed to the Plan.	The proposed plan recognises the important relationship between Gleneagles and Auchterarder and provides an appropriate planning policy framework to ensure any new development is appropriate and reflects the surrounding built and natural environment. No modifications are therefore required.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Auchterarder miscellaneous and comments on Infrastructure Studies	No modification is proposed to the Plan.	The reporter notes the concern expressed within a representation which requests amendments be made to the infrastructure study. It is not within the remit of the LDP examination to require amendments to be made to documents supporting the proposed plan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
42 Crieff	Town Centre and Infrastructure issues	<p>A number of concerns are raised including, among others, Crieff's ability to accept large developments and the pace of development in the settlement.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	The proposed plan provides a framework for the provision of the required infrastructure contributions associated with new development. The reporter considers this approach accords with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy and is therefore appropriate.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Broich Road area. Crieff	<p>Recently consented developments in the area provide for a proportionate contribution to the improvement of Broich Road.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>Policy 58B New Development Proposals requires development that will involve significant travel generation to be well-served and easily accessible by modes of transport. It requires all development proposals to be designed for the safety and convenience of all potential users and incorporate appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>No modifications.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No



Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Land at Bridgend, Proposal E26, Crieff	No modification is proposed to the Plan but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would be comfortable in accepting SEPA's recommendation to add a requirement for a flood risk assessment.	A potential flooding issue has been identified at site E26. As this may impact on the developability of part of the site, the reporter therefore found that there is a requirement to modify the site specific development requirement section to refer to the need for a flood risk assessment.	Reporter's recommendation reflects the wording change suggested by the Council.	No
	Land south of Broich Road, Proposal MU7, Crieff	No modification is proposed to the Plan but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would be comfortable in accepting SEPA's recommendation to add a requirement for a flood risk assessment.	A potential flooding issue has been identified at this site. This may impact on the developability of part of the site. The reporter therefore found it is appropriate to modify the site specific development requirements section to refer to the need for a flood risk assessment.	Reporter's recommendation reflects the wording change suggested by the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Land north of Broich Road, Proposal MU344, Crieff	<p>The listed buildings site specific developer requirements are more onerous than the already-consented scheme, but they will apply to future applications.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>The presumption in favour of the retention of the listed buildings accords with the requirement of paragraph 141 of Scottish Planning Policy.</p> <p>If an application were to come forward in the future which sought permission to demolish the listed buildings, this would be assessed against Policy 27B Demolition of Listed Buildings. Until such work is undertaken, I consider it would not be appropriate to modify the site specific development requirements.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Land at Wester Tomaknock, Proposal H5, Crieff7	No modification is proposed to the Plan.	<p>Development management has overtaken the development plan preparation process and the principle of residential development on this site has now been established. The reporter therefore found that it is appropriate for the site to remain as a housing allocation within the proposed plan.</p> <p>No modifications.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Land at Alichmore (Site H236), Crieff	No modification is proposed to the Plan.	<p>The reporter found that the elevated position of the site could result in any future development of the site being very prominent in the surrounding landscape. Concerns were raised at its remoteness from the town centre, and lack of mitigation in respect of the adjacent poultry farm.</p> <p>The reporter concluded that the site should not be allocated for housing development nor should it be included within the settlement boundary at this time.</p> <p>No modifications</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Land at Tomaknock Farm (Site H238), Crieff	No modification is proposed to the Plan.	<p>The reporter had concerns regarding the town's ability to accommodate development, the landscape impacts of the development of the site, particularly when considered against allocation H57.</p> <p>No modifications</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Land at Wester Kincardine Holdings (Site H240) and Land north of Broich Road and south of Skye Crescent (Site H239), Crieff	No modification is proposed to the Plan.	<p>The reporter found that development of the site could have a significant impact on the landscape.</p> <p>It is not clear that a number of identified constraints can be resolved. The adverse impacts including uncertainties regarding the ability of the infrastructure of Crieff to accommodate development on this site at this time led the reporter to conclude that the sites should not be allocated for housing development.</p> <p>No modifications.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Land north of 1 Callum's Hill (Site H385), Crieff	<p>Site should remain allocated as open space.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>Whilst the site is small, it provides an important green setting at one of the entrances to the town. This would be lost if it were to be developed even as a plot for a single house. I consider the existing settlement boundary to be robust in this location as it follows Pollock Terrace and Callum's Hill.</p> <p>No modification.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Land west of Gilmerton (Site MU383)	<p>Not appropriate to make an allocation based on refusal of planning permission, and in the absence of the required environmental assessment.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>It would not be appropriate to amend the settlement boundary or include a mixed use allocation for the site. However, a lack of allocation within the local development plan does not prevent the landowner submitting a planning application which would be considered against the policies within the proposed plan.</p>	<p>Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.</p>	No
43 Settlements with Proposals	Land at Cowden Road, Comrie (Proposal H58)	<p>Site should remain allocated for housing.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would be comfortable in accepting Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust's suggestion to add a requirement for archaeological assessment.</p>	<p>Scottish Planning Policy requires the planning system to protect and enhance ancient semi natural woodland as an important and irreplaceable resource. Therefore, whilst the ancient woodland lies outside of the site, there is the potential for the development of the site to impact upon it. This is referred to within the site specific developer requirements, although it does not specifically refer to ancient woodland, therefore a modification is required.</p> <p>As the development of the site has the potential to impact on areas of archaeological interest, a modification is required to refer to the need for an archaeological investigation and/ or protection of scheduled monuments.</p>	<p>The reporter's recommendation in respect of ancient woodland is contrary to the Council's position but has environmental benefits.</p> <p>The recommendation in respect of archaeology reflects the wording change suggested by the Council.</p>	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
44 Settlements without Proposals	Blackford, site H378 and OP377	<p>The Council did not support the suggestion to identify the site of the Blackford Hotel and Gleneagles Maltings and Brewery for office and community facilities. The Council also did not support the suggestion for a new housing site (H378) west of the settlement.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>In respect of the office and community facilities, the reporter concluded that the plan already contains policies against which to assess this suggestion and it is not necessary to allocate the site for new headquarters offices and community facilities.</p> <p>In respect of H378, the site appears detached from the village and is at risk of flooding on three sides. The site should not be allocated for housing at this time.</p> <p>No modification.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Gleneagles, sites H293 and H384	<p>The Council did not support either of the suggestions to amend the settlement boundary at Firhill, on the north side of the road between Gleneagles and Auchterarder; and at woodland to the rear of Caledonian Crescent.</p> <p>No modification is proposed to the Plan.</p>	<p>The reporter concluded that the site at Firhill provides an important gap between the settlements and coalescence would not be appropriate.</p> <p>To the rear of properties at Caledonian Crescent, the reporter found that the woodland belt is an important part of the landscape setting of the village.</p> <p>No modification.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Council's Recommendation</b>	<b>Reporter's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>	<b>SEA/ HRA implications?</b>
	gWest	No modification is proposed to the Plan but if the Reporter is so minded the Council would be comfortable in accepting SNH's recommendation to incorporate the mitigation measure as set out in the HRA.	The policy should be modified in accordance with the appropriate assessment of the proposed plan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects the wording change suggested by the Council.	No
	Muthill, sites H382, H246, H248 and	No modification is proposed to the Plan.	The reporter found Muthill settlement boundary has been drawn to allow for some infill development.  No modification.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	St David's, sites H416, H379, H380, H381	No modification is proposed to the Plan.	The reporter found the sites submitted for inclusion within the St David's settlement boundary would be unacceptable, and that it is appropriate for the settlement boundary to be tightly drawn to protect the form and character of the village.  No modification.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

## STRATHMORE AND THE GLENS AREA

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
<b>45-Strathmore &amp; the Glens Area- Alyth &amp; New Alyth</b>	H252: Annfield Place, Alyth	The site is effective and should be retained as a housing site	No modification to the Plan. The site relates well to the existing settlement and complies with TAYplan. Constraints such as access and flood risk do not justify the removal of the site and can be addressed at the planning application stage.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council	No
	H60: Albert Street and St Ninian's Road, Alyth	Highlight the likelihood of an archaeological investigation being required	Add archaeological investigation to the Site Specific Developer Requirements section for the site.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council	This change would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.
	H59: Glenree, Alyth	Retain as housing site	No modification to the Plan. The site constitutes a natural extension to the consented housing site to the south and there is developer interest for both areas.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council	No
	New Alyth Settlement boundary	Retain settlement boundary to the east of New Alyth and only modify it in relation to site 61.	Settlement boundary should only be altered to the west of New Alyth to follow the line of the extended H61 allocation.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council	Minor boundary change, no significant impact.
	New Alyth H61	If the site is extended, the	Amend the size and capacity range of site	Reporter's	The SEA for



Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
		capacity should be increased to 33 units, reflecting low density.	H61 to 3.1 ha and up to 33 units respectively. The suggestion to increase density to medium was not supported.	recommendation reflects that of the Council	the extended site should be updated with the correct site size.
	New sites (H253), Western side of Alyth	No additional sites area required in the settlement.	No modification to the Plan	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council	No
<b>46 Strathmore &amp; the Glens Area- Blairgowrie &amp; Rattray</b>	General: Infrastructure Capacity	No change required to the overall strategy	No modification to the Plan. The level of growth proposed for Blairgowrie/ Rattray, during the plan period, can be accommodated by the settlement infrastructure and would conform with the TAYplan spatial strategy.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council	No
	Settlement Boundary, Blairgowrie & Rattray	Retain settlement boundary	No modification to the Plan. The proposed modification to the settlement boundary (H395) involves a sensitive site and is not currently justified.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council	No
	MU330 & E31: Eastern Expansion, Blairgowrie	Retain sites as employment and mixed use allocations. Amend developer requirements to incorporate mitigation measures in relation to woodland areas, access and traffic impact and amend the indicative drawing.	Supports both sites and the approach to develop them under one comprehensive masterplan. Recommendations include adding the following criteria to the developer requirements for MU330: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A traffic management plan to minimise the impact of construction traffic on the area, including for the use of David Farquharson Road as a secondary access route, both during and after construction. This should be prepared and agreed in conjunction with the Roads Authority prior to construction commencing.</i></li> <li>• <i>Undertake a detailed survey to establish</i></li> </ul>	Reporter's recommendations largely reflect that of the Council with minor changes to the wording of developer requirements.	These changes would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
			<p><i>the ecological value of the existing ancient woodland (AWI LEPO) within the site. Retain and protect the woodland in line with the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal and with the recommendations of the survey. Provide native tree planting along the western edge of the site to link with this wood and retain an adequate buffer between the woodland and new development. Other woodland areas on site should also be retained for screening and biodiversity purposes.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention of part of the site for cemetery provision</li> </ul> <p>The Reporter also recommends changing the indicative drawing for the sites</p>		
	MU5: Western Blairgowrie	Retain the site as a mixed use allocation.	<p>No modification is required to the site; planning conditions attached to the in principle permission cover many of the concerns expressed in representations.</p> <p>For clarity, the indicative drawing should be amended to show the 90m contour line referred to in the developer requirements.</p>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council with a minor change to the indicative drawing.	No
	H63: Glenalmond Road, Rattray	No modification to the Plan	No change proposed. Construction on-site has commenced and the plan preparation process has been overtaken by events on the ground	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	H64: Blairgowrie South	No modification to the Plan.	No modification. The development of the whole site and the associated link road could be accommodated without an unacceptable impact on the character or amenity of Rosemount as a whole.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council. As a consequential change to deleting H258, the indicative drawing will be altered accordingly.	No
	H258: Golf Course Road, Blairgowrie	Retain the site as a housing allocation.	The Council supported H258 as it is a logical extension to H64 and allows for a new connection to be made with Golf Course Road. The Reporter acknowledged the potential benefits to placemaking, movement and connectivity however concluded that the development of the site for housing would reduce the open character along the western part of Golf Course Road and impact adversely on the amenity value of the wider area of open space. They requested that the allocation is deleted and the open space designation is restored.	The Reporter did not support the allocation and recommended the deletion of the site.	Acknowledge deletion of the site, no significant negative impact.

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	H341: Westfields of Rattray	Retain the site for housing and add a requirement for a Transport Statement in order to address concerns about the nearby junction and pedestrian safety.	Add the following to the site-specific developer requirements : • A Transport Statement dealing with the impact of the development on the nearby junction of Hatton Road and Balmoral Road and footpath links to the rest of Rattray • A Flood Risk Assessment will be required.	Reporter's recommendation largely reflects that of the Council however also suggests stating that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required.	These changes would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.
	Rosemount open space	No modification proposed to the plan. Small open space areas also make a valuable contribution to the designation.	No modification recommended. It is important that this significant area of green space (Rosemount) within the settlement boundary be protected for its amenity value, even if privately owned.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	New sites	No modification to the Plan.	No modification. There is no strategic numerical justification to provide further sites for housing within this Housing Market Area.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
<b>47- Strathmore &amp; the Glens Area Coupar Angus</b>	H65: Larchan Park, Coupar Angus	Retain as a housing allocation.	No modification. Circumstances have not changed, since the inclusion of this site in the adopted local development plan, which would justify its removal either in its entirety or in part.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	E32: Coupar Angus West, & E33: East of Scotland	No modification to the Plan however a requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment could be	Add Flood Risk Assessment to the site specific developer requirements in line with SEPA's recommendation.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	These changes would not significantly

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
	Farmers Ltd	added as a requirement for both sites.			change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.
	New Site – Beech Hill Road, Coupar Angus	No modification to the Plan.	No modification is recommended. Beech Hill Road is a small site and already within the settlement boundary.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
<b>48- Strathmore &amp; the Glens Area- Settlements with Proposals</b>	Proposed sites - Meigle	No modification to the Plan.	No modification to the Plan. Concluded that the level of development proposed for Meigle can be accommodated and supported by the settlement. There is no reason to consider either site ineffective.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	H68: Ardler Road, Meigle	No modification to the Plan however a requirement for Drainage Impact Assessment could be added as a requirement for the site.	Add a Drainage Impact Assessment to the site specific developer requirements for site.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	This change would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of

Issue	Site name	Council's Recommendation	Reporter's Recommendation	Officer Comments	SEA/ HRA implications?
					developing the site.
	H69: Forfar Road, Meigle		Add the following bullets to the site specific developer requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Transport Statement</li> <li>• Archaeological investigation may be required</li> </ul>	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	These changes would not significantly change the original assessment but would, if anything, lessen the negative impacts of developing the site.
	New site – H272	No modification to the Plan	No modification to the Plan. There is no strategic numerical justification to allocate further sites for housing within this Housing Market Area.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
<b>49- Strathmore &amp; the Glens Area- Small Settlements</b>	Meikleour	The settlement boundary could be extended to form a more logical settlement edge.	The proposed extension to the settlement boundary of Meikleour should be amended accordingly.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	Minor boundary change, no significant impact.
	Kettins	Only the smaller boundary extension around the curtilage of a residential building was supported by the Council.	No modification is proposed. While in most cases the curtilage of residential properties is included within the boundary, the suggested extension would involve a relatively large area of land in a settlement where the plan limits future growth.  The larger boundary extension to the east	Reporter does not support either of the two suggested boundary changes.	No

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Council's Recommendation</b>	<b>Reporter's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>	<b>SEA/ HRA implications?</b>
			of Kettins is not supported either.		
	Landward Site	No modification is proposed.	No modification is proposed. The development of this site would not accord with the aims of Policy 1 Location Priorities of TAYplan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No
	Ardler	No modification is proposed.	No modification is proposed. The development of this site would not accord with the aims of Policy 1 Location Priorities of TAYplan.	Reporter's recommendation reflects that of the Council.	No