

## **Erection of a dwelling @ Land 40 Metres West of 8 Langley Park, PH2 7XB**

I refer to the above, and the LRB's request for more information concerning the ongoing LRB review.

In the order of the specific points which you have raised them, I'll like to offer the following additional comments,

- i) No specific comment required. It is ultimately a matter for the LRB to decide whether or not they have sufficient information before them to make a decision, and how much 'new' information they wish to accept and consider.
- ii) A copy of the response from the Local Plan team is attached in terms of the questions about our Open Space Strategy (OSS).
- iii) I have not seen any further information from the applicant, so I'm not able to offer specific any comment on this point. I was not aware that new information was permissible to be added during review.
- iv) As above, I have not seen any new information to review and circulate, but I understand some details have been passed to the Transport Officer direct. Her comments are attached.

In terms of other matters, I would like to comment on the interpretation of Policy 20 of the NPF4.

Part a) of Policy 20 states that 'Development proposals that result in fragmentation or net loss of existing blue and green infrastructure will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would not result in or exacerbate a deficit in blue or green infrastructure provision, and the overall integrity of the network will be maintained. The planning authority's Open Space Strategy should inform this'

The area in question has been designated as open space within the LDP2 for its visual amenity value, in a local context. It is not a functional areas of open space, which is what the OSS will largely address – once it is prepared by the Council. In light of this, it is my view that the site is not necessary not green infrastructure as such, which would normally be more applicable to functional areas of space where there is a clear public use available ie North or South Inch areas. The terms of Policy 20 and the Open Space Strategy are therefore more aimed at those functional areas of open space, as opposed to smaller ones which have perhaps visual amenity qualities for the local area, and contribute positively to the character of those areas. It may be the case that in future LDP2 it may only be larger and more functional areas which are both included within the LDP2 as 'protected areas of open space', and match those areas which are included within the Council's Open Space Strategy – however that might be a question for the LDP team.

The OSS will include an audit of all areas referred to within the strategy, and clear reasons for their inclusion with the OSS, which will inevitable then translate to the LDP to come degree. New development within areas of open space which are excluded from the OSS (and probably the LDP) would then be assessed against the more generic amenity policies of the Development Plan (such as Policies 1 and 17 of the LDP2).

You will note that conflict with Policy 1 of the LDP2 was used for this decision, and the loss of the area would have an adverse impact on the local area.

It is too early to be certain whether or not this particular site will or will not be included within the OSS or the next LDP2 as a protected area, but in the event of this review being dismissed the applicant should be making representations to the LDP2 team – as was the advice at pre-application stage

Hope this helps,

Many thanks,

Andy Baxter  
Planning Officer

## SPR Planning Local Review Body

---

**From:** Dante Sosa  
**Sent:** 14 July 2025 10:27  
**To:** Andy Baxter  
**Subject:** Re: LRB-2025-05

Morning Andy,

I was passed your enquiry as the officer responsible for the open space policy area and our strategy development.

We are in the process of preparing our first Open Space Strategy and this is expected to be finalised at the end of 2025. We are required to include all sites >0.2ha in the audit and have also included the designated open space to review ahead of LDP3.

You are correct, I've checked the LDP2 open space layer which shows the "function" of the site is landscape value. I've also found some background in LDP2's [Examination Report](#) (p. 471), please see the reporter's comments below:

*"Mount Tabor Road H169*

*6. I recognise that under Issue 1 A Successful, Sustainable Place, it has been found that there is no shortfall in meeting the housing land requirement in the Greater Perth Housing Market Area. Adequate housing land has been provided to satisfy the requirements set out in the strategic development plan. Accordingly, there is no strategic numerical justification to allocate further sites for housing within the Greater Perth Housing Market Area. The land subject to the representation is located to the south of the Murray Royal Hospital site MU336 and allocated as open space in the proposed plan. The pasture land, along with the rest of the open space allocation, provides a visual break from the residential development that has taken place in the wider surrounding area.*

*7. Housing development would detract from the rural character of the area and green network provided by the open space allocation. Although the site may not contain protected species, in general, green networks can also provide habitat and corridors for wildlife within urban areas. The land is bounded to the west by a core path but is not available for public access. It is contended to be effective and free of constraints. Nevertheless, it is a prominent green space when viewed from near the properties of The Corner House and Tabor at Muirhall Road.*

*8. Despite the existence of some tree and shrub boundary vegetation, any intensive development of the site would have an adverse effect on the setting of the category B listed Gean Cottage, which was the childhood home of Sir Patrick Geddes. Potential still exists for re-use of the land as a paddock and it has been allocated as an open space for several years, although not included in an open space audit. The site was not taken forward to the Main Issues Report stage and the proposed change of this part of the open space allocation was not the subject of full public consultation. Given the above and in particular the provision of adequate housing sites elsewhere to meet the strategic housing needs of the Greater Perth Housing Market Area, I conclude that the allocation of the land at Mount Tabor Road is not currently justified. No modification."*

It is too early to say whether this would remain designated, however I can share that the site was pre-screened out of the full open space audit. The reason given by the surveyor was that this was a private

garden with no public use or access. We still need to check the site's ecological qualities through the blue-green infrastructure audit and we also have a live survey which may provide information on whether this site is important to the community.

Generally, it is my view that designations should be given where sites have a clear public function or in cases where they are important natural spaces. Other sites may offer more value by having designations removed. There are a lot of factors (e.g. housing land requirement, community consultations) and while I will make recommendations based on the OS audit findings the decision will be down to the relevant locality officer.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Kind regards,

**Dante Sosa**

Assistant Planning Officer  
Development Plans  
Perth and Kinross Council

**LDP3 Call for Sites is now open:** Local Development Plan 3 - Call for Sites - Perth & Kinross Council  
Citizen Space - Citizen Space

