



Steve Rogers – Head of Planning & Building Standards Services
 Kirkbank, English Street, Dumfries, DG1 2HS
 Telephone (01387) 260199 - Direct Dial Fax (01387) 260188

Planning Applications Committee Report

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING FORMATION OF ACCESS ROAD AND LANDSCAPING AT LAND OPPOSITE QUEENSBERRY BRAE, THORNHILL

Application Type: Planning Permission in Principle

Applicant: Queensberry Properties Ltd

Ref. No.: 09/P/3/0355

Recommendation - Refuse

Ward - Mid and Upper Nithsdale

Hierarchy Type (if applicable) - Major

Case Officer - Patrick Hanna

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Under the Scheme of Delegation, this application requires to be considered by the Planning Applications Committee because the proposal is defined as 'Major' development as prescribed under the terms of the Town and Country Planning (Hierarchy of Development) (Scotland) Regulations 2009. The Planning Etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 (Saving and Transitional Provisions) Order 2009 states that applications made before 3 August 2009 but determined on or after that date will need to meet the criteria specified in the new Development Management Procedure Regulations.

1.2 The application site comprises an area of agricultural land of some 5.2 hectares. The site forms the western half of a larger field unit, which is contained to the north and west by woodland strips (known as Boatbrae Wood), to the east by Thornhill Hospital and Hospital Brae, and to the south by the B731. The eastern boundary of the application site itself is undefined. The application site is topographically complex, with areas of steeply sloping ground around the north-eastern corner, the central section of the northern boundary, and the south. The site is currently accessed via a small field gate in the south-west corner of the site. A Scheduled Ancient Monument (noted as a Roman fort, but now thought to be a pre-historic homestead) lies just outwith the eastern boundary of the application site.

1.3 The proposal is for planning permission in principle for residential development. The application site comprises Phase 1, and the remainder of the larger field unit (outwith the application site boundary) is noted indicatively as Phase 2. Detailed information relating to road construction and landscaping has been supplied in respect of the access provision, which runs from Kinnell Street through the woodland strip to the north-east of the site.

1.4 Following submission of the original full application, the applicant was advised of officer's serious concerns regarding the proposal. Rather than withdrawing the application, the applicant requested the opportunity to explore the key issues further. The application was subsequently amended from a fully detailed application to planning permission in principle only, with the originally submitted layout and design now to be considered as indicative only.

1.5 The following documents have been submitted in support of the application:- Planning and Design Statement; Pre-Development Tree Survey, Landscape Report for Proposed New Access through Boatbrae Wood, Archaeological Assessment Report, Protected Species Survey, photomontages and Community Engagement Report.

1.6 A northern section of the application site, comprising an area of some 4.2ha, is identified in the Nithsdale Local Plan as part of reserved housing land MN4a Extension to West of Hospital Brae. The remainder of the application site to the south, comprising an area of some 1ha, is identified as part of housing land MN4 West of Hospital Brae. The boundary woodlands wrapping around the north and west of the application site are identified as Areas of Local Environmental Importance (General Policy 43) and Safeguarded Amenity Open Space and Play Areas (General Policy 79). This area is classified as Ancient Woodland. The smaller cluster of woodland to the far south of the application site also forms part of the Area of Local Environmental Importance. The application site falls within the Thornhill Regional Scenic Area.

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Thornhill Community Council:- Objection.

(a) The entrance is unsatisfactory given the current road layout. The exit means that five road points will converge: Townhead Street (South), Townhead Street (North), Cairnkinna Crescent, Kinnell Street, and the new access. Major road upgrading is necessary prior to any planning approval.

(b) Although it is intended that traffic from the new site should proceed upwards into Thornhill, this simply will not happen. Human nature being what it is, will mean that there will be significant traffic to and from the site from the Dumfries side via the Penpont road and up Hospital Brae. These roads are totally inadequate to support two-way traffic. Again, road upgradings are required prior to any planning approval (e.g. one-way traffic on the bottom Penpont road, from Highways corner to Hospital Brae). Why cannot road access to the site be from the bottom road (near to Boatbrae Wood) rather than Townhead Street?

(c) The proposed entrance will interfere with the Core Paths Network Scheme, unless common sense prevails and site access is from the bottom road.

(d) The planning application, if approved, will necessitate the loss of the wooded area. Such loss requires reinstatement elsewhere by the developer. How and where is such reinstatement to take place?

(e) The wooded area lost (near to Townhead Street, Kinnell Street, Hospital Brae) includes areas of important wildlife, including red squirrel habitat. Also, there are bats present - a protected species.

(f) The development, when completed in its entirety, would put unacceptable pressure on local education facilities. The new Wallace Hall Academy will already be near to capacity. How will it cope with a large additional influx of pupils as this housing development will produce (together with the 2 other proposed housing developments for the village)? Another 200-300 additional pupils is the possible outcome, with which current school facilities will not cope.

(g) Unacceptable pressure will be placed on local Health Services, with a further 700-800 people in the area when the various developments are completed. Has this been thought through, particularly in the light of the local Health Board's preferred intention of reducing health facilities in the area e.g. via their preferred option of the closure of Thornhill Hospital?

(h) Are local water and sewerage facilities adequate to cope with this particular development?

2.2 Council Landscape Architect:- Comments as follows.

Response to amended proposal

(a) Creating an access point through this wooded, steep-sloping hillside will be detrimental to the landscape and setting of the main settlement.

(b) However, if this is the only viable access point and development has to take place, then the following comments should be taken into account:

- (i) Several large trees are shown for retention; this should retain an impression of continuous woodland cover when viewed from across the valley to the south, provided all trees indicated for retention can be saved.
- (ii) Several trees to be retained in the vicinity of the road require an element of formative or restorative pruning. This should be undertaken as a condition of development since the proximity of a road and an increase in footfall close to the trees increases potential risks associated with e.g. limb fall.
- (iii) Proposals to move toward a 'woodland ride' rather than a fully engineered road are welcomed, however the planting layout plan shows what appear be bollards and an Armco barrier; Suggests consideration be given to using timber bollards and setting the barrier behind the first layer of planting to soften its visual impact whilst retaining the security of a substantial barrier.
- (iv) The Landscape Report suggests tree T9 (a beech; *Fagus sylvatica*) is in good condition. It goes on to say that it 'should be reviewed in the context and likely extent of impact the proposed road construction works (e.g. excavations and compaction) will realistically have on its health and stability.' This tree appears to be roughly the same distance from the proposed kerblines as T14 which is to be retained, so there is no obvious reason why it could not be retained. There should be a clear stated intention to retain and protect this tree and its associated root zone, otherwise construction activities will inevitably cause damage. This places an onus on the road designers to work with the tree rather than ignore it.
- (v) Retention of tree T14 (beech; *Fagus sylvatica*) is also important since the loss of T12 and potentially T9 will leave a significant gap.
- (vi) Appropriate and effective protection of trees to be retained will be vital. This should be in accordance with BS5837 2005: 'Trees in Relation to Construction', including using heras fencing, supported by rigid scaffolding (there is a drawing and specification for this in the BS) to protect identified root protection zones.
- (vii) Proposals for including hedgerow planting are welcomed but the mix includes several large, spreading species. It is important these are planted at least 3metres from back of pavement, with smaller low-growing/ground cover species to the front. This should be included in a detailed planting plan.
- (viii) Proposals to use locally-occurring native tree species, and for understorey planting, are welcomed.
- (ix) Proposals to improve the existing woodland walk, and use this as an alternative to pavements to both sides of the access road, are welcomed.

(c) Notwithstanding the above and previous comments made by the Landscape Architecture service, there is no reason to object to the proposals.

Response to original scheme

(a) Boatbrae Wood is important to the amenity, character, and setting of the settlement of Thornhill which is an important element in the justification for General Policy 43. On this basis, there is an argument to resist the development of the access road.

(b) General Policy 79 states that there will be a general presumption against development that could give rise to the loss of amenity space. This amenity space is an established woodland with trees which have taken decades to grow. Its main benefit is as an almost continuous woodland feature which 'protects' the heart of the original settlement. This value will be compromised by being split by an access road, especially as it will cut through the belt at an angle and by means of an artificial landform rather than following a natural break (such as the route followed by Queensberry Road). It is doubted that the woodland is surplus to requirements. The benefit to the community is both as a visual amenity (i.e. a green backdrop, and all other benefits associated with trees and woodland near to housing areas) plus an open space for exercise and recreation. Woodlands take decades to develop so it is difficult to argue that there would be any community benefit in replanting another area.

(c) Development of the main part of the site should not impact on Boatbrae Wood other than through more intensive use as an amenity space. However, given the clear issues relating to General Policies 43 and 79, it is suggested that consideration be given to using an alternative access point to avoid cutting through the existing woodland.

2.3 SNH:- No objections.

Responses to amended proposal

(a) 1 June 2011:- SNH have reviewed the revised landscape proposals for the new access road, and are now satisfied that the impact to existing ancient woodland element will be minimised by the proposals and satisfactorily compensated for by the proposed additional planting on the slopes of the road and by infilling gaps created by previous felling with approximately 70 new trees. SNH would strongly advise that all new planting - both trees and shrubs should be native Scottish species of local origin.

(b) 29 March 2010:- The preferred SNH option is for an alternative access route to be used. If, however, no alternative route can be found and the roadway results in a permanent loss of the area of Inventory Woodland then consider that the proposed mitigation would be an appropriate measure to mitigate these impacts.

Response to original scheme

(a) A pre-development tree survey for the above development states that 10 mature trees will be removed as a result of the construction of the access road and that a further 10 trees will be removed irrespective of the development. The survey notes that there will be negligible ecological loss through the removal of these trees due to the species present and the very low ecological value of the ground flora under these trees due to dumping.

(b) Despite the findings of this report, SNH still has concerns regarding the removal of this area of Ancient Woodland for development of the access road. Only 1.2% of Great Britain is ancient semi-natural woodland, a valuable and irreplaceable natural resource as such its conservation is important. The tree report states that 10 trees will be removed irrespective of the development, however because of the development these trees will not be replaced after felling as would normally be expected in an area of woodland, therefore the actual loss due to development will be 20 trees. The survey also states that there will be negligible ecological loss through removal of these trees. However 7 out of 20 of these trees are native species including several oak, willow and elm, and during a recent visit by SNH, a number of native species including bluebell, holly, elder, ivy, bramble, foxglove, herb-robert and bugle were identified within the ground flora and scrub layer within the area to be felled despite a small amount of dumping and garden waste also being present.

(c) The area of woodland to be felled has a greater ecological value than that stated within the survey report, particularly as it forms part of a larger belt of Ancient Woodland as detailed on the "Ancient Woodland Inventory" which stretches from the A76 to the B731 and on around the west side of Thornhill, (presently broken only by Townhead Street) and is likely to act as an important wildlife corridor.

(d) In addition a path exists within this area of woodland which is identified in Dumfries and Galloway's final draft core paths plan (path number 4438) presumably due to its popularity with Thornhill residents. This is recognised in the Nithsdale Local Plan in which this area is covered by General Policy 79 - safeguarding amenity open spaces and play areas.

(e) SNH note that the housing area is identified for development in the Nithsdale Local Plan. However, planning policies are in place to protect the area of woodland proposed to be felled for the access road. SNH recommend that the existing Local Plan policies should apply and that an alternative access point for the development should be sought which would not result in loss of ancient woodland and part of a proposed core path.

2.4 Historic Scotland:- Comment as follows.

(a) The proposed development lies within the vicinity of Templand Mains, Roman Signal Station 770M NNW of Dumfries and Galloway scheduled as being of national importance under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.

(b) The setting of scheduled monuments must be taken into account when assessing development proposals. The Council should therefore be satisfied that the applicant has fully considered the particular setting of the scheduled monument known as Templand Mains, Roman Signal Station, in relation to the proposed development. On the basis of the information submitted, it is difficult to ascertain that this has been carried out.

(c) While Historic Scotland acknowledge the archaeological assessment by CFA Archaeology, no specific reference to the setting of this monument is made on the document. It is important that setting is shown to have been considered in all such cases, even if it is then determined that the setting is not significant or affected. Such a conclusion should be clearly expressed as part of the assessment.

(d) The monument sits on top of a low natural mound and, rather than Roman, it is now thought more likely to be the remains of a prehistoric homestead. It survives as a circular crop mark visible on aerial photographs set within a rural landscape.

(e) The proposed development will enclose the site of the scheduled ancient monument, and while a buffer zone of green space is to be created, this is straight-edged on two sides in contrast to the curvature of the site.

2.5 Council Archaeologist:- No objections, subject to conditions.

(a) There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument within the development site. This comprises buried features recorded through aerial photography of crop marks that are interpreted as the remains of a Roman signal station. The masterplan shows the designated area and a buffer of open space around it unaffected by the development. Historic Scotland were consulted and have not raised an objection to the proposal although they appear to question the shape of the open space around the designated area, and ask to be reconsulted when further information on the setting of the site is submitted. Accordingly, the site and setting is adequately protected by the design of the scheme and there are no grounds for objection relative to Structure Plan Policy E12, subject to conditions protecting the designated area.

(b) The application was accompanied by a report by CFA archaeology Limited (Report no. 1496) that comprised an archaeological desk based assessment, as recommended by the site guidance accompanying policy MN4: West of Hospital Brae. This report identified a number of potential archaeological features within the site. These are not assessed as being of sufficient significance to require evaluation by archaeological excavation prior to determination. However, it is recommended that the area where feature number 5 was

recorded in that report is subject to a scheme of archaeological investigation (by condition) in advance of, or potentially during, development in order to record any items of archaeological interest prior to destruction through the development.

(c) The scheme of management of the open spaces within the development must take account of the presence and management needs of the designated area and the requirements of the legislation. It is recommended that permitted development rights are removed from all open space, and that the developer submit a management scheme for approval by the planning authority in consultation with the Council Archaeologist.

2.6 Transport Scotland:- No objections.

2.7 Council Roads Officer:- No objections, subject to conditions.

(a) It is noted that this planning proposal is now 'detailed' in respect of the proposed access road through Boatbrae Wood and 'permission in principle' in respect of the proposed Phase 1 housing development including roads, landscaping and SuDS (as shown on 'Proposed Masterplan Phase 1 and 2', drawing no. 25738(02)003 Rev A dated April 2001).

(b) The application boundary includes areas identified in the Nithsdale Local Plan as General Policy 79 (Safeguarding Amenity Open Space and Play Areas), MN4 (50 dwelling units allocated) and MN4a (reserved housing land), and lies to the west of the C134n Queensberry Brae public road and is bounded in turn to the west and south by the B731 public road.

(c) It should be noted that the roads within this proposed development will be subject to Road Construction Consent and will require a Traffic Regulation Order to restrict the speed of all traffic to 20mph within the development site to have been promoted (prior to commencement of any construction works on the site) and thereafter implemented prior to the occupation of any of the dwellinghouses, all at the applicant's expense.

Proposed Access Road through Boatbrae Wood

(d) Whilst the Local Plan identifies land for development, access to it from the C134n public road is severely restricted and this proposal includes a new access road through Boatbrae Wood and a realignment of the existing junction of Kinnell Street and Queensberry Brae.

(e) The line of the proposed new road requires substantial ground works and engineering in order to comply with Council standards. The drawings 73693/1020 through 1023 show:-

- A satisfactory junction with Queensberry Brae
- A satisfactory realignment of Kinnell Street
- A satisfactory vertical and horizontal alignment
- A footway on the north-west side of the proposed road
- Throttles to control speed located at strategic crossing points
- Vehicle restraint system in vicinity of ground retaining structure

This proposal therefore addresses in engineering terms the difficulties associated with providing an adoptable access to this site.

(f) Whilst there is no objection in principle to the proposed access road, it should be noted that as roads drainage from the proposed access road is to outfall to a SuDS in Phase 1, no Road Construction Consent will be issued until full design details of the SuDS and site drainage scheme have been approved in writing by the roads authority.

Phase 1 Development

(a) Further development is required of the internal road layout, drainage and SuDS for Phase 1. Therefore no planning permission should be granted in respect of these matters.

- (b) Given the future development potential of land in this area south of Thornhill and in order to protect future connectivity / strategic links, it would be appropriate that this larger area be subject to Masterplanning and a Development Brief including Design Code.
- (c) Current Council standards indicate provision of 2 car parking spaces within each house plot and it should be noted that any proposed or future garage shall be located a minimum of 6 metres behind the heel of any footway, verge or service strip.
- (d) It is noted that a permanent SuDS pond is proposed and it would be appropriate therefore that any future application include:-
- Details of the overall drainage strategy across the site
 - A drainage impact Assessment with calculations for sizing of SuDS feature (including the return periods being catered for)
 - Details of the SuDS outfall
 - Clarification of who will be responsible for the future maintenance of the SuDS
- (e) It is understood that roads surface water should be subject to 2 stages of treatment. It should also be noted that road surface water SuDS may require additional land take. Prior to commenting in detail upon any SuDS proposal the roads service will require to be provided with copies of SEPA and Scottish Water consultation responses.
- (f) The landowner / developer will need to enter into a legal agreement which will form a part of the SuDS Maintenance Agreement. This will place responsibility for the construction and maintenance of the SuD system with the owners and then in the event of the road being adopted the owners grant the Council as roads authority the right to discharge roads surface water into the SuD system.
- (g) It is understood that the phasing of the proposed development will be subject to further agreement with the developer.

2.8 Council Strategic Housing Services:- No objections, subject to conditions. Thornhill is a priority area under the Local Housing Strategy so the affordable housing policy should be applied here.

2.9 Council Access Officer:- Comment as follows:-
There is a claimed right of way which is also a proposed core path route to the north of this proposed development.

2.10 Council Land and Street Services:- No objections, subject to conditions.
(a) A development of 65 dwellings should provide 3250m² of public open space consisting of 1300m² of passive open space and 1958m² of active open space. This should include an equipped play area for all ages and an informal ball games area of 500m².
[NB - The amended application does not specify number of dwellings]
(b) Further clarity on locations and the specification of equipment is required.

2.11 Contaminated Land Officer:- No objections.
The historical maps show nothing of concern on the site or on the immediate adjoining land. There are no contaminated land issues with the development.

2.12 SEPA:- No objections.
(a) Foul drainage must be discharged to the public sewerage system. It is the responsibility of Scottish Water to ensure that the additional flow arising from this development will not cause or contribute to the premature operation of consented storm overflows.
(b) SEPA advise that the proposed discharge be in accordance with the requirements of the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2005 (as amended).

(c) SEPA advise that surface water from the site is treated in accordance with the principles of the SuDS Manual (C607) by CIRIA.

2.13 **Scottish Water**:- No objections.

(a) Due to the size of this proposed development, it is necessary for Scottish Water to assess the impact this new demand will have on their existing infrastructure.

(b) The water network that serves the proposed development is currently able to supply the new demand.

(c) Kettleton Water Treatment Works has limited capacity available for new demand. The developer should discuss their development directly with Scottish Water.

(d) Thornhill Wastewater Treatment Works at present has limited capacity to serve this new demand. The developer should discuss the implications directly with Scottish Water. Initial investigations have highlighted that there may be a requirement for the developer to carry out works on the local network to ensure there is no loss of service to existing customers.

3 **REPRESENTATIONS**

A total of **100 representations** were received objecting to the application. A list of these parties is included in **Appendix 1**.

3.1 Following receipt of the amended proposal, all representors were invited to make further comment. Two letters of further objection were received, and one letter of objection was withdrawn. The grounds of objection can be summarised as follows:-

Council policy

(a) Surprise that this is presented as complying with the Council's development plan.

(b) Will there be any stipulations as to the proposed number of houses that will be permitted on the site? Also are there any requirements with regard to public and amenity areas?

Servicing and infrastructure

(c) The current population of Thornhill is approximately 1700. This development will likely add approximately 23% to the population. With the old school flats, an increase of approx. 30%. This increase could change the character of the village due to its sudden growth.

(d) Where are the future householders going to work as there is no employment in the area. They will need to commute adding more cars to a dangerous road, also adding to the effects of additional fuel emissions.

(e) An increase of this size in such a short time is likely to be more than the new school and the existing Health Centre can cater for.

(f) The entire infrastructure of Thornhill would be overwhelmed by this large development.

(g) The water treatment plant serving Thornhill is running at maximum capacity.

Access and road safety

(h) The access to Phase 1 of the proposed development could be dangerous as it is through a wooded area off a steep hill on Townhead Street.

(i) The access roads will add some extra 250 cars (500 journeys), all using Townhead Street, West Morton Street or Cairnkinna Crescent.

(j) Townhead Street narrows down to only 5m wide at a very bad Y-junction with West Morton Street and dangerously near the corner. Residents of the development travelling north would exacerbate the bottleneck at this junction.

(k) The Council should make an order for Townhead Street to be closed to all traffic in excess of one tonne from the junction with Queensberry Beeches southward to the B731

road, in order to safeguard pedestrians at its narrowest point. Townhead Street to be made one way for permitted traffic from Queensberry Beeches southward to the B731 road with a maximum speed limit of 20 mph, in order to remove the risk of increased traffic approaching the Queensberry Beeches junction which has a sight-line obstruction from the south.

(l) Cairnkinna Crescent enters the A76 at a bad bend on a hill with poor sightlines each way. The Crescent road is only 5.3m wide and there are a large number of parked cars, there being no room for off street car parking.

(m) Townhead Street will need to be widened to take the traffic from Phase 2 of the development ideally down to B731 and a new road to link with the A76.

(n) The junction between the B731 and the A76 is a very dangerous junction. Residents of the development travelling south would use this junction.

(o) The southern entry to the development site to be from the B731 with the creation of a roundabout at this point, in order to reduce the speed of traffic using the B731 and create a two lane route through the new estate for all local traffic to approach or leave the town centre, and to remove the proposed access and egress point in Townhead Street.

(p) Hospital Brae is a very busy single track road. Vehicles have to use residential driveways as passing places.

(q) Why is the land to the north of Rigi and south of the hospital not being used for the access?

(r) On-street parking for residents of Kinnell Street will be restricted by the new access. The new access is directly adjacent to the driveway to 68 Kinnell Street. Do sightlines satisfy current standards?

(s) Lack of provision for pedestrian crossing of new access.

Woodland

(t) The woodland belt is protected and should not be destroyed. It is classed by SNH as ancient woodland. Thornhill has long been renowned for its tree lined streets and surrounding native woodlands.

Archaeology

(u) The monument in the middle of the site is a pre-historic homestead and is a nationally important site. The development appears to encroach upon this.

Natural heritage

(v) There are red squirrels, bats, owls and birds in the wooded areas surrounding the development and the works as proposed will have an effect on their habitat.

[NB – additional comments were also made in respect of construction traffic, construction noise, and disruption to patients in the adjacent hospital. However, these are not material considerations which the Council as planning authority can take into account when determining this application.]

4 REPORT

Relevant development plan policies:-

**Dumfries & Galloway Structure Plan
D36 - Design of Development
E2 - Regional Scenic Areas**

E6 - Conservation of Habitats & Species
E12 - Development Affecting Archaeological Sites
E13 - Archaeologically Sensitive Areas

Nithsdale Local Plan

General Policy 1 - Development Principle
General Policy 2 - Development Considerations
General Policy 3 - Settlement Boundaries
General Policy 6 - Land Reserved for Long Term Development
General Policy 7 - Siting & Design
General Policy 18 - Provision of Open Space in Residential Developments
General Policy 20 - Affordable Housing
General Policy 42 - Regional Scenic Areas
General Policy 43 - Areas of Local Environmental Importance
General Policy 54 - Known Archaeological Sites - Including Scheduled Ancient Monuments
General Policy 55 - Archaeologically Sensitive Areas
General Policy 57 - Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)
General Policy 60 - Water Sewerage & Drainage Provision
General Policy 79 - Safeguarding Amenity Open Space & Play Areas

Policy MN4: West of Hospital Brae (50 units allocated)

Policy MN4a: Extension to West of Hospital Brae (reserved housing land)

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) is also a material consideration

4.1 Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended by the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006, requires that:- *“Where, in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination is, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, to be made in accordance with that plan”.*

4.2 When determining applications, the Council is required to consider the overall aims and objectives of the development plan as well the above subject policies. The guiding principle of the Dumfries & Galloway Structure Plan is to encourage the growth and development of sustainable communities in Dumfries & Galloway. To achieve this, the following aims have been set out for the Structure Plan:-

- To support development of the local economy
- To support urban and rural communities
- To support and protect the natural and built environment
- To make best use of services and facilities

4.3 A small section of the application site (some 20%) is allocated for housing under Nithsdale Local Plan Policy MN4. The policy provides detailed site guidance as follows:- *‘The site has a south and westerly aspect, is located within the shelterbelt bounding Thornhill to the south and foul and surface water drainage can be provided. Before development can take place access issues will require to be resolved particularly in relation to Hospital Brae. On the north part of the site there exists the remains of a Roman signal station which is designated as a nationally important Scheduled Ancient Monument. Before development can take place within the wider site area any developer will be required to safeguard the archaeological remains identified within the site, to the*

satisfaction of Historic Scotland and the Council. To achieve this a development framework will be required. This will need to be informed by the results of an archaeological evaluation of areas outwith the Scheduled area. This framework should address the comprehensive development of the site and illustrate how the Scheduled area can be safeguarded in any future development.'

4.4 The larger part of the application site (some 80%) is identified as reserved housing land (MN4a). The justification for this policy states that:-

'The site is reserved for long term development and will only be considered for release during the Plan period if the development of the Hospital Brae land cannot be achieved.'

4.5 In terms of the fundamental principle of the development, the above policies raise the following issues:-

- Can the Scheduled Ancient Monument be adequately protected?
- Can access to Hospital Brae be resolved?
- Is there sufficient justification to release reserved housing land (MN4a) before the development of the allocated housing land (MN4)?

4.6 In addition to the principle of development, and notwithstanding that this is an application for planning permission in principle, consideration must be given to following aspects of the proposal:-

- Can access be appropriately accommodated through an Area of Local Environmental Importance (General Policy 43)?
- Can access be appropriately accommodated through a Safeguarded Amenity Open Space and Play Area (General Policy 79)?
- Road safety and traffic management
- Open space
- Natural heritage
- Affordable housing
- Servicing

4.7 Finally, consideration should be given to the following material considerations and discussion documents:-

- Scottish Planning Policy
- Other representations

Can the Scheduled Ancient Monument be adequately protected?

4.8 The Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) within the centre of the field is formally identified as Templand Mains Roman Signal Station although Historic Scotland now consider that it may be the remains of a pre-historic homestead. The monument sits on top of a low natural mound, but there is no visual indication of its presence above ground; the site is improved pasture land as is the rest of the field. There are no direct impacts on the SAM, and both Historic Scotland and the Council's Archaeologist have no objections in this respect.

4.9 Historic Scotland have commented that no reference has been made by the archaeological report to indirect effects, i.e. the impact on the setting of the SAM. Given that the proposal has subsequently been amended to an application for planning permission in principle, this is not currently necessary. However, this will require assessment at the detailed stage, when an appropriate buffer of open space should be provided around the SAM.

Can access between MN4 and Hospital Brae be resolved?

4.10 Policy MN4 acknowledges the difficulties in accessing the allocated site. It clearly states that access issues, particularly to Hospital Brae, will need to be resolved before development commences.

4.11 Access to MN4 presents significant difficulties for the following reasons:-

- The width of Hospital Brae is restricted along the four existing dwellings between Rigi and Nithview, preventing travel from the site to the north towards Thornhill. It is understood that, when developing these plots, options to widen the road on all four plots were not retained (three of which have submitted objections to the proposal)
- Access to the south, from the B731, would encourage traffic to use the extremely dangerous A76 / B731 junction. The existing field gate to the south-west of the site has extremely poor visibility due to the curvature of the road, and would not be suitable for a development of this scale.
- Access to the south, without provision of suitable access to the north, would result in the proposed development being isolated and disconnected from Thornhill.

4.12 From the context of the site and from the above access constraints, it can be reasonably assumed that the Local Plan intended access to MN4 to be taken from Hospital Brae, either via hospital land, or from the south of Nithview by means of road widening between Rigi and Nithview.

4.13 The applicant considers that access between MN4 and Hospital Brae cannot be achieved and, as a result, proposes instead to access MN4a reserved housing land. The design statement notes that the access to the north is located where the gradient allows. The design statement also indicates an exit point fixed by the requirement to eventually continue a route to the A76.

4.14 As a result of officers expressing serious concerns about this proposed access (see below discussion), the applicant has explored the opportunity of gaining access through the land between Thornhill Hospital and Rigi. The applicant controls a 9 metre wide strip of land here. However, extensive discussions have concluded that this strip is not in itself wide enough to accommodate the necessary two-way road, footpath and visibility splays for a development of this scale. Additional land would be required, which is understood to be owned by the NHS. Negotiations between the applicant and the landowner have been undertaken, but the applicant has advised that no agreement has been reached.

4.15 Overall, it is considered that satisfactory access to MN4 is unlikely to be resolved without further land assembly; this may involve obtaining additional land at Thornhill Hospital or along Hospital Brae between Rigi and Nithview. As such, it has not yet been demonstrated that access issues between MN4 (allocated housing site) and Hospital Brae have been resolved.

Is there sufficient justification to release reserved housing land (MN4a) before the development of the allocated housing land (MN4)?

4.16 MN4a is identified as reserved housing land. General Policy 6 states that reserved sites shall be safeguarded for the future development specified in relation to the land. The justification for Policy MN4a states that the reserved housing land will only be considered for release during the Plan period where development of allocated housing site MN4 cannot be achieved. The Plan period would normally be considered to run for 5 years,

from adoption in 2006 until 2011. Accordingly, the Plan period is considered to have passed in this instance and the release of MN4a is therefore acceptable, in principle.

4.17 Notwithstanding this, the provision of an access to MN4a is also difficult, because the allocated site does not directly bound any road. The boundaries to the north and west are defined by mature woodland and footpaths protected under General Policies 43 and 79, and the southern boundary marks the delineation between MN4a and MN4. The east of the site is largely occupied by the hospital, allocated as General Policy 75 (Safeguarding of Land for Community Facilities), with the exception of a small strip of land associated with the Hospital Cottage. As such, it can be reasonably assumed that the Local Plan intended access to MN4a to be taken via MN4 or via hospital land.

Can access be appropriately accommodated through an Area of Local Environmental Importance (General Policy 43)?

4.18 The proposed access is drawn through a strip of protected woodland between the application site and Kinnel Street to the north. This woodland is identified as an Area of Local Environmental Importance (General Policy 43). It is also Ancient Woodland, meaning that the site has been continuously wooded, at least since 1750. General Policy 43 states that there will normally be a presumption against development having a materially adverse effect on Areas of Local Environmental Importance defined on the Inset Maps. It states that these protected areas not only have an amenity value, but that many are important to the natural or cultural heritage of the settlement, and are valued by the local community. Furthermore, it is noted that such areas may help to further the Council's biodiversity and habitat objectives. Reference to this woodland strip is made in Nithsdale Local Plan, which comments that Thornhill and its approaches are characterised and enhanced by a fine landscape setting and shelterbelts of mixed woodland. The woodland provides a shelter belt which protects the setting of the town and, at this point, contains a variety of mature trees, including Sessile Oak, Hornbeam, Lime, Beech, Willow, Elm, and Sycamore. Most of the trees are between 20 and 30m in height. SNH have noted that a number of native ground flora species including bluebell, holly, elder, ivy, bramble, foxglove, herb-robert and bugle were identified within the scrub layer within the application site area. The woodland strip is between 43m and 57m deep within the application site, and is very steeply sloping down from Kinnell Street to the site, with a drop of some 13m. This results in an existing ground gradient of up to 1 in 3.

4.19 The proposal would involve the provision of a new vehicular road through the woodland. In addition to General Policy 43 above, the new road would need to comply with General Policies 1 and 7 which require the siting and design of development to be in keeping with the character of the locality. Due to the steepness of the site, a very heavily engineered road is required, raised above existing ground levels by as much as 6.5m, on an artificial landform with steep embankments either side and a retaining wall of over 3.5m in height. The steepness of the proposed road has resulted in the need to provide three pedestrian rest areas along the footpath. The embankments to both sides of the proposed road will have a slope of 1 in 2, dropping by up to 6.5m. The south side of the proposed road would require a 36m long vehicle restraint barrier. Of the 32 trees within the application site, 20 would be removed (14 trees would be removed along the proposed road route, and an additional 6 elsewhere removed for health and safety reasons). Proposals include provision for new tree planting on the embankment slopes and within woodland gaps, as well as mitigation in the form of upgrading of the existing footpath and replacement planting at the western edge of Gallows Brae field (between Gill Road and Boat Brae).

4.20 The Council Landscape Architect has confirmed that the preferred option would be for an alternative access to be provided elsewhere, in order to retain the woodland belt at this point. SNH have stepped back from a similar position, and now raise no objection (this is consistent with SNH's current policy to only object on matters of national interest). Where no alternative access can be provided elsewhere, the mitigation schemes are acceptable in landscaping terms (it should be noted that the Council Landscape Architect's response is predicated on the submitted landscape drawing which shows the retention of one key 30m high beech tree (no. 14) close to the proposed road, when, in fact, the detailed tree survey shows that this is to be removed).

4.21 The key question, in planning terms, is whether the development would have a materially adverse effect on the Area of Local Environmental Importance. At present, the protected area offers a nearly continuous shelterbelt of mixed woodland, broken only by Hospital Brae, a gap of just 10m. The proposal would, to a large extent, remove a further 100m of the central section of the shelterbelt. Whilst it is acknowledged that 12 of the 32 trees are intended to be retained, the overall character of the protected area would be fundamentally and adversely affected. The existing woodland character would be lost, with the proposed access road becoming the visually dominant feature of the area. This dominance would be exacerbated by the traversing of the protected area at an angle, and the creation of an artificial landform with steep embankments of up to 6m in height to accommodate the road.

4.22 In conclusion, the proposal would result in a contrived, heavily engineered and visually over-dominant access road, raised up significantly above existing ground levels on an artificial landform with steep embankments, within the central section of an Ancient Woodland shelterbelt, such that it would have a materially adverse effect on an Area of Local Environmental Importance, contrary to Nithsdale Local Plan General Policies 1, 7 and 43.

Can access be appropriately accommodated through a Safeguarded Amenity Open Space and Play Area (General Policy 79)?

4.23 The woodland is popular for use as a recreational woodland walk and, as such, is identified as a Safeguarded Amenity Open Space and Play Area (General Policy 79). This established and well trodden path runs for approximately 1km up to the junction at Nith Bridge / Boat Brae. The path forms part of a proposed Core Path from the A76 running the full length of the woodland belt and then north over Boat Brae and ending at Gill Road.

4.24 General Policy 79 states that there will be a general presumption against development that would give rise to a loss of informal play facilities or amenity open space including the larger areas shown on the Proposals Map. Development will only be permitted where :-

- (a) the amenity open space can best be retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site; or
- (b) the amenity open space is shown to be surplus to requirements within a locality or alternative provision or equivalent community benefit can be made available in the locality; or
- (c) there would be an overall community gain.

The policy further states that amenity open space in this context is generally considered to include public parks and gardens, and grassy areas in urban housing estates. Accordingly it is important to consider the impact of the proposal on both the footpath itself and the wider amenity of the woodland.

4.25 In terms of criterion (c) above, it is not accepted that the proposals would represent a genuine overall community gain. It is also considered inappropriate to use criterion (b) in this instance as the proposal involves destruction of an irreplaceable asset. Whilst the relocation of a playground may be perfectly acceptable under this criterion, the intrinsic value of Ancient Woodland is in its location and its maturity; relocation or alternative provision elsewhere would mean accepting that loss.

4.26 To address criterion (a) above, the developer is proposing to extend the footpath further to the north. This would involve the planting of a new woodland at Gallows Brae field, through which the proposed footpath would travel. However, the proposed new footpath runs parallel to, and within close proximity of, a proposed Core Path. Accordingly, the proposed new path offers minimal new recreational benefit. Furthermore, in terms of the wider amenity of the woodland, the proposal would result in the loss of a key section of Ancient Woodland within the urban area, as discussed under General Policy 43 above. One of the real merits of the existing woodland is the fact that it offers an almost continuous shelterbelt, and erosion of the central section of this would adversely affect this amenity. On that basis, the proposal fails to comply with General Policy 79.

4.27 In conclusion, the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Nithsdale Local Plan General Policy 79 in that (a) it has not been demonstrated that the amenity footpath can best be retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site, (b) it would result in the loss of a safeguarded amenity footpath within the central section of an Ancient Woodland shelterbelt, for which no satisfactory alternative amenity footpath provision can be made and, (c) it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would result in an overall community gain.

Road safety and traffic management

4.28 Notwithstanding the above concerns in respect of the visual appearance of the proposed road, the access to the site is acceptable in technical terms. The roads officer has commented that the engineering requirements have been met, but notes that substantial ground works are required to achieve appropriate standards. Further development would be required of the proposed indicative internal road layout, drainage and SuDS for Phase 1.

4.29 Representations have been made in respect of the constrained road network within Thornhill that would serve the site, notably at the junction between West Morton Street and Townhead, and the junction between Cairnkinna Crescent and the A76. The road to the south also leads to an unsatisfactory junction between the B731 and the A76. The roads officer has raised no concerns on these grounds but, instead, has commented that, given the future development potential of land in this area south of Thornhill and in order to protect future connectivity / strategic links, it would be appropriate that this larger area be subject to Masterplanning. This would offer the opportunity to address these constrained junctions.

Open space

4.30 The application is for planning permission in principle; the detailed layout would need to indicate provision of open space in accordance with the Council's standard requirements. These are currently set out in SPG No.1: Open Space in New Residential Developments. For 51-100 dwellings, 50m² per dwelling including an equipped play area, and an informal ball games area of 500m² would be required.

Natural heritage

4.31 Representations have been made in respect of loss of wildlife habitat. A protected Species Survey was submitted with this application, which found no evidence of roosting bat, badger, red squirrels, birds of prey, otter, water vole, amphibians or reptiles were found within the woodland area proposed for access. SNH have raised no objections on natural heritage grounds.

Affordable housing

4.32 At the time of the submission of the application, the 2004 Local Housing Strategy identified Thornhill as a pressured larger rural settlement, triggering the requirement for affordable housing provision. Consultation with Strategic Housing Services has indicated that 25% was appropriate in this instance, in line with the benchmark figure of 25% identified in paragraph 88 of Scottish Planning Policy. The 2011 LHS is broadly consistent with the superseded LHS, in principle, however the benchmark figure for the Dumfries HMA (of which Thornhill is part) is now 20% affordable units.

Servicing

4.33 Scottish Water have confirmed adequate water supply to the site from Kettleton WTW. Foul drainage capacity at Thornhill WWTW is limited, but Scottish Water have confirmed that there may be a requirement for the developer to carry out works on the local network to address this limitation. Surface water drainage for a site of this size would require treatment by means of SuDS - full details of which would be required at full application stage.

Scottish Planning Policy

4.34 In terms of the strategic provision of housing, SPP states that development plans should allow a generous supply of land for housing, to give the flexibility necessary for the continued delivery of new housing even if unpredictable changes to the effective land supply occur during the lifetime of the plan. A supply of effective land for at least five years should be maintained at all times to ensure a continuous supply of land for house building. The MN4 and MN4a allocations in the Nithsdale Local Plan are considered to provide this (within the constraints set out within this report), particularly given the above acceptance of the principle of release of MN4a reserved housing land (see 4.16 above).

4.35 SPP also states that the siting and design of new housing development should take account of its setting, the surrounding landscape, topography, character, appearance, and ecologies. In terms of landscape and natural heritage, SPP states that planning authorities should seek to prevent further fragmentation or isolation of habitats; existing landscape, recreational and wildlife resources should be protected and enhanced wherever possible both as part of new development and green networks. These considerations reflect the requirements of the Local Plan. For the reasons set out above, the proposed access fails to take sufficient account of these constraints.

Other representations

4.36 Objections have been raised in respect of additional pressure on education and health facilities, as well as lack of employment in the locality. However, the proposal is for the development of allocated and reserved housing land, as identified in the Nithsdale Local Plan as part of the Council's long term vision for bringing wider economic growth and development in the area. In this light, objections on these grounds cannot be sustained.

Conclusion

4.37 The proposal would result in a contrived, heavily engineered and visually over-dominant access road, raised up significantly above existing ground levels on an artificial

landform with steep embankments, within the central section of an Ancient Woodland shelterbelt, such that it would have a materially adverse effect on an Area of Local Environmental Importance, contrary to Nithsdale Local Plan General Policies 1, 7 and 43.

4.38 The proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Nithsdale Local Plan General Policy 79 in that (a) it has not been demonstrated that the amenity footpath can best be retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site, (b) it would result in the loss of a safeguarded amenity footpath within the central section of an Ancient Woodland shelterbelt, for which no satisfactory alternative amenity footpath provision can be made and, (c) it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would the proposal would result in an overall community gain.

4.39 In reaching this conclusion, consideration has been given to the overall objections of Dumfries and Galloway Structure Plan, which aims to encourage the growth and development of sustainable communities. In this instance, the requirement to support and protect the natural environment and a community resource is considered to outweigh the other key strategic objective of local economic development.

4.40 Overall, the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of the above development plan policies. As such, the proposal should be refused unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise. The proposal has been assessed against Scottish Planning Policy and other material considerations, none of which provide any overriding justification for a departure from the development plan. Accordingly, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

5 RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Refuse on the following grounds:-

1. The proposal would result in a contrived, heavily engineered and visually over-dominant access road, raised up significantly above existing ground levels on an artificial landform with steep embankments, within the central section of an Ancient Woodland shelterbelt, such that it would have a materially adverse effect on an Area of Local Environmental Importance, contrary to Nithsdale Local Plan General Policies 1, 7 and 43.
2. The proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Nithsdale Local Plan General Policy 79 in that (a) it has not been demonstrated that the amenity footpath can best be retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site, (b) it would result in the loss of a safeguarded amenity footpath within the central section of an Ancient Woodland shelterbelt, for which no satisfactory alternative amenity footpath provision can be made and, (c) it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would result in an overall community gain.

Relevant Drawing Numbers:

Location Plan Phase 1&2 25736-(02)003 RevA
Road Layout 73693-1020 Rev B

5 May 2011
14 Nov 2011

Road Layout 2	73693-1021 Rev B	14 Nov 2011
Road Section	73693-1022 Rev A	14 Nov 2011
Road Longitudinal Section	73693-1023	14 Nov 2011
Road Landscape Layout	1107E-330 Rev PO1	4 May 2011
Road Landscape Section	1107E-700 Rev PO1	4 May 2011
Proposed Path Plan		30 Mar 2010

List of Representors Objecting to the Application**Objection (100):**

Mrs A Cooper, Eliock, Hospital Brae, Thornhill
 Owner/Occupier, 29 Calside Court, Calside, Dumfries
 Owner/Occupier, Auchencairn, Closeburn
 Owner/Occupier, 1 Bennan Court, Lochside, Dumfries
 Owner/Occupier, 16 West Morton Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Owner/Occupier, 23 West Morton Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Owner/Occupier, 34 West Morton Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Owner/Occupier, 1 Alpine Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Owner/Occupier, 20 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Owner/Occupier, 6B Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Owner/Occupier, 7 Benan Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Owner/Occupier, 17 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Kenneth M & Caroline Young, Carsemill Cottage, Burnhead, Auldgirth, Dumfries
 W.R. & E. Ackland, 1 Queensberry Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 James & Davina Allan, 4 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 W Beck, 2 Benan Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 G.D & A Bell, 7 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 T.W. Bishop, 5 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Mrs M & Dr G Blake, 1 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 A & K Boon, 3 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Cecilia Brant, 26 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 S.J & M.B. Bromilow, 10 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 S.H. Campbell & I.R. Campbell, 1 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Jane Cavani, 3 Benan Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Robert & Iris Chaplin, 6A Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Aisuko Clement, 14 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Mr D Coltart, Elmarglen Hotel, 11 West Morton Street, Thornhill
 A & G Cooper, Eliock, Hospital Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Gwen Crawford, 28 West Morton Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Mr E Crosbie, 68 Kinnell Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 P Crosbie, 68 Kinnell Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Mr Robert Crosbie, 68 Kinnell Street, Thornhill
 Joan M & WMJ Dalgliesh, 34 Townhead Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 J & MGT Douglas, 7 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 M & A Findlater, 29 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Janet & David Flaxman, 2 Queensberry Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 June Halliday, 17 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 R & W Halliday, 5 Benan Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Robert W. & Margaret Harvey, 1 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 E.N & E.A Hunter, 11 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 C & AC Hutton, 6 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 W Hyslop, 15 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Mrs V Inglis, 25B West Morton Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 M Irvine, 23 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 J.E. Irving, 21 West Morton Street, Thornhill, Dumfries

D.R. & A.M.H Ivens, 12 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Ms S Jarvis, Auchenstone, Townhead Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Louise Kirkpatrick, Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 M & A Kneeshaw, 75 Kinnell Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Jean Lenza, 31 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 John T Logan, 8 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 R Logan, 6 Queensberry Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 J & J.G. MacGregor, 4 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 John & Eleanor MacKie, 4 Queensberry Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Robert W Marchbank, 33 Townhead Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 S J Matthews, 14 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 D & S McBain, 8 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Sarah McCartney Brown, 31 Townhead Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Andrew McGaw, 26 West Morton Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Mary McKendrick, "Kildonan", Townhead Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Ishbel McKendrick, c/o " Kildonan", Townhead Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Kenneth McLachlan, Lochindaal, 5 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Charles F McLean, 6 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 W.D. McMichael & L. Murray, 8 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Hugh McVey, 3 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Innes & Davina McVey, 15 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 N & R.C. McWilliam, 10 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Joan & Christine Murdoch, Nithview, Hospital Road, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Mr & Mrs J Murdoch, Nithview, Hospital Road, Thornhill, Dumfries
 G Nicol, 1 Benan Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Sonya Platt, Greenlea, Townhead Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Derek Possee & May Possee, 3 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Tim & Kirsty Prentice, 3 Briar Bush, Penpont, Dumfries
 Ann & Brendan Quaye, 6 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Mrs H Reid, 15 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Anne-Marie Rodda, 22 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Frances M Rodger, 4 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 C Sauaders, 6 Benan Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 D M Sharpe, 79 Kinnell Street, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Liz & Chris Simmonds, 17 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Sheila Smith, 13 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 N Spencer, Courthill Smithy, Keir, Dumfries
 S Templeton, 15 Grennan Road, Penpont, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Peter & Alice Stewart, 8 Queensberry Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Robin & Sheila Stitt, 21 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 S & J Sturrock, 16 Cairnkinna Crescent, Thornhill, Dumfries
 David & Elizabeth Tait, 29 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Robert Teale, 21 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 R & SJ Thompson, 18 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Peterette Turner, 9 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Janet Vartman, 5 Queensberry Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 M.Y. Watson, 8 Benan Place, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Douglas Watters, 2 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
 Mrs A Weir, Garynahine, Hospital Brae, Thornhill
 Morag Whitefield, 25 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
 J.E. & D Williams-Faulks, Riggside, 28 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill,
 Dumfries

Charles & Violet Wright, 11 Queensberry Beeches, Thornhill, Dumfries
S.G. & M.J.D Young, 12 Queensberry Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries
Sharon & Gavin Young, 2 Drunishinnoch Brae, Thornhill, Dumfries