



Notice of Intention by David Liddell, a Reporter appointed by the Scottish Ministers

- Planning appeal reference: PPA-110-2384
- Site address: Op2, Bonnyton Farm, Pitmedden, AB41 7GQ
- Appeal by Kirkwood Homes Ltd against the decision by Aberdeenshire Council
- Application APP/2019/0753 for planning permission dated 3 April 2019 refused by notice dated 27 September 2019.
- The development proposed: Erection Of 64 Dwellinghouses With Associated Infrastructure, Landscaping And Open Space
- Application drawings: see Schedule at the end of the Notice
- Date of site visit by Reporter: 11 March 2020

Date of notice: 3 April 2020

Notice of Intention

For the reasons given below I am minded to allow the appeal and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed below, following the signing and registering or recording of a planning obligation under section 75 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, or some suitable alternative arrangement, covering the matters listed in paragraph 33 below.

The appellant submitted a claim against the council for an award of its expenses in making the appeal. I shall issue a decision on that claim when I determine the appeal.

Reasoning

1. I am required to determine this appeal in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan comprises the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan, the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan and their associated supplementary guidance.

Background

2. The appeal site is at the northeastern edge of Pitmedden. It is site OP2: Land at Bonnyton Farm in the local development plan, allocated for 64 homes and public open space. A number of development requirements are identified, and a masterplan is to be prepared. Two access points are to be provided. The B999/Ingleside junction is to be reinstated, and reconfigured to allow continued safe and convenient use of the car park accessed from the junction. There should be an active travel link to the village via Bonnyton Road. Open space should be principally focussed towards the south of the site.



3. The strategic development plan places Pitmedden within a 'local growth and diversification' area. On the evidence before me, and in particular given that the principle of residential development (and some of its detailed requirements) are covered in the local development plan, the strategic development plan is of limited relevance in this case.

4. Prior to the submission of the planning application the appellant prepared a masterplan for the site. This included several options for reinstating the Ingleside junction. Advice from the council's transportation officials was that option 3 was potentially deliverable. However the council's Formartine Area Committee declined to approve the masterplan as they considered that it did not demonstrate that the access to the site could be delivered to a suitable standard. A revised masterplan was prepared which narrowed down the options for the reinstated junction. Again the committee was not satisfied, and asked for other alternatives to be considered.

5. There were around 50 objections to the planning application, including from Udney Community Council and the Udney Community Trust. Many of the concerns expressed relate to the re-opening of the Ingleside junction and the effects of this on road safety and congestion, and the safety of pedestrians. This includes concerns about the associated proposal to remove the layby/loading bay outside the village shop. It is also held that opening up the junction would prevent or discourage many of the placemaking opportunities for the centre of the village identified through the 'Imagine Udney' initiative. There are concerns about the use of the residential streets Breckview and Croftland to access the site. Objectors also raise other concerns, including in relation to flood risk, the effects on the amenity of neighbouring houses, the scale of the development and the capacity of schools and other local facilities to accommodate the new residents.

6. The council refused the application, taking the view that the proposals to reopen the Ingleside junction would negatively impact upon road safety, lead to congestion and cause a loss of amenity to the centre of the village. Consequently, the proposal was judged contrary to local development policy RD1 Providing suitable services.

7. Having regard to the provisions of the development plan the main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposal on the safety and convenience of pedestrians and road users in Pitmedden; and whether the scale and form of the development is appropriate having regard to such matters as the effects on neighbouring houses, the risk of flooding and the capacity of local services to accommodate the development.

The safety and convenience of road users and pedestrians

8. Clearly, traffic levels on Breckview and Croftland would increase as a result of the development. This may be noticeable for residents, but the overall volumes of traffic generated by a development of this scale would be fairly modest. The council's transportation officials raise no objection to the use of these streets to access the site. They are standard residential streets, and I can identify no significant safety or amenity concerns with their further use by the amount of traffic which would be generated from the development. Traffic flows along these streets and their junctions (and indeed at the Ingleside junction) would, as the appellant's Transport Assessment demonstrates, remain well within their design limits. There would likely be some inconvenience caused by construction traffic, but this would be inevitable in any development of this allocated site.

9. I also note that the re-opening of the Ingleside junction would provide a second point of access to the B999 (the main north to south road through the village) for the significant number of existing houses for which Croftland provides the only access point presently.

10. Although the local development plan says that the Ingleside junction is to be re-opened, I must still have regard to the effects of doing so. It is evident that a range of design approaches have been considered by the appellant and discussed with the council's transportation officials. Option 3 from the initial masterplan (modified following further discussions with council officials) is the approach pursued through the planning application. In refusing the application and in responding to the appeal, the council has not stated whether any of the other options considered might form the basis for a proposal which is acceptable to it. In any event, it is the effects of the appeal proposal, not any potential alternative options, which I must consider.

11. As well as opening up the junction, the layby just to the north of it, outside the village shop, would be removed to provide the required visibility at the junction. In effect the layby extends across the blocked-off junction, with the area in front of the bollards regularly used for informal parking and for visits to the shop. A puffin crossing would be introduced opposite the shop entrance, replacing the existing zebra crossing which is further north. The access to the car park, on the west side of the junction, would remain in place.

12. Objectors state that the junction was blocked off years ago because it was unsafe. The council has no record of why this was done. The appellant suggests it may have been because vehicles in the layby obstructed visibility. In any event, the technical evidence does not indicate any safety shortcomings in the design for re-opening the junction.

13. The appellant's transport advisors evidently had lengthy discussions with council transportation officials. This took them to the point where the final consultation response from the latter confirmed that, subject to planning conditions, there was no objection to the application. The stage 1 road safety audit, undertaken by a separate firm of road safety consultants, identified three road safety issues for option 3. These were the potential for minor collisions caused by obstructive parking, the potential for collisions because of the narrow separation between the proposed puffin and zebra crossings, and the increased potential for pedestrian/vehicle conflict.

14. The final proposed junction design responds to these. A proposed new southern zebra crossing has been removed. There would be dropped kerbs and tactile paving at crossing points. The puffin crossing would in fact be at a more convenient location, closer to the shop, park entrance and car park than the existing crossing. Parking restrictions would be proposed to prevent obstructive parking, including preventing parking which interferes with junction visibility. The details of these parking restrictions would be a matter for a subsequent Road Traffic Order.

15. It is pointed out by an objector that the southern visibility splay of the junction crosses over the front garden of the house at the corner of the junction. However this is only by a few centimetres, and over a wall which is currently low enough for drivers to see over. The appellant says that even excluding the wall would still allow a visibility splay of 43m, in accordance with normal roads standards.

16. Residents are concerned about the new junction in respect of safety and congestion. In respect of safety, as I note above the technical evidence shows that the junction would be of an appropriate design. I recognise that the car park beside the school can be busy at peak periods. I observed the site at both morning and evening rush hours, including through school start and finishing times. Albeit this evidence is anecdotal, I noticed the car park becoming full or nearly full, but with no significant disruption caused as a result. I have no reason to conclude that the new junction, even at busy times, could not operate safely.

17. I have sympathy with those objectors (which include the shop operators) who are concerned about the loss of the layby and other parking opportunities. Although the car park would remain, the necessary parking restrictions would prevent parking in some locations around the junction, for example perhaps opposite the school and on part of Ingleside. Although I am satisfied that the precise details of these would be for proper consideration through a Road Traffic Order, the result would be reduced informal parking provision near the shop and school. This would be an inconvenience for some.

18. I also recognise that there would be similar effects on the shop itself, in terms of deliveries. Although the layby is not a dedicated loading bay (and indeed I saw it in constant use by shoppers and others) it is also used for deliveries. Its removal, and any new parking restrictions, would mean deliveries having to be unloaded from another kerbside location. I accept that it is possible that delivery vehicles could be inconsiderately parked in a way which blocked driveways or the entrance to the footpath north of the shop, or could be left noisily idling. However I have no particular reason to think that this would become a common occurrence as a result of the loss of the layby.

19. These effects on the operation of the shop and on parking provision in the centre of the village more generally, do, however, have to be considered in the context of a clear requirement, if the allocated site is to be delivered, of re-opening the Ingleside junction. Also in light of a detailed process whereby, having rejected various other options, council transportation officials consider the proposed approach is acceptable. Given that the need to open up the junction is established, in my judgment the need to provide adequate junction visibility outweighs the inconvenience caused by the loss of the layby and reduction in other opportunities for informal parking.

20. Policy RD1 Providing suitable services only allows development with adequate road access. Given my findings above, in my view this would be provided in this case. I find no significant conflict with the other detailed requirements of the policy in respect of access.

The scale and form of the development

21. Neighbours express concerns about overlooking and overshadowing of the houses at Breckview and Croftland immediately to the west of the site. The rear gardens of the proposed houses on the western boundary would not be large, with some as little as 7m in depth. However there would be a further narrow landscaped strip between these houses and the existing houses to the west. The rear elevations of the proposed houses would be no closer than around 11-12m from the back gardens of the existing houses. The closest directly facing window-to-window distance to any existing home would be about 22m. This would be sufficient to avoid any significant effects on amenity as a result of overlooking. Although some of the new houses would cast a shadow onto existing homes and gardens, this is inevitable in a residential area and would not occur to an undue degree.

22. In these respects, the proposal would satisfy the amenity and privacy requirements of policy P1 Layout, siting and design. Although the new houses might be prominent in some views, this too is inevitable if the site is to be developed in accordance with the allocation in the local development plan.

23. The local development plan requires that the majority of the open space be focussed on the south of the site, adjacent to the Bronie Burn. The proposed layout conforms with this requirement, providing a significant area of public open space. The council committee report says that the layout contains approximately 40% open space (the masterplan says 41%), a requirement of policy P2 Open space and access in new developments.

Flood risk

24. In the experience of some objectors, flooding is more frequent than as modelled in the appellant's Flood Risk Assessment. In any event, this Assessment appears to demonstrate that the proposed homes, gardens and roads would avoid the areas of the site at risk from fluvial flooding associated with the burns on the eastern boundaries of the site. The footpath along the northeast boundary would appear to be within the flood risk area. The council's Flood Risk and Coast Protection officer had no objection to the application, but recommended a number of conditions to ensure the development is delivered in accordance with the mitigation measures identified in the Flood Risk Assessment.

25. The development therefore generally avoids areas of flood risk, as required by policy C4 Flooding. The policy makes an exception for areas which would be less impacted by flooding, giving examples such as play areas and car parks. I am satisfied that the footpath would come under such a category.

The capacity of local services to accommodate the development

26. The council's Developer Obligations Assessment Report says Pitmedden school is operating within capacity and would not require any intervention. Although some objectors say the playground is too small, the council does not identify this as an issue. Meldrum Academy is assessed as operating in excess of capacity. Based on the Developer Contributions: Methods for Calculation supplementary guidance, the development is expected to generate an average of just under 10 secondary school pupils per year. Using a standard pro-rata figure for the cost of new school accommodation, the above Assessment Report calculates a required contribution of £231,282. A much smaller contribution, towards an all-weather sports pitch at the Academy, is also identified.

27. The local development plan says that all developments in Pitmedden must contribute towards the extension or reconfiguration of Haddo Medical Group to allow additional capacity. The consultation response from NHS Grampian expects such a contribution. Objectors also raise capacity issues at this health centre. However the Developer Obligations Assessment Report says that, as this is a privately owned facility, no contribution is sought. Given these tensions, I sought further evidence on this matter.

28. In response, the council provided a previous appeal decision which concluded there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate a need for an extension to the health centre as a result of that development. However, beyond what is stated in that decision letter, I have

limited evidence from the council which would allow me to safely say that the same conclusion would now need to be reached in this case.

29. I am not convinced that its status as a private facility need render the health centre unable to be the recipient of a developer contribution. The terms of such a contribution might need, however, to be informed by this status. NHS Grampian refers to the potential for a 'clawback' clause in this regard.

30. NHS Grampian's response to my evidence request says that there are not enough rooms to accommodate patients from the new development. It states that the existing building does not have enough clinical rooms to meet the needs of the patient population. A grant application was made to try and address this, but no funding is available.

31. It appears, then, that there is an existing issue with the configuration (if not overall floorspace) of the facility. But no evidence has been submitted showing how (and to what extent) the expected number of new patients would exacerbate this existing problem, or what further physical works would be required as a result. I would expect this kind of evidence in order to demonstrate the case for a contribution. In its lack, and given the apparent lack of funding to resolve what appear to be existing issues with the building, it has not been shown that such a contribution is necessary or reasonable in this case.

32. One quarter of the proposed houses would be affordable housing, as required by policy H2 Affordable housing. The council's committee report recommended that this be secured through a planning obligation.

33. Policy RD2 Developers' obligations seeks contributions towards the provision of necessary infrastructure. Council officials and the appellant had agreed, prior to the committee's decision to refuse the application, on the need for a planning obligation covering affordable housing (16 social rented units) and contributions towards additional classroom capacity and an all-weather pitch at Meldrum Academy. In light of the above context, I agree that these are necessary.

Conclusions

34. Drawing the various elements of the development plan together, the site is allocated for housing and therefore the proposal draws support from policy H1 Housing land. Save for the lack of an approved masterplan and a contribution towards healthcare facilities, it satisfies the requirements identified in the settlement statement for Pitmedden and Milldale, including opening up the Ingleside junction. The masterplan shows how the site can be developed whilst doing so. I find no significant conflict with any other aspects of the development plan (including the strategic development plan and the relevant items of supplementary guidance). In my view the lack of an approved masterplan or a healthcare contribution are matters of detail which in this case have been shown to be of lesser importance. Overall, I judge that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan.

35. I have had regard to the January 2019 Imagine Udney community action plan which was commissioned by the Udney Community Trust and prepared with the involvement of a wide range of local organisations and members of the community. It is feared that the re-opening of the junction and the associated proposals could have implications for some of the actions identified in Imagine Udney for the centre of the village. However these are

expressed in fairly general terms so it is not clear to me to what extent, if at all, any of these desired actions would be frustrated. The action plan, perhaps surprisingly, makes no reference to the local development plan proposals for Pitmedden, despite these having already established the need to re-open the junction to accommodate the development of the allocated appeal site. Although I fully recognise what appears to have been a very inclusive process in preparing the action plan, it does not in my view provide a strong basis for dismissing the appeal.

36. I take account of the health concerns raised by objectors from one neighbouring property about the prospect of noise and disruption during the construction period affecting one resident whose medical condition makes him very sensitive to these. I therefore have a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity. However, the site is allocated for housing, the construction of which would inevitably lead to a degree of disturbance. A condition is proposed which would require the submission of a construction method statement aiming to minimise noise and dust from the construction process. Whilst having regard to my duty under the 2010 Act (and to concerns about disturbance from construction raised by other objectors), I find that the proposed condition is an appropriate response to the need to take reasonable measures to minimise the disturbance to neighbouring residents.

37. I have been made aware of a further recent planning application (as yet undetermined) for the site which does not propose re-opening the Ingleside junction. Nevertheless, I must still determine this appeal on its own merits.

38. I therefore conclude, for the reasons set out above, that the proposed development accords overall with the relevant provisions of the development plan and that there are no material considerations which justify refusing to grant planning permission. I have considered all the other matters raised, none which lead me to alter my conclusions.

39. The council recommends that, should the appeal be allowed, a number of conditions be imposed. The appellant has not commented on these. Subject to minor amendments, I intend to impose the council's proposed conditions.

40. I conclude that a planning obligation restricting or regulating the development or use of the land should be completed in order to ensure the contributions towards the affordable housing, education and open space infrastructure identified in paragraph 33 above. I will accordingly defer determination of this appeal for a period of up to twelve weeks to enable the relevant planning obligation (either an agreement with the planning authority or a unilateral obligation by the appellant under section 75 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 or some suitable alternative arrangement as may be agreed by the parties) to be completed and registered or recorded, as the case may be. If, by the end of the twelve week period, a copy of the relevant obligation with evidence of registration or recording has not been submitted to this office, I will consider whether planning permission should be refused or granted without a planning obligation.

David Liddell

Reporter

List of conditions

1. No works in connection with the development hereby approved shall commence until the proposed off-site road improvement works to the public road network (as per the details of Option 3 set out in drawing 96596/0102(D) or other details as otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority) required to re-open the junction between the B999 and Ingleside have been completed and brought into public use.

Reason: in the interests of road safety and preserving the amenity of the village and the occupants of the proposed development.

2. No works in connection with the development hereby approved shall commence unless an archaeological written scheme of investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority and a programme of archaeological works has been carried out in accordance with the approved written scheme of investigation. The written scheme of investigation shall include details of how the recording and recovery of archaeological resources found within the application site shall be undertaken, and how any updates, if required, to the written scheme of investigation will be provided throughout the implementation of the programme of archaeological works. Should the archaeological works reveal the need for post excavation analysis the development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless a post-excavation research design (PERD) for the analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The PERD shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to safeguard and record the archaeological potential of the area.

3. No individual dwellinghouse hereby approved shall be erected unless an Energy Statement applicable to that dwellinghouse has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The Energy Statement shall include the following items:

- a) full details of the proposed energy efficiency measures and/or renewable technologies to be incorporated into the development; and
- b) calculations using the SAP or SBEM methods which demonstrate that the reduction in carbon dioxide emissions rates for the development, arising from the measures proposed, will enable the development to comply with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - Carbon Neutrality in New Developments.

The development shall not be occupied unless it has been constructed in full accordance with the approved details in the Energy Statement. The carbon reduction measures shall be retained in place and fully operational thereafter.

Reason: to ensure the development complies with the on-site carbon reductions required in Scottish Planning Policy and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - Carbon Neutrality in New Developments.

4. No works in connection with the development hereby approved shall commence unless a Phasing Plan setting out the details, including the delivery of the open space and footpath links, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved Phasing Plan.

Reason: to ensure that build-out of the development is phased so as to avoid adverse impact on local services and infrastructure and in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

5. Prior to occupation of any dwellinghouse a Residential Travel Plan detailing sustainable travel options in line with the relevant information in the Transport Assessment and locally at the time shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. A copy of the approved Residential Travel Plan shall be provided to the first occupant of each dwellinghouse at the time of first occupation.

Reason: in the interests of encouraging a more sustainable means of travel to and from the proposed development.

6 No individual dwellinghouse shall be occupied until such a time as a connection to the public water supply and sewer for that property has been secured and implemented. Thereafter said connections shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: in the interests of public health and the amenity of the properties

7. No works in connection with the development hereby approved shall commence unless an investigation of the site has been undertaken in accordance with BS10175:2011+A1:2013 - 'Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice' and a report of that investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. Where it is determined by the site investigation report that remediation of the site is required no works in connection with the development hereby approved shall commence unless a remedial scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless the approved scheme of remediation has been carried out in its entirety and a validation report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. Any areas of hardstanding, clean cover or other such barriers within the application site boundary that are included within the approved scheme of remediation and are required to break one or more pollutant linkages shall be permanently retained as such and shall not be disturbed without the prior written approval of the planning authority.

Reason: in order to ensure any potential contamination of the site is dealt with appropriately in the interests of public and environmental safety.

8. No works in connection with the dwellinghouses within the development hereby approved shall commence unless details of the finish proposed for the 'raised shared surfaces' marked on the site plan drawing 1958/P/000/XX/003 K have been submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority. The dwellinghouses which utilise these surfaces for direct access shall not be occupied unless the external finish has been applied in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: in the interests of the appearance of the development and the visual amenities of the area.

9. The areas of public open space (identifiable from the Landscape Proposal and Proposed Site Layout Plan drawings) shall not form part of the domestic garden ground of any individual property, or be otherwise developed or enclosed without an express grant of planning permission from the planning authority.

Reason: in the interests of the visual amenity of the development and in order to ensure an adequate proportion of the development constitutes public open space.

10. All soft and hard landscaping proposals shall be carried out in accordance with the approved planting scheme and management programme. Any planting which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, is dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased, shall be replaced by plants of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted. Once provided, all hard landscaping works shall thereafter be permanently retained.

Reason: to ensure the implementation and management of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping which will help to integrate the proposed development into the local landscape in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

11. No individual dwellinghouse shall be brought into use until such a time as adequate parking, within the parameters set forth in the 'Aberdeenshire Council Parking Standards' dated November 2001, has been provided for that property. Thereafter that level of parking shall be retained unless altered through an express grant of planning permission by the planning authority.

For the avoidance of doubt the relevant parking standards require residential parking to be provided at the following ratio:

Properties with 3 or less bedrooms - 2 spaces

Properties with 4 or more bedrooms - 3 spaces

In order for a garage to effectively contribute to parking provision, it must measure at least 3m x 6m (internal).

Reason: in the interests of providing an adequate level of parking within the development, and in the interests of road safety.

12. Prior to the construction of any dwellinghouse, the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority:

- (a) location and details of the children's play equipment including surfacing materials of the play areas; and
- (b) details of the long-term management of the play equipment and surfacing.

The equipment shall be installed in the agreed location prior to the completion of the penultimate house on the site and maintained thereafter in complete accordance with the approved details.

Reason: in the interests of ensuring the timely provision of suitable play equipment in the areas of open space in the interests of the amenity of the area.

13. No works in connection with the development hereby approved shall commence unless a detailed site-specific construction method statement and related site plan has

been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The construction method statement shall include details of dust and noise mitigation during the construction process. All construction works on the site shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved construction method statement.

Reason: in the interests of protecting the local amenity.

14. No dwellinghouse hereby approved shall be occupied unless all roads, footpaths, parking and turning areas within the development and serving the dwellinghouse have been completed to the level of bottoming and binder course, including the access bellmouth and all turning heads in accordance with the council's Standards for Road Construction Consent and Adoption.

Reason: to ensure the provision of a means of access and turning space to an adequate standard in the interests of road safety.

15. No land-raising or development shall take place within the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability + climate change functional floodplain, as defined on drawing ref. 96596/2100 within the Flood Risk Assessment report.

16. Finished floor levels for the proposed dwellinghouses shall be set at a minimum elevation of the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability + climate change flood level + 600mm freeboard, or as stated on drawing ref. 1958/P/000/XX/003/K.

17. Buffer strips of 6m to all watercourses and waterbodies shall be implemented and maintained, as a minimum in line with Aberdeenshire Council's Planning Advice 9/2015 Buffer Strip Guidance

18. No fences or other structure shall be constructed within the functional floodplain or adjacent to any watercourse in such a way that they would impede flows or alter the conveyance of the watercourse/floodplain.

19. No dwellinghouses hereby approved shall be occupied until the proposed surface water drainage system has been provided in accordance with drawing 96596/2000(A). The surface water drainage system shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason for conditions 15-19: to ensure that there is no increased risk of flooding as a result of the development.

Schedule of drawings

1958/P/000/XX/020 Version A Proposed Waste Management Plan
96596/1008 Version B Vehicle Swept paths 1 of 2
96596/1009 Version B Vehicle Swept Paths 2 of 2
1958/P/000/XX/052 Version A Proposed House Type Elevations
1958/P/044-058/FB/01 Flats 044 & 058 - Proposed Flat Block Floor Plans
437.18.01 Version A Landscape Proposal
437.18.02 Version A Landscape Proposal
437.18.03 Version A Landscape Proposal

437.18.04 Version A Landscape Proposal

1958/P/000/XX/001 Location Plan

1958/P/000/XX/002 Topographical Survey & Existing Features

1958/P/000/XX/003 Version K Proposed Site Layout Plan

1958/P/000/XX/020 Proposed Waste Management Plan

1958/P/000/XX/030 Version G Proposed Green Area Plan

1958/P/000/XX/040 Proposed Sectional Elevations

1958/P/000/XX/050 Proposed Materials Elevation and Details

1958/P/000/XX/060 Proposed Boundary Treatment Plan

1958/P/000/XX/061 Proposed Boundary Treatment Details

1958/P/044-058/FB/02 Flats 044 & 058 - Proposed Flat Block Elevations

1958/P/072/SD/01 HT 072 - Proposed Semi-Detached Floor Plans - Affordable Housing

1958/P/072/SD/02 HT 072 - Proposed Semi-Detached Elevations - Affordable Housing

1958/P/091-102/SD/01 HT 091 & HT 102 - Proposed Semi-Detached Block Floor Plans - Affordable Housing

1958/P/091-102/SD/02 HT 091 & HT 102 - Proposed Semi-Detached Block Elevations - Affordable Housing

1958/P/091/SD/01 HT 091 - Proposed Semi-Detached Block Floor Plans - Affordable Housing

1958/P/091/SD/02 HT 091 - Proposed Semi-Detached Block Elevations - Affordable Housing

1958/P/091/TB/01 HT 091 - Proposed Terraced Block Floor Plans - Affordable Housing

1958/P/091/TB/02 HT 091 - Proposed Terraced Block Elevations - Affordable Housing

1958/P/113/LH/01 HT113 - Buchan - Left Hand - Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/113/LH/02 HT113 - Buchan - Left Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/113/RH/01 HT113 - Buchan - Right Hand – Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/113/RH/02 HT113 - Buchan - Right Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/114/LH/01 HT114 - Craig - Left Hand - Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/114/LH/02 HT114 - Craig - Left Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/114/RH/01 HT114 - Craig - Right Hand - Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/114/RH/02 HT114 - Craig - Right Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/120/XX/01 HT 120 - Proposed Floor Plans – Affordable Housing

1958/P/120/XX/02 HT 120 - Proposed Elevations – Affordable Housing

1958/P/125/LH/01 HT125 - Strathbeg - Left Hand – Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/125/LH/02 HT125 - Strathbeg - Left Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/125/RH/01 HT125 - Strathbeg - Right Hand – Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/125/RH/02 HT125 - Strathbeg - Right Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/133/LH/01 HT133 - Atholl - Left Hand - Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/133/LH/02 HT133 - Atholl - Left Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/133/RH/01 HT133 - Atholl - Right Hand - Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/133/RH/02 HT133 - Atholl - Right Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/136/LH/01 HT136 - Birse - Left Hand - Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/136/LH/02 HT136 - Birse - Left Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/136/RH/01 HT136 - Birse - Right Hand - Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/136/RH/02 HT136 - Birse - Right Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/139/LH/01 HT139 - Tummel - Left Hand – Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/139/LH/02 HT139 - Tummel - Left Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/139/RH/01 HT139 - Tummel - Right Hand – Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/139/RH/02 HT139 - Tummel - Right Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/148/LH/01 HT148 - Carnie - Left Hand - Proposed Floor Plans

1958/P/148/LH/02 HT148 - Carnie - Left Hand – Proposed Elevations

1958/P/148/RH/01 HT148 - Carnie - Right Hand – Proposed Floor Plans
1958/P/148/RH/02 HT148 - Carnie - Right Hand – Proposed Elevations
1958/P/170/LH/01 HT170 - Lyon - Left Hand - Proposed Floor Plans
1958/P/170/LH/02 HT170 - Lyon - Left Hand – Proposed Elevations
1958/P/170/RH/01 HT170 - Lyon - Right Hand - Proposed Floor Plans
1958/P/170/RH/02 HT170 - Lyon - Right Hand – Proposed Elevations
96596/1001 Version A Roads Layout Sheet 1 of 3
96596/1002 Road Longitudinal Sections Sheet 1 of 2
96596/1003 Road Longitudinal Sections Sheet 2 of 2
96596/1004 Version A Road Construction Details
96596/1005 Road Construction Details Sheet 2 of 2
96596/1006 Version A Kerbing Layout Sheet 1
96596/1007 Version B Kerbing Layout Sheet 2
96596/1008 Version A Vehicle Swept Paths Sheet 1 of 2
96596/1009 Version A Vehicle Swept Paths Sheet 2 of 2
96596/1500 Levels Layout Sheet 1 of 3
96596/1501 Version A Levels Layout Sheet 2 of 3
96596/1502 Version A Levels Layout Sheet 3 of 3
96596/2000 Version A Conceptual Drainage Layout
96596/2002 Version A Pre & Post Development Overland Flow Paths
96596/2950 Version B Existing Scottish Water GIS Overlay
96596/0102 Version D Proposed Junction Configuration Option 3
96596/0106 Version A Indicative Parking Locations (Rigid Truck and Large Car)