

## **Appendix 2 – Summary of applicants supporting information**

### **Planning Design Statement**

The Planning Design Statement describes the planning history for the site where planning applications have been submitted for larger scale proposals which were predominantly located outwith the development boundary for Ruthven.

It indicates that the agricultural buildings to the south of the site have been redundant for a number of years, and are in a state of disrepair. It indicates that the buildings would be demolished and the natural stone from the demolished buildings would then be re-used in the future redevelopment of the site.

It indicates that the proposal would result in significant environmental and visual improvement to the site and the surrounding area due to the demolition of the buildings which are located in the part of the site to the south of the public road. It indicates that the proposal would respect the character of the area surrounding the site, the residential properties and the listed buildings. It also indicates that the proposal would provide affordable housing and residential properties which would be of a mix of sizes and tenures.

It suggests that the proposal would be compatible with relevant policies in the development plan.

### **Structural Inspection Report**

The Structural Inspection Report indicates that the structural inspection was consisted of external viewing from floor level. It indicates that parts of the buildings which were covered, unexposed or inaccessible were not inspected.

It describes the general structure of the buildings and indicates that although the walls of the buildings appeared to be in most parts fairly plumb, the buildings have several issues and challenges which would make it difficult for them to be reused.

Building A: The A-frame roof structure would require to be strengthened. It indicates that there would be a risk of movement and instability due to one side of the double storey section of the building not having any intermediate walls and the lack of a return wall.

The circular part of the building has a poor roof structure where the support structure to the roof looks to be crude and not structurally designed. The roof is partially collapsed and the support structure to the roof dominates the internal space. The combination of no adequate floor and likely shallow foundations ensures that the walls would likely need to be fully underpinned which would be a risky and costly process.

Building B: The A-frame roof structure would require to be strengthened, and the combination of no adequate floor and likely shallow foundations ensures that the walls would likely need to be fully underpinned which would be a risky and costly process. The single storey structure with corrugated roof which adjoins the southern elevation of the building would not be suitable for further use.

Building C: The combination of no adequate floor and likely shallow foundations ensures that the walls would likely need to be fully underpinned which would be a risky and costly process.

It indicates that buildings D and E would not be structurally sound for residential use.

## **Bat Survey & Species Protection Plan**

An initial desk study was carried out which was then followed by an internal and external inspection survey of the buildings. Three dusk emergence surveys were carried out in June and July and identified that 11 bat roosts which contained 16 bats of 3 different species (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat) were observed in buildings A and B. No bat roosts were identified in building C. The proposal to demolish buildings A and B would have the potential to impact 10 non-breeding common and pipistrelle bat roosts and 1 non-breeding brown long-eared bat roost. The proposal to demolish buildings C, D and E would not have an impact on bats.

To compensate for the loss of 11 active bat roosts, a species protection plan would be produced and the developer would have to apply for a European Protected Species licence before any works which may affect the bat roosts could progress. Mitigation would be provided to compensate for the loss of bat roosts, including the provision of bat boxes.

## **Ecological Survey**

The Ecological Survey indicates that an ecological walkover survey was conducted across the site in June 2024. The results identified that no rare or otherwise notable plants or habitats, and no non-native invasive species were recorded in the site. Signs of pine marten use of the site for foraging/commuting were recorded but there were no signs of other protected mammal species such as beaver, otter, badger, red squirrel or water vole.

The results identified that the proposal would have no impact on ancient woodland, the River Tay Special Area of Conservation, the Den of Airlie Site of Special Scientific Interest, or the Den of Alyth Site of Special Scientific Interest.

A number of recommendations are proposed which includes (amongst other things) retaining the mature hedge which is located in the part of the site to the north of the public road; retaining the mature trees in the site where possible; restricting the working hours in the site; raising awareness with the site operators that species such as pine marten may be present in the site; covering all exposed pipes and trenches; and the requirement for a nesting bird check if works would commence within the main bird breeding season between March – August.