



# Agenda

## Planning Committee

**Date:** Wednesday, 22 May 2019

---

**Time:** 10.00

---

**Venue:** Council Chambers,  
Clydebank Town Hall, Dumbarton Road, Clydebank

---

**Contact:** Craig Stewart, Committee Officer  
Tel: 01389 737251, [craig.stewart@west-dunbarton.gov.uk](mailto:craig.stewart@west-dunbarton.gov.uk)

Dear Member

Please attend a meeting of the **Planning Committee** as detailed above. The business is shown on the attached agenda.

Yours faithfully

**JOYCE WHITE**

Chief Executive

Distribution:-

Councillor Jim Finn (Chair)  
Bailie Denis Agnew  
Councillor Jim Brown  
Councillor Gail Casey  
Councillor Karen Conaghan  
Councillor Diane Docherty (Vice Chair)  
Councillor Douglas McAllister  
Councillor Marie McNair  
Councillor John Mooney  
Councillor Lawrence O'Neill

All other Councillors for information

Date of Issue: 9 May 2019

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY, 22 MAY 2019**

**AGENDA**

**1 APOLOGIES**

**2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members are invited to declare if they have an interest in any of the items of business on this agenda and the reasons for such declarations.

**3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING 5 – 14**

Submit for approval as a correct record, the Minutes of Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 24 April 2019.

**4 NOTE OF VISITATIONS 15**

Submit, for information, Note of Visitations carried out on 23 April 2019.

**5 OPEN FORUM**

The Committee is asked to note that no open forum questions have been submitted by members of the public.

**6 WEST DUNBARTONSHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT 17 - 309  
PLAN 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON THE  
PROPOSED PLAN**

Submit report by the Strategic Lead – Regulatory informing of the representations received on the West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2: Proposed Plan and seeking agreement that the unresolved objections to the Plan are submitted for Examination.



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

At a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, Clydebank Town Hall, Dumbarton Road, Clydebank on Wednesday, 24 April 2019 at 10.00 a.m.

**Present:** Bailie Denis Agnew and Councillors Jim Brown, Gail Casey, Karen Conaghan, Diane Docherty, Marie McNair, John Mooney and Lawrence O'Neill.

**Attending:** Peter Hissett, Strategic Lead – Regulatory; Pamela Clifford, Planning, Building Standards and Environmental Health Manager; Erin Goldie, Team Leader – Development Management; John Walker, Assistant Engineering Officer (Roads); Sarah Hamill, Contaminated Land Officer; Nigel Ettles, Section Head – Litigation and Craig Stewart, Committee Officer.

**Apologies:** Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Councillors Jim Finn and Douglas McAllister.

**Councillor Diane Docherty in the Chair**

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that there were no declarations of interest in any of the items of business on the agenda.

### MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 20 March 2019 were submitted and approved as a correct record.

### NOTE OF VISITATIONS

A note of Visitations carried out on 19 March 2019 was submitted for information, a copy of which forms Appendix 1 hereto. It was noted that Councillor Marie McNair was also present at the visitations.

### OPEN FORUM

The Committee noted that no open forum questions had been submitted by members of the public.

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Reports were submitted by the Strategic Lead – Regulatory in respect of the following planning applications:-

- (a) **DC18/209 – Erection of a petrol filling station with jetwash and alterations to the car park at Clyde Retail Park, Livingstone Street, Clydebank by Asda Stores Limited.**

Reference was made to a site visit which had been undertaken in respect of the above application. The Planning, Building Standards and Environmental Health Manager was heard in further explanation of the report.

The Chair invited Mr John Hainey, Drumry and Linnvale Community Council, objector, to address the Committee. Mr Hainey was heard in respect of the Community Council's representations in regard to the application, and in answer to Members' questions.

The Chair then invited Mr Alan Jones, representing the applicant, and Keith McGillivray, highway consultant for the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr McGillivray was heard in answer to Members' questions.

At this point, the Chair invited Mr Iain MacBean, objector, to come forward to address the Committee and he was heard in respect of his representation.

After discussion and having heard the Planning, Building Standards and Environmental Health Manager and the Assistant Engineering Officer (Roads) in answer to Members' questions, the Committee agreed that the application be refused on the grounds that it would increase traffic congestion significantly in the vicinity and would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the surrounding area.

## ADJOURNMENT

After hearing Councillor Docherty, Chair, the meeting agreed to adjourn for a short time, to enable those in the public gallery in attendance for Planning Application DC18/209 to leave the meeting. The meeting resumed at 10.58 a.m. with all Members listed in the sederunt in attendance.

- (b) **DC18/245 – Remediation of the site including extraction and treatment of contaminated soils and groundwater at the former Carless Oil Terminal, Erskine Ferry Road, Old Kilpatrick by Malin Group Properties Limited.**

Reference was made to a site visit which had been undertaken in respect of the above application. The Planning, Building Standards and Environmental Health Manager was heard in further explanation of the report.

The Chair invited Mr Ian Laidlaw, Project Manager for the Applicant, and Mr Duncan Smart, Agent, to address the Committee and both were heard in respect of the application.

The Chair then invited Mr John Miller, who had made a representation to the application, to address the Committee.

After discussion and having heard the Planning, Building Standards and Environmental Health Manager in clarification of certain matters, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in Section 9 of the report, as detailed within Appendix 2 hereto.

**(c) DC18/273 – Erection of a 55 unit affordable housing development, community garden, associated infrastructure and landscaping at the former Aitkenbar Primary School site, Howatshaws Road, Dumbarton by West Dunbartonshire Council.**

After discussion and having heard the Team Leader – Development Management in further explanation and in answer to Members' questions, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in Section 9 of the report, as detailed within Appendix 2 hereto.

Note: Councillor O'Neill left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

The meeting closed at 11.30 a.m.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**NOTE OF VISITATIONS – 19 MARCH 2019**

**Present:** Bailie Denis Agnew and Councillors Karen Conaghan and Diane Docherty.

(The above lists Members who attended at least one site visit).

**Attending:** Pamela Clifford, Planning, Building Standards and Environmental Health Manager; Erin Goldie, Team Leader – Development Management; and Lisa Miller, Planning Officer.

**SITE VISITS**

Site visits were undertaken in connection with the undernoted planning applications:-

(1) Queens Quay, Clydebank

DC18/272 – Erection of 149 flatted dwellings and four commercial units, associated car parking, amenity space and landscaping at Queens Quay, Clydebank by Wheatley Group.

(2) Land north west of Gavinburn Farm, Kilpatrick Braes

DC18/207 – Construction and operation of a 250kW hydro power scheme at Land north west of Gavinburn Farm, Kilpatrick Braes by Scotia Hydro.



**DC18/209 – Erection of a petrol filling station with jetwash and alterations to the car park at Clyde Retail Park, Livingstone Street, Clydebank by Asda Stores Limited.**

**REFUSED** on the following grounds:-

That it would increase traffic congestion significantly in the vicinity and would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the surrounding area.

**(b) DC18/245 – Remediation of the site including extraction and treatment of contaminated soils and groundwater at the former Carless Oil Terminal, Erskine Ferry Road, Old Kilpatrick by Malin Group Properties Limited.**

**GRANT** planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Notwithstanding the approved Remedial Strategy (dated Nov 2018) no works (other than investigative works/remedial trials) shall commence on site until such time as an updated, finalised Remedial Strategy for the site (informed by the findings of the investigative works/remedial trials) is submitted to and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. The revised strategy shall include details of the findings of the investigative works/remedial trials as well as an overview of the remedial approach, including details of the remedial target(s) and also verification requirements that the remediation is to achieve.
2. A Remediation Scheme, in accordance with the approved Remedial Strategy that details the different phases of the remediation, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. The scheme shall be prepared by a suitably qualified person and shall detail the measures necessary to deal with the Part IIA linkages identified at the site. The scheme shall include method statements for works to be undertaken, a timetable of works and/or details of the phasing of works and all other site management procedures relating to the remediation.
3. The Planning Authority shall be notified in writing (by submission of the Notice of Commencement of Development) of the intended commencement of remediation works not less than 14 days before these works commence on site. Upon completion of each phase of remediation, a verification report, which demonstrates the effectiveness of the completed remediation works, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority.
4. A monitoring and maintenance scheme (including the monitoring of the longterm effectiveness of the proposed remediation) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing. Any actions/measures ongoing shall be implemented within an agreed timescale with the Planning Authority. Following completion of the actions/measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a further report which demonstrates the effectiveness of the monitoring and maintenance measures shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority.

5. The presence of any previously un-encountered contamination that is not covered by the Remedial Strategy which becomes evident during the remediation of the site shall be reported to the Planning Authority in writing within one week. At this stage, if requested by the Planning Authority, an investigation and risk assessment shall be undertaken and an amended remediation scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority prior to the recommencement of works in the affected area. The approved amended remediation scheme shall be implemented as approved.
6. The applicant shall coordinate a meeting that shall be held on site every 2 months (or more regularly if the need arises) to appraise the Planning Authority of the progress of the works hereby approved.
7. No works shall commence on site until such time as a noise/vibration impact assessment has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. This assessment shall include an assessment of the potential for the proposed works to cause noise/vibration nuisance affecting residential, industrial, commercial properties in the vicinity. Where potential disturbance is identified, proposals for the attenuation of that noise/vibration shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. Any such approved attenuation scheme shall be implemented prior to the works commencing and shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved scheme. Should the approved attenuation scheme impose restrictions upon the way in which operations on site are carried out, the site shall be operated in this manner unless otherwise agreed and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The assessment and any recommendations in respect of attenuation measures shall be prepared by suitably qualified person.
8. During the period that the remediation works and any ancillary operations are carried out which are audible at the site boundary (or at such other place(s) as may first be agreed in writing by the Planning Authority), shall be carried out between the following hours unless otherwise agreed and approved in writing by the Planning Authority:  
  
Mondays to Fridays: 08.00 – 18.00  
Saturdays: 08.00 - 13 00  
Sundays and public holidays: No working
9. No works shall commence on site until such time as details (including specific luminaire and lamp type; beam control; wattage; use of reflectors, baffles, louvers, cowling; lux contours/distribution diagrams and columns types/colours) of the lights/floodlights have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. The lights/floodlights shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained. Any subsequent changes to their position or specification shall be subject to the prior written approval of the Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, bright lighting shall be avoided during the months of September to March inclusive where this would illuminate areas of the inter-tidal habitat of the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area.

10. No works, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority, shall commence on site until such time as a scheme for the control and mitigation of dust has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. The scheme shall identify likely sources of dust arising from the approved remediation works, and shall identify measures to prevent or limit the occurrence and impact of such dust. The approved scheme shall thereafter be implemented fully prior to any of the identified dust generating activities commencing on site and shall be maintained thereafter, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.
11. No works shall commence until a Bird Hazard Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority in consultation with Glasgow Airport. The submitted plan shall include details of:
  - Management of earthworks
  - Monitoring of any standing water within the site temporary or permanent
  - Reinstatement of grass areas and soft landscaping (including details of species and spacing of trees and shrubs)

The Bird Hazard Management Plan shall be implemented as approved. No subsequent alterations to the plan shall take place unless firstly approved in writing by the Planning Authority in consultation with Glasgow Airport.

12. No works shall commence until an Ecological Clerk of Works has been appointed to oversee, monitor and ensure the effectiveness of all ecological mitigation measures to protect the integrity of the Natura site.
13. No works, between the months of September to March inclusive, shall commence until a screening barrier has been installed along the southern boundary of the remediation works area, to provide screening against visual and noise disturbance. Details of the screening shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority and implemented as approved. No activities shall take place below Mean High Water Springs (i.e. within that part of the application site boundary that overlaps with the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area.
14. Any clearance of ground vegetation, prior to the main remediation works being undertaken, shall be carried out by hand during the winter months. The vegetation clearance shall be overseen by the Ecological Clerk of Works with a view to retaining as much vegetation on site as possible while still facilitating the remediation works – particularly where such retained vegetation can retain and enhance the screening of the remediation works from the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area.
15. No remediation works shall commence until wheel washing facilities and/or other appropriate measures for traffic connected with the remediation works have been installed in accordance with details agreed by the Planning Authority. Once installed such facilities shall be used to prevent mud and

other debris being deposited from the site onto the public highway during the period of the remediation works and shall be maintained thereafter.

**DC18/273 – Erection of a 55 unit affordable housing development, community garden, associated infrastructure and landscaping at the former Aitkenbar Primary School site, Howatshaws Road, Dumbarton by West Dunbartonshire Council.**

**GRANT** planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development shall be completed in accordance with the following external finishing materials:
  - Ibstock Ivanhoe Cream clay bricks;
  - Ibstock Grey stock clay bricks;
  - Grey Marley Eternit Ltd modern roof tiles (single lap interlocking tiles) in smooth grey
  - Aluminium Clad timber windows by NorDan UK Ltd in RAL 1020
2. Prior to the commencement of development on site, a sample panel of brickwork shall be constructed for all brick types to be used in order to determine the appropriate colour of mortar that should be used which shall be approved by the Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved mortar.
3. Prior to the commencement of works on site, full details of all hard surfaces shall be submitted for the further written approval of the Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any unit within the development.
4. Prior to the commencement of development on site, details of the design and location of cycle storage provision for the flatted blocks, street furniture and lighting shall be submitted for the further written approval of the Planning Authority and the development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any of the approved properties, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.
5. No house/flatted unit shall be occupied until the vehicle parking spaces associated with that house/flatted unit have been provided within the site in accordance with the approved plans. The spaces shall thereafter be kept available for parking at all times.
6. Twelve months after completion of the development, a parking review shall be undertaken within the development to ascertain levels of car ownership and whether there are any parking related problems within the development. The findings and recommendations of the review shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority. Thereafter the additional parking spaces illustrated on drawing no. AL(--)-205D shall be formed if required, in accordance with the agreed recommendations and the approved details.

7. Unless as may otherwise be agreed in writing by the Planning Authority, the landscaping scheme for the site shall be implemented not later than the next appropriate planting season after occupation of the first residential unit. The landscaping shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with these details.
8. Prior to the commencement of development on site, full details of the design of the community garden shall be submitted for the approval of the Planning Authority and shall include details of hard and soft landscaping locations and specifications, public art, lighting and furniture. Thereafter, the community garden shall be implemented and approved in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any residential unit.
9. Prior to the commencement of development on site, details of measures to protect trees located within and adjacent to the site shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
10. Unless as may otherwise be agreed in writing by the Planning Authority, no trees other than the five cherry trees at the southwest corner of the development site, shall be removed either within or adjacent to the site without the prior written approval of the Planning Authority.
11. Prior to the commencement of development on site, details of the location and form of any site compound or storage area shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
12. Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority, no development shall commence on site until such time as a scheme for the control and mitigation of dust has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The scheme shall identify likely sources of dust arising from the development or its construction, and shall identify measures to prevent or limit the occurrence and impact of such dust. The approved scheme shall thereafter be implemented fully prior to any of the identified dust generating activities commencing on site and shall be maintained thereafter, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.
13. If there is a requirement to either re-use site won material or to import material then the assessment criteria and sampling frequency that would adequately demonstrate its suitability for use shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to any material being re-used or imported. In addition to this and in accordance with BS3882:2015 and BS8601:2013, material to be used in the top 300mm shall be free from metals, plastic, wood, glass, tarmac, paper and odours. Prior to placement of any of the material, the developer shall submit a validation report for the approval in writing of the Planning Authority and it shall contain details of the source of the material and associated test results to demonstrate its suitability for use. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

14. No development shall commence on site until such time as a revised ground gas assessment is undertaken and submitted to the Planning Authority for approval.
15. No development (other than investigative works) shall commence on site until such time as a detailed remediation strategy/plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The strategy shall be prepared by a suitable qualified person and shall summarise all the measures required to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property. The strategy shall ensure that upon completion of the remediation works the site will no longer qualify as contaminated land under Environmental Protection Act 1990 Part IIA in relation to the intended use of the land after development.
16. Remediation of the site shall be carried out in accordance with the approved remediation strategy/plan prior to the proposed development being brought into use. Any amendments to the approved remediation strategy/plan shall not be implemented unless approved in writing by the Planning Authority. On completion of the remediation works and prior to occupation of any of the units, the developer shall submit a completion report for the approval in writing of the Planning Authority, confirming that the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved remediation strategy/plan and that the works have successfully reduced the risks to acceptable levels.
17. Prior to the commencement of development on site, details of the Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) and its maintenance following installation shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. The SUDS shall be designed to ensure that any contaminants present on the site are not mobilised and that pollution pathways are not created. The Sustainable Urban Drainage System shall thereafter be formed and maintained on site in accordance with the approved details prior to development.
18. During the period of construction, all works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary (or at such other place(s) as may first be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority), shall be carried out between the following hours unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority:
  - Mondays to Fridays: 0800-1800
  - Saturdays: 0800-1300
  - Sundays and public holidays: No working

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

### NOTE OF VISITATIONS – 23 APRIL 2019

**Present:** Provost William Hendrie; Bailie Denis Agnew and Councillors Jim Brown, Karen Conaghan and Marie McNair.

(The above lists Members who attended at least one site visit).

**Attending:** Erin Goldie, Team Leader – Development Management; Craig Jardine, Lead Planning Officer and Sarah Hamill, Contaminated Land Officer.

### SITE VISITS

Site visits were undertaken in connection with the undernoted planning applications:-

**(1) Clyde Retail Park, Livingstone Street, Clydebank**

DC18/209 – Erection of a petrol filling station with jetwash and alterations to the carpark at the Clyde Retail Park by Asda Stores Limited.

**(2) Site of the former Carless Oil Terminal, Erskine Ferry Road, Old Kilpatrick**

DC18/245 – Remediation of the site including extraction and treatment of contaminated soils and groundwater by Malin Group Properties Limited.

**(3) Site of the former Aitkenbar Primary School, Howatshaws Road, Dumbarton**

DC18/273 – Erection of a 55 unit affordable housing development, community garden, associated infrastructure and landscaping by West Dunbartonshire Council.





**WEST DUNBARTONSHIRE COUNCIL****Report by the Strategic Lead – Regulatory****Planning Committee: 22 May 2019**

---

**Subject: West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2 –  
Representations received on the Proposed Plan**

**1. Purpose**

- 1.1** To advise the Committee of the representations received on the West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2: Proposed Plan and to seek agreement that the unresolved objections to the Plan are submitted for Examination.

**2. Recommendations**

- 2.1** It is recommended that the Committee notes the representations made to the Plan, as detailed in Appendix 1, and also the notifiable and non-notifiable changes, as detailed in Appendix 3.
- 2.2** It is recommended that the Committee approve the responses to the received representations as set out in Appendix 2 of the report for submission to the Planning and Environmental Appeals Division for examination.

**3. Background**

- 3.1** The Local Development Plan sets out the Council's strategy for the development and use of land in the Council area (excluding that part within the National Park where the Park Authority acts as Planning Authority). The Planning Committee approved the publication of the Proposed Plan on 19 September 2018. It was published on 12 October 2018 with the period for submitting representations ending on 23 November. 777 representations were received on the Proposed Plan covering a wide range of issues.
- 3.2** Appendix 1 summarises the representations received to the Proposed Plan and provides a brief synopsis of the grounds of objection to each section of the Plan.

The majority of the representations received are in relation four sites within the Plan, namely:

- City Deal Project, Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard;
- Proposed residential site at Strauss Avenue, Clydebank;
- Proposed residential site at the Glebe, Old Kilpatrick; and
- Proposed residential site at Main Street, Jamestown.

Other representations relate to issues regarding the various policies in the Plan and other site allocations, for example, requesting changes to the business and industrial land supply and housing land supply.

- 3.3** A workshop was held with elected members on 07 May 2019 to present the issues that the majority of the representations relate to and representations made to our key regeneration sites.

#### **4. Main Issues**

##### Examination and Representation Response Form (Schedule 4)

- 4.1** The Town and Country (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) requires that if there are unresolved objections to the Proposed Plan, that the Plan and the objections are submitted to the Scottish Ministers for Examination. This is to be done using what is commonly known as a 'Schedule 4' form. This form summarises the representations received in respect of particular issues, specifies the change sought by those making the representation, and sets out the Council's response to the representation. The Examination Reporter(s) who will be appointed by the Planning and Environmental Appeals Division will use the same form to record his/her/their conclusions and recommendations.
- 4.2** A total of 36 Schedule 4 forms have been prepared for the Planning and Environmental Appeals Division and these are set out in Appendix 2. Representations have been largely grouped to reflect the chapter order of the Plan. Specific issues in relation to the proposed residential allocations on Strauss Avenue, Clydebank; the Glebe, Old Kilpatrick; and Main Street, Jamestown; have been grouped within their own specific Schedule 4 form due to the level of representation. Comments on other housing sites have been grouped geographically. Other issues raised in relation to the Plan, such as the non-inclusion of Duntiglennan Fields, Clydebank and Young's Farm, Dumbarton, have also been grouped within separate issues.
- 4.3** The Schedule 4 and Examination process offer the opportunity for the Council to accept some of the modifications proposed by respondents to the Proposed Plan. These proposed notifiable modifications that the Council are agreeing to through this process are set out within Appendix 3. It also contains the non-notifiable changes the Council are agreeing to, which relate to technical errors, such as, colours relating to designations being of similar colouring therefore making the map difficult to comprehend. These non-notifiable changes are not matters that will be considered as part of the examination.

##### Next steps

- 4.4** Following approval of the Schedule 4 forms, they will be submitted along with supporting documents to the Planning and Environmental Appeals Division for Examination. It is intended that this will be done on or before the 31<sup>st</sup> May 2019 in accordance with the timescale set out in the Development Plan Scheme (September 2018). A lead Reporter will be appointed, along with a

number of other Reporters based on the scale of the Examination. The Reporter(s) will then determine whether further information is required in respect of any of the representations or if a Hearing is necessary. It is estimated that the Examination will take up to 6 months.

- 4.5 An Examination Report will then be received including the Reporter's recommendations. It is hoped to adopt Local Development Plan 2 by January 2020 and on adoption, Local Development Plan 2 will replace the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan 2010.

## **5. People Implications**

- 5.1 There are no personnel issues associated with this report.

## **6. Financial and Procurement Implications**

- 6.1 The Council is responsible for the costs of running the Examination. Costs are predominantly related to the fees of the Reporter and the Planning and Environmental Appeals Division administrative staff. A budget has been allocated to meet the costs of the Examination in 2019/20.

## **7. Risk Analysis**

- 7.1 Any significant changes to the Plan at this stage would require it to be republished for a second time with a minimum 6 week period allowed for representations to be received. The whole Plan would again be open to comment during this period. This would delay the Plan process and make its adoption ahead of January 2020 extremely unlikely. The development plan timetable is a key consideration in the Planning Performance Framework.
- 7.2 The adopted West Dunbartonshire Local Plan is over 9 years old now and coupled with the Proposed Plan (2016) only being a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, any delay to the approval of Local Development Plan 2 could have implications for the future development of the area and lead to an increase in planning appeals. The timeframe outlined in the Development Plan Scheme (September 2018) should be maintained as far as possible.

## **8. Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA)**

- 8.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken in respect of the Proposed Plan. A wide range of positive impacts were identified with no groups being disadvantaged, as a result, no negative impacts are identified.

## **9. Environmental Sustainability**

- 9.1 Local Development Plan 2 has been subject to a full Strategic Environmental Assessment. The Environmental Report was subject to consultation at the same time as Local Development Plan 2 as required by the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005.

## **10. Consultation**

- 10.1** There has been widespread and thorough consultation throughout the process of preparing the Local Development Plan particularly at key stages such as the publication of the Main issues Report and the Proposed Plan. Consultation has been carried out in line with the approved Participation Statement (September 2018).

## **11. Strategic Assessment**

- 11.1** The Proposed Plan has a strong focus on delivering regeneration, place making and design, and community empowerment. It is considered to contribute to all of the Council's strategic priorities.

**Peter Hessett**

Strategic Lead - Regulatory

Date: 07 May 2019

---

<b>Person to Contact:</b>	Pamela Clifford, Planning & Building Standards Manager, <a href="mailto:pamela.clifford@west-dunbarton.gov.uk">pamela.clifford@west-dunbarton.gov.uk</a> 0141 951 7938  Antony McGuinness, Team Leader – Forward Planning, <a href="mailto:antony.mcguinness@west-dunbarton.gov.uk">antony.mcguinness@west-dunbarton.gov.uk</a> 0141 951 7948
<b>Appendices:</b>	Appendix 1: Summary of Representations Received to the Local Development Plan 2: Proposed Plan Appendix 2: Schedule 4 forms Appendix 3: Supported Modifications to Local Development Plan 2: Proposed Plan
<b>Background Papers:</b>	West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2: Proposed Plan and associated documents Proposed Plan Responses
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All

## **Appendix 1: Summary of Representations Raised to Local Development Plan 2: Proposed Plan**

### Introduction and Spatial Strategy

4 representations and 6 letters of support were received. The representations sought the inclusion of new text supporting ancient woodland; the Plan to consider the impact on railway infrastructure and facilities from new development; and amendments to the spatial strategy to allow greenfield land available for residential development.

### Queens Quay, Clydebank

There have been 7 representations and 1 letter of support to this part of the Plan. 3 of these relate to allocated housing sites within Queens Quay. The other representations relate to the wording of the supporting text in relation to the SPA; green network enhancements; and the provision of public transport within the site.

### City Deal Project: Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard

204 representations and 1 letter of support have been received to this part of the Plan. The majority of the representations are in relation to land being used for the road against the landowners will and that this piece of land is in the greenbelt. Other issues that have been raised are in relation to landscape; open space; allocations on the site; built environment; nature conservation, infrastructure; road safety and flooding, water and drainage.

### Carless, Old Kilpatrick

15 representations and 1 letter of support were received in relation to Carless. The majority of the representations seek various changes to the land allocations within the Plan, with several of the representations objecting to these allocations and requesting that the site be left undeveloped and as a nature area. Other grounds of representation are in relation to the loss of green infrastructure, woodland and wildlife areas; impact on biodiversity and protected species; impact on the Forth and Clyde Canal; access; restricting the access of the public to the foreshore; and wording of the supporting text in relation to the SPA.

### Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront

4 representations and 2 letters of support were received in relation to the Town Centre and Waterfront. The representations raised issues in regard to empty premises and suggested various improvements to the Town Centre. Other representations were received in relation to public transport provision; developer contributions; Dumbarton Rock; Dumbarton Football Club; Proposed Conservation Area; and wording of the supporting text in relation to the SPA.

### Clydebank Town Centre

In relation to the Town Centre, 4 representations and 1 letter of support were received. The majority of issues relate to improvements to the town centre and bus and train stations. Other representations related to the need for the Canal to have an strong and active frontage.

### Alexandria Town Centre

1 representation and 1 letter of support was received with regard to this section of the Plan. The representation sought various improvements to the Town Centre, mostly in relation to pedestrian routes, parking and the Train Station.

### Bowling Basin

6 representations and 1 letter of support were received in relation to Bowling Basin. The representations related to the loss of natural environment; viability of the proposed housing site; impact on Bowling's identity; safeguarding of paths and routes; impact on the Forth and Clyde Canal; wording of the supporting text in relation to the SPA; and the outer harbour.

### Lomondgate

In relation to Lomondgate, 4 representations and 1 letter of support were received. The majority of the representations received sought to expand the range of uses allowed within the Business Park and sought various changes to the Proposals Map. Other issues raised were in relation to the impact of the proposed uses on Alexandria and Dumbarton Town Centres and congestions and traffic issues.

### Vale of Leven Industrial Estate

The Vale of Leven Industrial Estate attracted 4 representations and 1 letter of support. The majority of the representations objected to the business and industrial allocations within the park in relation to loss of nature and woodland; the potential loss of routes for future cycle paths; and the impact on the setting of Strathleven House. Other points of representation relate to the built and natural environment, rights of way; and the water environment.

### Our Key Assets

7 representations and 4 letters of support were received against this section of the Plan. The representations related to impacts on the SPA; objections to wind farm development and unauthorised within the Kilpatrick Hills; suggestions for improvements to the Kilpatrick Hills; the need to reference ancient woodland; the need for better cycle and pedestrian paths within the green network; and modifications to the maps within the section to make them clearer. Several of the representations supported the Council's protection of the greenbelt from inappropriate development.

### Communities and Place

4 representations were received to this section of the Plan which sought general changes to the policy framework wording; the need to reference existing community consultation guidance; the need to ensure that there is policy coverage should Local Place Plans be introduced in the new Planning Bill; and the need for in-depth visual and graphic information for developments at pre-planning stage to be provided when consulting with the Community.

## Creating Places

With regard to this section of the Plan, 4 representations and 1 letter of support were received. The Representations sought the amendments in relation to the blue and green network, and biodiversity. One representation sought fundamental changes to Policy CP 3 on Masterplanning, in relation to the development strategy for Carless.

## Delivering Homes

In relation to the Plan's Housing Land Requirements, 6 representations and 2 letters of support were received. 3 representations all objected to the housing land targets within the Plan and stated that there was a shortfall in the housing land supply, between 113 and 205 units, and new greenfield releases were required to address the shortfall. The representations all objected to the Council's strategy of directing residential development to Brownfield Land and that the majority of the allocated sites were not effective, including the 8 new sites the Council allocated within the Plan. Programming of sites was also disputed and that the Plan did not conform to having a ten year land supply from the date of adoption of the Plan are required by Scottish Planning Policy. 1 Representation also objected to Policy H1 of the plan on the grounds that it was too restrictive.

Representations were also received in relation to a number of sites. A summary of the representations to these sites are contained below.

## Strauss Avenue

435 representations and 2 letters of support were received to a proposed allocation of housing at Strauss Avenue. The representations sited loss of open space, increases in traffic within Linnvale; and the proposed secondary access. One representation objected to the allocation of the site and sought its replacement with Duntiglennen Fields and other representations questions the suitability of the site for development.

As a result of the representations, the proposed allocation of the site was taken to the Place and Design Panel for consideration. The Place and Design Panel concluded that *"a site under 100 units could be supported with one access/egress option with another access for emergency vehicles only"*. In relation to the loss of open space, the Place and Design Panel report stated that:

*"the Panel considered the concerns of the residents over loss of open space and amenity and access at every stage of the conversation and suggested ways that might allow the site to be developed successfully while addressing the concerns with balanced and well thought out solutions. This included linkage of existing and future communities by careful consideration of how the open space and pedestrian and cycling permeability was achieved across the site..... A strong theme of the discussions was around recognising the nature of the site as a real pedestrian bridge between the pedestrians and cyclists on the cycle path and the communities south of the canal over to the retail park."*

The Panel considered that an area of open space, to the south of the site and on the opposite side of the Canal, could be used to compensate for the loss of open space on the site and as part of a wider development framework for the whole area. This would maximise the opportunity for connected amenity and outdoor spaces within

the area. The area of open space in question is also considered to be low quality and in need of improvement.

The Panel also recommended a development brief/design guidance should be brought forward setting out how the landscape and the edge at the canal should be treated. The Panel concluded that it was unusual to have such a well-connected site, in close proximity to facilities and public transport links. The Report of the Place and Design Panel can be found within Appendix X of this Report.

#### The Glebe, Old Kilpatrick

56 representations were received objecting to the allocation of this site. The grounds for representations are on the loss of open space; road and access issues; ground stability issues; and capacity of the site.

#### Main Street, Jamestown

42 representations were received in relation to this proposed new application. The grounds of representations were loss of open space; loss of trees; affordable housing; impacts on character and amenity of area; flood risk; impact on public transport; effectiveness of the site; landscape; and parking issues

#### Other Residential Sites

Objections were also received in relation to the following residential sites:

#### Clydebank: Braidfield High School (2 representations)

Cable Depot Road (1 representation)

Carleith (2 representations)

Carless (1 representation)

Clydebank Health Centre (3 representations)

Hardgate Health Centre (2 representations)

RHI Site (1 representation)

St Andrews High School (1 representation)

Auld Street (3 representations)

Caledonia Street (4 representations)

Auld Street Phase 2 (4 representations)

Faifley Bowling Club (5 representations)

#### Dumbarton: Castlegreen Street, Dumbarton (1 representation)

Notre Dame Convent (1 representation)

Our Lady & St Patrick's High School (1 representation)



Sandpoint Marina (1 representation)

Littlemill Distillery, Bowling (2 representations)

Former Aitkenbar Primary School, Dumbarton (1 representation)

Vale of Leven: Heather Avenue (1 representation)

Haldane Primary School (1 representation)

Jamestown IE (1 representation)

Former Council Office, Church Street (3 representations)

Dalquhurn (4 representations)

Carman Waterworks (4 representations)

Golf Hill Drive, Bonhill (1 representation)

The grounds for objection include effectiveness of the sites; design and amenity issues; loss of open space; traffic and congestion issues and impact on existing properties.

Land for residential development is also suggested at the following locations:

- Duntiglennen Fields, Clydebank;
- Overtoun Road, Alexandria;
- Lesser Boll of Meal Park, Alexandria
- Main Street, Jamestown (re-allocation from Industry to Residential)

### Revitalising our Economy

11 representations and 3 letters of support were received with regard to this part of Local Development Plan 2. The majority representations object to the allocation of a number of business and industrial sites. Other representations seek various changes to the text within the section and some of the policies with regard to the impact on Special Protection Areas and Special Area for Conservation and to reference the role and contribution of the social economy and social enterprise. Glasgow Airport request changes to the aircraft noise maps to bring them into conformity with their Noise Action Plan.

The following business and industrial sites were objected to:

- Clydebank Industrial Estate (1 representation)
- Vale of Leven Industrial Site E1 (1 representation)
- Vale of Leven Industrial Site E2 (2 representations)
- Vale of Leven Industrial Site E3 (1 representation)
- Vale of Leven Industrial Site E4 (1 representation)
- Main Street, Jamestown (1 representation)

Grounds for objections to these sites include loss of biodiversity; nature conservation, flooding and the need for them to be allocated.

Land for business and industrial development is also suggested at the following location:

- Land adjoining Dumbuckhill quarry (Milton & Dumbarton)

### Supporting Town Centres

1 representation was received in relation to this section of the Plan. The representation focussed on issues within Alexandria and sought restrictions on clusters of uses, such as hairdressers, bookmakers and hot-food takeaways within the Town Centre.

### Protecting our Built Environment

2 representations were received and related to minor wording changes to the policies and supporting text in relation to Scottish Planning Policy and Historic Environment Scotland's remit. One representation sought changes to the listed buildings policy to allow for their demolition where they were a constraint to development and there is no viable prospect of their restoration.

### Green Infrastructure

The section on Green Infrastructure attracted 8 representations and 3 letters of support. The representations related to the Council not abiding with its own policies; the need for open space standards; clarification on why sites suggested for allotments were not included within the Plan; the criteria within the Developer Contributions Policy and that developer contributions should be waived in terms of enabling development; and suggestions for further green infrastructure projects that contributions should be directed towards.

### Safeguarding our Environment

8 representations and 3 letters of support were received in relation to this section of the Plan. Representations sought amendments to the text and policies of the plan in relation to the SPA and landscape; requiring developers to build allocated sites instead of new sites within or adjacent to the buffer zones of Natura 2000 sites; reference to geological conservation; links to maps; recognition of ancient woodland and the contribution trees can make to urban areas; land raising in relation to areas of flood risk; temporary greening of sites should not affect wildlife that has naturally colonised on brownfield sites; recognitions that tree canopy's and native trees can help absorb pollution and act as a noise barrier; and the issue of ground stability need to be addressed.

### Connectivity

6 representations and 2 letters of support were received in relation to this part of the Plan. The representations related to the need to conform to National Planning Framework 3 in terms of providing one example of an exemplar walking and cycle friendly settlement within the Plan; the consideration of freight to accord with Scottish Planning Policy; pooling of developer contributions to be used to improve rail

infrastructure and stations; the need to protect all forms of access in terms of recreation; need to specifically mention bridleways throughout the Plan; the unrealistic expectations on developers to guarantee internet connection speeds for superfast broadband; and the need to explicitly state the criteria for communication infrastructure as set out in Scottish Planning Policy;

### Renewable Energy

With regard to the Renewable Energy policies, 2 representations and 3 letters of support were received. The representations sought minor amendments to the wording within the policies to reflect Scottish Planning Policy; amendments to the wording of the Renewable Heat policy to soften the requirements on developers; and the removal of low and zero carbon standards as these are covered by Building Standard regulations.

### Minerals, Aggregates and Coal Extraction

2 representation and 3 letters of support were received in relation to this part of the Plan. Minor changes to the wording of the text and policies were requested to better conform to Scottish Planning Policy; and that Supplementary Guidance should be prepared in relation to financial guarantees.

### Other Issues

1 representation sought a new Policy on Community Facilities to be included within the Plan and in relation to this, the Council's Greenspace also sought an amendment in the Plan to allocate the proposed extension to the Vale of Leven Cemetery on the Vale of Leven proposals map. Dumbarton Football Club also sought the reinstatement of Young's Farm on the same basis as it have been within the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016). 1 representation sought an allocation for a care home at Lesser Boll of Meal Park, Alexandria



## **Appendix 2: Schedule 4 Forms**

<b>Table of Contents</b>		
<b>Issue Number</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
1	General	2
2	Introduction and Spatial Strategy	4
3	Queens Quay, Clydebank	10
4	City Deal Site - Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard	15
5	Carless, Old Kilpatrick	35
6	Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront	58
7	Clydebank Town Centre	67
8	Alexandria Town Centre	72
9	Bowling Basin	75
10	Lomondgate Business Park	82
11	Vale of Leven Industrial Estate	87
12	Our Key Assets	93
13	Communities and Place	101
14	Creating Places	105
15	Housing Land	110
16	Revitalising our Economy and Achieving Zero Waste	130
17	Supporting Town Centres	137
18	Built Environment	140
19	Green Infrastructure	142
20	Environment	148
21	Connectivity	158
22	Renewable Energy	164
23	Minerals and Coal	169
24	Private Housing Sites: Clydebank	173
25	Private Housing Sites: Dumbarton	179
26	Private Housing Sites: Vale of Leven	183
27	Strauss Avenue, Clydebank	189
28	Main Street, Jamestown	210
29	The Glebe, Old Kilpatrick	215
30	Non-Allocation of Duntiglennan Fields, Clydebank	227
31	Non Allocation of Young's Farm, Dumbarton	232
32	Affordable Housing Sites: Clydebank	236
33	Affordable Housing Sites: Dumbarton	243
34	Affordable Housing Sites: Vale of Leven	245
35	Re-allocation of Land	247
36	New Policy: Community Facilities	252

<b>Issue 1</b>	<b>General</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	General	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
The Scottish Government (PLDP/659/10 and 659/11)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	This issues relates to general comments made in relation to a reference to National and Regional Marine Plans not being made within the Plan.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><b>The Scottish Government (PLDP/659/10)</b> state that reference should be made within the plan regarding its integration with the National Marine Plan and the subsequent Clyde Regional Marine Plan. Clydeplan (2017) states that 'land use development plans will require to be aligned with the National Marine Plan and subsequent regional marine plan'. The importance of alignment between marine and terrestrial plans is reflected in legislation through the Marine Acts and the Town and Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008, which require that marine plans and development plans have regard to each other.</p> <p><b>The Scottish Government (PLDP/659/11)</b> state that, in order to comply with Section 15 of the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010, the Plan should be amended to acknowledge that planning decisions which affect the Scottish Marine Area must be taken in accordance with the National Marine Plan and any subsequent regional marine plan once adopted, unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><b>The Scottish Government (PLDP/659/10)</b> require the Plan to be modified to ensure that the LDP2 is aligned with the National Marine Plan and the subsequent Clyde Regional Marine Plan.</p> <p><b>The Scottish Government (PLDP/659/11)</b> require the Plan to be modified to acknowledge that planning decisions which affect the Scottish Marine Area must be taken in accordance with the National Marine Plan and any subsequent regional marine plan once adopted, unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise.</p>		
<b>Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:</b>		
In relation to the representations from the Scottish Government, the Council would have no objection to the plan being modified to state LDP 2 is aligned with National Marine Plan and the subsequent Clyde Regional Marine Plan and that text is inserted into the Plan alongside this reference to acknowledge that planning decisions which affect the Scottish Marine Area must be taken in accordance with the National Marine Plan and any		

subsequent regional marine plan once adopted, unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the Plan in this regard, the Council would have no objection to a new paragraph being inserted into the text of the Our Waterfronts section of the Plan on Page 54, after Paragraph 2, as follows:

*“Local Development Plan 2 also fully aligns with Scotland’s National Marine Plan (2015) and the emerging Regional Marine Plan for Clyde Marine Region. Any proposals for planning within the Marine Plan area must be in accordance with Scotland’s National Marine Plan (2015) and the emerging Regional Plan once adopted, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.*

The Council would also suggest that an additional criterion is added to Policy WD1 Waterfront Development to ensure that developments within a coastal location are consistent with the Plans mentioned above. Should the Reporter wish to amend the policy, the Council would have no objection to the policy being changed and would suggest the following wording for the new criteria:

*e) Development proposals with a marine component or implication (such as marinas, ports, harbours, shipbuilding, marine tourism and recreation, fish farming etc) will, in principle, be supported where they are consistent with Scotland’s National Marine Plan and the emerging Regional Marine Plan for Clyde Marine Region (once adopted). All proposals will require to be in accordance with the criteria detailed above and with all other relevant Policies of the Plan.*

<b>Reporter’s conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter’s recommendations:</b>

Issue 2	Introduction and Spatial Strategy	
Development plan reference:	Introduction (Pages 6 – 7) and Spatial Strategy (Pages 11 -13)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<p>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP182/1) (Support)</p> <p>SNH (PLDP/640/1)</p> <p>Avant Homes (Scotland) Limited (PLDP/642/1) (Support)</p> <p>Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/1)</p> <p>East Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/648/1) (Support)</p> <p>RSPB (PLDP/649/1); (PLPD/649/2 – Support)</p> <p>Network Rail (PLDP/662/1)</p> <p>Homes for Scotland (PLDP669/1)</p> <p>SPT (PLDP/675) (Support)</p> <p>SEPA (PLDP/676/1) (Support)</p>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Introduction, the Spatial Strategy and Spatial Strategy Map.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP182)</b> state their support for the Building with Nature Candidate award and all policies within Local Development Plan 2 relating to Green Infrastructure that may help achieve this award.</p> <p><b>SNH (PLDP/640/1)</b> is of the view that in order to highlight and consolidate the valuable natural assets that contribute to the attractiveness of West Dunbartonshire and to provide clarity and context for the subsequent content, supporting text and policies in the Plan, particularly 'Delivering Our Places', Natura 2000 sites and Habitat Regulations Appriaisal requirements; explicit reference should be made to the value of the 'natural' environment in the introductory paragraph.</p> <p>The respondent therefore seeks a specific reference to the international (European) designation of the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest.</p> <p><b>Avant Homes (Scotland) Limited (PLDP/642/1)</b> supports the Spatial Strategy of the Plan and the focus on regenerating other brownfield sites; and where possible, practical and economically viable the protection of historic assets.</p> <p><b>Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/1)</b> states that Ancient Woodland is a key natural asset and this needs to be highlighted and specifically mentioned in the Local Development Plan.</p> <p><b>East Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/648/1)</b> welcomes that the Clydeplan strategy of prioritising the development and regeneration of brownfield land over greenfield has been</p>		



at the centre of preparing the plan. This will help to ensure that the strategy of maintaining a compact and sustainable city region is achieved.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/1)** states that the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to a changing climate should be a key component of the Local Development Plan and should be mentioned in the introduction.

The respondent welcomes the commitment to Green Infrastructure in the Local Development Plan, commends the award of the Building With Nature Candidacy and hopes that the adopted Local Development Plan will continue this approach and achieve the Building With Nature Excellent Award. Habitat corridors and biodiversity enhancements of infrastructure are vital to sustain wildlife populations and to facilitate climate change adaptation. Green infrastructure is a key component of Scotland's National Ecological Network.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/2)** welcomes the recognition given to Key Green Assets.

**Network Rail (PLDP/662/1)** broadly supports Local Development Plan 2's objectives as set out in the Spatial Strategy. However, the overall policy framework from which the Spatial Strategy flows needs to ensure that it can accommodate reasonable foreseeable future demands on railway infrastructure. For example, the Scotland Route Study proposes that passenger growth in the West Dunbartonshire area should be managed by train lengthening, which may require platform lengthening at some stations.

Continued support is sought for safeguarding and improving the safety and capacity of the existing and future railway network in tandem with new development, and that where improvements are required, that they are considered at the right time as part of the planning for new development with appropriate strategic assessment and to feed in to and mitigate the infrastructure and capacity issues required. Directing growth towards public transport corridors, without the provision of additional capacity or where required, improved facilities, will result in the network becoming constrained and not being able to provide increased service. The Plan must therefore ensure that any impacts on railway infrastructure and facilities from new development are considered and mitigated. This should be explicit in the Spatial Strategy.

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP669/1)** broadly agrees with the principle of focusing development in and around the existing urban areas and supports the desire to reduce the amount of vacant land. However, the respondent is of the view that brownfield land does not always represent the most sustainable, appropriate or viable option for development; therefore, a balanced approach will be necessary if the increase in housing delivery which is required is to be realised. This could involve allocation of greenfield land in appropriate locations to augment the development prospects of brownfield sites.

The respondent also welcomes the emphasis on economic development and the provision of new infrastructure; but is of the view that these opportunities need to be complemented by a robust spatial strategy which provides new opportunities for delivering an increase in housing delivery within West Dunbartonshire. The respondent considers that the Introduction and Spatial Strategy sections could place more focus on the delivery of new homes to support the ambitions for economic regeneration; and states that it is regrettable that the willingness to make greenfield land available for business uses is not matched by a similarly pragmatic approach to housing delivery.

**SPT (PLDP/675/1)** welcomes the Spatial Strategy as it directs development to the existing built up area, and by doing so generally reduces the need to travel, supports sustainable travel behaviour and makes best use of existing transport infrastructure and services.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/1)** support the strategies being proposed and are broadly in agreement with the policy framework relating to the issues that lie within the respondents remit. Support is also given in relation to the drive within Local Development Plan 2 for development to adhere to the concept of 'Building with Nature' and that Green Infrastructure will be an integral aspect of the development process from concept to delivery and beyond.

The respondent also acknowledges that regeneration of derelict land can be challenging and it is imperative that the environmental risks associated with the development of these sites is understood and managed, particularly when the future use of the sites may involve the creation of new communities. The respondent recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies.

To support these strategic policies the respondent acknowledges that the plan will also include development policies which will ensure the Council delivers on the planning outcomes set out in Scottish Planning Policy by contributing to a place that is Successful, Sustainable, Natural, Resilient and Connected and Low Carbon.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**SNH (PLDP/640/1)** seeks that the following sentence is added to the first paragraph of the Introduction:

*Insert 'It also contains the internationally important Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) designated for redshank which are a qualifying interest' after 'West Dunbartonshire is a very attractive part of Scotland with the Kilpatrick Hill providing a captivating backdrop over Clydebank and Dumbarton.'*

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/1)** seeks to add a specific reference to Ancient Woodland as a key natural asset within the Spatial Strategy.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/1)** requests that the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to a changing climate as a key component of the LDP is mentioned in the introduction.

**Network Rail (PLDP/662/1)** requests that the following text should be inserted as a new paragraph after the end of the first paragraph, column one of "Implementation on p13:

*"The Spatial Strategy directs growth towards the main public transport corridors and it is proposed, through appropriate policies in the Plan, to maximise the use of and seek opportunities to enhance infrastructure to ensure sustainable travel opportunities including road and rail travel."*

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP669/1)** does not suggest a specific change of form of words to

either the introduction or spatial strategy, but it is implicit in their response that they wish to see the Introduction and Spatial Strategy modified to ensure that the plan places more focus on the delivery of new homes to support the ambitions for economic development and that a balanced spatial strategy is provided, which allows for the release of greenfield land for housing development.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The support of **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP182/1)**, **East Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/648/1)**, **RSPB (PLDP/649/2)**, **SPT (PLDP/675/1)**, and **SEPA(PLDP/676/1)** is welcomed.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the first paragraph of the introductory text on Page 6 of the Plan being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/1)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the paragraph.

With regard to the representation from **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/1)**, the Council would point out the third sentence in paragraph 2 within the Forestry, Woodlands and Trees section of the Plan (Page 99) states that '*Ancient Woodland is an irreplaceable resource...These resources can have a high nature conservation and landscape value and should be protected from adverse impacts resulting from development.*' The Council is of the view that this sentence recognises the importance of Ancient Woodland as a key natural asset. No modification to the Plan is therefore necessary in this regard.

In relation to the representation made by **RSPB (PLDP/649/1)**, the Council considers that it may be appropriate to modify the introduction to include a specific reference to climate change and adaption. Should the Reporter wish to amend the introduction, the Council would have no objection to a new paragraph being inserted after Paragraph 7 on Page 6 and would suggest the following wording:

#### *'Climate Change*

*The effects of climate change are well documented and it is clear that Local Development Plan 2 has a key role to play in addressing its causes (Mitigation) and dealing with its effects (Adaptation). Whilst there is no chapter within the Plan specifically covering this subject, Climate Change issues are embedded in all aspects of the plan.*

#### *Mitigation*

*The Plan seeks to ensure that everyone has access to new quality homes and employment opportunities but, as a consequence, new development to achieve these goals will result in increased carbon emissions. Local Development Plan 2 mitigates against this by ensuring that:*

- *New developments are within sustainable locations and easily accessible to public transport to reduce the use of the private car;*
- *The layout, design and construction of new buildings are of a high quality, sustainable and suited to the climate and location and provides sustainable design which reduces carbon emissions in the developments construction and end use;*
- *Buildings are energy efficient and that low and zero carbon technologies are installed wherever appropriate;*
- *A green infrastructure first approach to development is undertaken;*

- *Carbon rich soils and peatland are protected from inappropriate development due to their importance as carbon sinks;*
- *Renewable energy, including heat and electricity from renewable sources is achieved in in line with national climate change targets whilst giving due consideration to environmental, community and cumulative impacts.*

### *Adaptation*

*In tandem with reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, it also must be ensured that the effects of climate change are also dealt with. Particular attention must be given to the threats of flooding and in this regard Local Development Plan 2 ensures, as far as possible, that development in areas of flood risk is avoided or where this is not possible that potential flooding issues are flagged up at an early stage so that they can be addressed by the development industry. All development is required to demonstrate sustainable drainage solutions.*

*The Plan also embeds a green infrastructure first approach for the design of new developments and has strong green network and green infrastructure policies. These policies are seen as being an important part of the Plan's mitigation against and adapting to the threats faced by climate change.'*

The Council, in response to the representation raised by **Network Rail (PLDP/662/1)**, is of the view that an amendment to the Implementation section of the Plan on Page 13 may be appropriate. Should the Reporter wish to amend the Implementation section of the Spatial Strategy, the Council would have no objection to new paragraph being inserted after Paragraph 1 on Page 13 and would suggest the following wording:

*"The Spatial Strategy directs new development towards the main public transport corridors, where possible, and seeks to maximise the use of existing public transport stops and connections to provide sustainable modes of transport. Where appropriate and directly relevant, new development should seek to enhance public transport infrastructure, including connections to these facilities and services, to ensure that people can easily access sustainable transport and that the infrastructure can cope with the level of new demand."*

In relation to the view of **Homes for Scotland (PLDP669/1)** that brownfield land does not always represent the most sustainable, appropriate or viable option for development, the Council considers that the prioritisation of brownfield land accords fully with the aims of SPP, and that the sites allocated in the LDP are all effective and capable of being delivered within the Plan period. However, the Council is keen to facilitate an increase in the delivery of brownfield sites and would be keen to investigate, with Homes for Scotland and their members, what potential measures could be taken to make brownfield sites more attractive or viable to house builders. This issue is considered further within Issue 15: Housing Land. The Council has also allocated two greenfield sites for the development of new housing, which are in sustainable locations within settlement boundaries; are considered to be effective; and will not undermine the strategic focus on the development and regeneration of brownfield and key regeneration sites.

It should be further noted that the respondent does not specify any areas of greenfield land that should be released for housing development, which brings into question the demand for such greenfield releases within West Dunbartonshire. Only one member of Homes for Scotland – Taylor Wimpey West Scotland - has suggested a release of land

within the Greenbelt and this proposed allocation is considered within Issues 15 and 30. The Council is strongly of the view that releasing additional land within the Greenbelt to increase the housing land supply, as the respondent is seeking, may not necessarily result in an increase in house building within West Dunbartonshire, nor will it represent a balanced Spatial Strategy. It would also be contrary to Clydeplan's vision of a compact city region. Additional releases of greenfield land are not required as there is a sufficient mix of brownfield and greenfield sites within the Plan to comply with SPP (CD xx) and to meet the Housing Land Requirement of the Plan. Issue 15 of the Plan looks in more detail at the Housing Land Requirement.

The Council is therefore of the view that the Spatial Strategy is balanced and provides opportunities for the development of new homes without jeopardising the redevelopment of the key regeneration sites and brownfield land within settlements. As a result, no modifications to the Plan are required in this regard.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>

Issue 3	Queens Quay, Clydebank	
Development plan reference:	Delivering our Places: Queens Quay, Clydebank (Pages 16 – 19)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Clydebank Engineering & Fabrication Ltd (PLDP/009) Ms L Walker (PLDP/013) Mr M Walker (PLDP/015) SNH (PLDP/640/2) Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/2) RSPB (PLDP/649/3) SPT (PLDP/675/2) SEPA (PLDP676/2) (Support)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Queens Quay section of the Plan which sets out a Development Strategy and a series of place based policies for development of the area.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
The representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Queens Quay Supporting Text; Development Strategy; Queens Quay Policy 2: Cable Depot Road; Site H2(9) Cable Depot Road; and Site H2(11) Queens Quay.		
Please note that the representations relating to Housing Sites within Queen's Quay, namely Site H2(9) Cable Depot Road and Site H2(11) Queens Quay, are also considered within Issue 15: Housing Land and Issue 24: Private Housing Sites: Clydebank.		
Queens Quay Supporting Text		
SNH (PLDP/640/2) are of the view that an additional sentence requires to be added to Paragraph 6 on Page 81 to indicate that the site adjoins the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI). SNH also request amendments to paragraph 6 to be consistent with text used elsewhere in the Plan and to provide clarity regarding consideration of all potential threats to the SPA.		
RSPB (PLDP/649/3) welcome the recognition of the need to avoid adverse impacts on the integrity of the Inner Clyde SPA, we would suggest that the wording could be simplified. Also request that the Policy is cross-referenced to Policy ENV 1.		
SEPA (PLDP676/2) recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies. This strategy is the primary mechanism for the delivery of the key locations and it is anticipated these will be delivered over the next 5 to 10 years. One of these sites is Queen's Quay.		



## Development Strategy

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/2)** state that green network improvements should include native trees, and the integration of urban trees into the redesign of this area. Urban forestry, of which street trees are part of, provides a series of benefits such as improved air quality, surface runoff mitigation, habitat for wildlife. The Trust would like to see the appropriate species of native trees which are best suited for urban environments integrated within this urban landscape.

## Queens Quay Policy 2: Cable Depot Road

**SNH (PLDP/640/2)** note the opportunities for Green Network enhancement for proposals adjacent to the railway bridge and embankment and would welcome the opportunity to advise further through pre- application discussions.

**SPT (PLDP/675/2)** acknowledge that the provision of a bus service is dependent on commercial bus operators, but are of the view that this policy should recognise the requirement to ensure that the road infrastructure on Cable Depot Road is sufficient to allow bus service to operate on it in the future, should the opportunity arise.

## Site H2(9) Cable Depot Road

**Clydebank Engineering & Fabrication Ltd (PLDP/009)** objects to housing on Site H2(9) due to the nature of their laser cutting and steel fabrication business. The respondent states that as the business generates noise, having housing in close proximity could be problematic.

## Site H2(11) Queens Quay

**Ms L Walker (PLDP/013)** object to housing on this site as it will restrict the light coming into the respondents property; it will increase traffic; and put a strain on traffic. Housing should not be allowed adjacent to Glasgow Road and if buildings were to be erected, they should be no taller than the existing buildings on Glasgow Road.

**Mr M Walker (PLDP/015)** objects to the proposed change from commercial to residential development due to the detrimental effect on the light entering the respondents property; will heavily impact upon the road infrastructure; and would have environmental issues. Also seeks clarification on the height of the housing on the site and states that it cannot be any higher than the original building.

## **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

### Queens Quay Supporting Text

**SNH (PLDP/640/2)** requests that an additional sentence requires to be added to Paragraph 6 on Page 16 as follows:

*“The Queens Quay site adjoins the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI)”.*

SNH also recommend that the Paragraph 6 on Page 16 is amended to:

*“Development at Queens Quay must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development.”*

**RSPB (PLDP/649/3)**, in reference to Paragraph 6 on Page 16, state that the wording should be simplified to the following:

*‘There must be no adverse impact on the integrity of the Inner Clyde SPA’.*

They also request that there is a cross-reference to Policy ENV 1 within the text.

#### Development Strategy

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/2)** seek a specific mention of native trees within the bullet point 4 with regard to green network improvements.

#### Queens Quay Policy 2: Cable Depot Road

**SPT (PLDP/675/2)** request that the Policy is amended to include a final paragraph as follows:

*“Development proposals are required to maintain the potential for bus services to operate on Cable Depot Road, in the future.”*

#### Site H2(9) Cable Depot Road

**Clydebank Engineering & Fabrication Ltd (PLDP/009)** seek removal of the residential designation on the site.

#### Site H2(11) Queens Quay

**Ms L Walker (PLDP/013) and Mr M Walker (PLDP/015)** seek removal of the residential designation on the site.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Councils responses to the representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Queens Quay Supporting Text; Development Strategy; Queens Quay Policy 2: Cable Depot Road; Site H2(9) Cable Depot Road; and Site H2(11) Queens Quay.

#### Queens Quay Supporting Text

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modifications to Paragraph 6 on Page 16 being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/2)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the paragraph.



In relation to the representation from **RSPB (PLDP/649/3)**, the Council would point out that this wording has been agreed with SNH (and they have suggested revisions to this wording within their representation above). The Council is therefore of the view that the text (modified or not) should remain as it is, apart from the proposed modification by SNH. No modification to the text is therefore required.

However, the Council is of the view that an amendment to last sentence in Paragraph 7 may be appropriate to relate to requirements of Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation and to ensure that developers fully accord with the requirements of the Plan in that regard. Should the Reporter wish to amend the last sentence of the paragraph, the Council would have no objection to paragraph 7 on Page 16 being changed and would suggest the following wording (the proposed amendment is in bold):

*“Development which could harm an internationally important site will only be approved in certain circumstances **as detailed within Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation.**”*

Although, not specially requested by the RSPB in their representation, the same proposed modification will be required to be made to the relevant paragraphs, containing the same text, within the following sections of the Plan for consistency:

- Carless, Old Kilpatrick: Paragraph 5, Page 24;
- Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront: Paragraph 7, Page 28
- Bowling Basin: Paragraph 5, Page 40; and
- Our Waterfronts: Paragraph 5, Page 54.

The comments of **SEPA (PLDP676/2)** on the purpose of the development strategy and policies within the section are acknowledged.

#### Development Strategy

The Council do not see the need to specifically refer to native species of trees within bullet point 4 of the Development Strategy, as requested by the **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/2)**, as the term green network improvements includes trees. Moreover, the type of trees to be included within Queens Quay is a detailed matter which is best left to the development management stage to address. No modifications to the Plan are therefore required.

#### Queens Quay Policy 2: Cable Depot Road

The comments and the assistance at pre-application stage in terms of green network enhancements offered by **SNH (PLDP/640/2)** are welcomed.

In relation to the representation from **SPT (PLDP/675/2)**, the Council supports an amendment to the Policy to ensure that the road infrastructure on Cable Depot road is sufficient to allow bus services to operate on it to ensure sustainable modes of transport and direct links to public transport infrastructure is provided.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the policy, the Council would have no objection to the Policy being changed and would suggest that a new sentence is added to the end of the Policy as follows:

*“Development proposals are also required to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to allow public transport to be accessed from the site and to ensure that buses can be operated on Cable Depot Road in the future when required.*

Site H2(9): Cable Depot Road

With regard to the representation from **Clydebank Engineering & Fabrication Ltd (PLDP/009)**, the Council considers the site to be an effective housing site and is required as part of the wider housing land requirement for the plan; will assist with the removal of a vacant and potentially contaminated land; and will contribute to the wider regeneration of Queens Quay as a whole. Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Plan will help to ensure that the amenity of the new housing site is not unduly affected by its location close to existing businesses. Issues with noise and amenity are detailed design considerations which will be addressed at the Development Management stage. The site should not be deleted from the Plan for the reasons set out above.

Site H2(11): Queens Quay

In relation to **Ms L Walker (PLDP/013)** and **Mr M Walker (PLDP/015)**, the Council points out that this site already has full planning permission for residential permission. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 4</b>	<b>City Deal Site - Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Delivering Our Places: Carless, City Deal Site - Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard (Pages 20-23)	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<div> Donna McGuire (PLDP/027)  Philip WayIn (PLDP/028)  James Officer (PLDP/029)  Derek Montgomery (PLDP/030)  Caitlin Flynn (PLDP/031)  Diane Murray (PLDP/032)  Lara Mneimneh (PLDP/033)  Shaunni Meiklejohn (PLDP/034)  Tracey O'Keefe (PLDP/035)  Lindsey Gow (PLDP/036)  Lorraine Connolly (PLDP/037)  Aimee Ward (PLDP/038)  Linzi Scott (PLDP/039)  Linda Barrs (PLDP/040)  Mrs Mavis Campbell (PLDP/041)  Kirsty Murdoch (PLDP/042)  Alison Harper (PLDP/043)  Lindsay Hotchkiss (PLDP/044)  Anne McWilliam (PLDP/045)  Nicole Brammer (PLDP/046)  Jade Campbell (PLDP/047)  Sean Grant (PLDP/048)  Cheryl Houston (PLDP/049)  Rhona MacGregor (PLDP/050)  Mrs S Killen (PLDP/051)  Kaufman (PLDP/053)  Emma Kelly (PLDP/054)  Vicky Corrieri (PLDP/055)  Peter MacDonald (PLDP/056)  Eddie Mackay (PLDP/057)  Maureen Connolly (PLDP/059)  Lynne Paterson (PLDP/060)  Chris Forbes (PLDP/061)  Cardine McAuley (PLDP/062)  Cameron Gauld (PLDP/063)  Caroline Kernaghan (PLDP/064)  Anne Connelly (PLDP/065)  Lauren Hamilton (PLDP/066)  Pamela Daily (PLDP/067)  R J- (PLDP/069)  Jennifer Yates (PLDP/070)  Karen Anne Duffy (PLDP/071) </div> <div> Michelle Macleod (PLDP/072)  Eilidh Forbes (PLDP/073)  Hazel Campbell (PLDP/074)  Dominic D- (PLDP/076)  Elizabeth O'Neery (PLDP/077)  D Reilly (PLDP/078)  Mrs C Harkins (PLDP/079)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/080)  Paul Cunningham (PLDP/081)  Tracey K- (PLDP/082)  Eleanor Sedden (PLDP/083)  John Johnston (PLDP/084)  Ruth Muir (PLDP/085)  Keri Convery (PLDP/086)  Karen Reily (PLDP/087)  Alex Johnston (PLDP/088)  Erin Donaldson (PLDP/089)  Karen Nicholson (PLDP/090)  Laura Daviy (PLDP/091)  David Butler (PLDP/092)  Nicole Francis (PLDP/093)  Lee Thomas (PLDP/094)  Karen Thomas (PLDP/095)  Ginny Allwood (PLDP/096)  Alanna Jackson (PLDP/097)  Chris Flynn (PLDP/098)  Chris Ferguson (PLDP/099)  Stuart Bissland (PLDP/100)  K Blackwood (PLDP/101)  Lisa McLaughlin (PLDP/102)  Susan Milne (PLDP/103)  Craig Reynolds (PLDP/104)  Iain Muir (PLDP/105)  Tony Whitmore (PLDP/106)  J Gardner (PLDP/107)  Amanda Smith (PLDP/116)  Helen Cusker (PLDP/117)  Nicola Cahill (PLDP/121)  Dave Laszlo (PLDP/122)  K Williamson (PLDP/123)  Liam Slater (PLDP/124) </div>		

<p> Karen Holmes (PLDP/125)  Jason Bean-Sweeney (PLDP/126)  Lorna Booth (PLDP/127)  Christie Burbidge (PLDP/128)  Lynn Stewart (PLDP/129)  Yvonne Pearson (PLDP/130)  Clare Daly (PLDP/131)  Caroline Beeten (PLDP/132)  G Blair (PLDP/133)  M Buchanan (PLDP/134)  Amanda Crooks (PLDP/135)  Margaret Seppings (PLDP/136)  A Findlay (PLDP/137)  Laura Gebbie (PLDP/138)  Huam Zhao (PLDP/139)  Boateng (PLDP/140)  Nicola Mac (PLDP/141)  C Cook (PLDP/142)  Isabel Gardiner (PLDP/143)  Kate Cousins (PLDP/144)  Susan Gebbie (PLDP/145)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/146)  Alison Byres (PLDP/147)  Kirsty Revel (PLDP/148)  Skye Burt (PLDP/149)  Victoria Jones (PLDP/150)  Gillian Gillespie (PLDP/151)  Oisin King (PLDP/152)  Olivia Paly (PLDP/153)  Sarah Tait (PLDP/154)  Amy Wood (PLDP/155)  Steven Findlay (PLDP/156)  Roderick D Massey (PLDP/157)  Gordon Morrison (PLDP/164)  Lorraine Kane (PLDP/174)  Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)  Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/4)  Joseph Higgins (PLDP/185)  E Meikle (PLDP/187)  Leigh McAulay (PLDP/188)  Joseph McAulay (PLDP/189)  A Yannelta (PLDP/190)  Agnes Scott (PLDP/191)  S Wade (PLDP/192)  Anne Polk (PLDP/193)  G Allan (PLDP/194)  I Bell (PLDP/195)  Julie Richardson (PLDP/196) </p>	<p> Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/197)  Joanne Hollem (PLDP/198)  Iain Dalrymple (PLDP/199)  Sarah Smith (PLDP/200)  Brian Yates (PLDP/201)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/202)  Tabathe Fishe (PLDP/203)  Scott Howie (PLDP/204)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/205)  Marie Husband (PLDP/206)  Kathryn Provan (PLDP/207)  Mark Dougal (PLDP/208)  Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) (PLDP/640/4)  Woodland Trust (PLDP/646/4)  RSPB (PLDP/649/4)  Peel Land &amp; Property (Ports) Ltd (PLDP/650)  Mrs Karen Douglas (PLDP/651)  Neil Brown (PLDP/656)  Network Rail (PLDP/662/4)  Miss Jacqueline Robertson (PLDP/672)  Scottish Water (PLDP/674/4)  SPT (PLDP/675/4)  SEPA (PLDP/676/2 (Support) and /676/4)  Janine Brown (PLDP/722)  C Smilie (PLDP/723)  C Fletcher (PLDP/724)  A Johnstone (PLDP/725)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/726)  Amy Clark (PLDP/727)  Joe McGinley (PLDP/728)  Porter (PLDP/729)  J Davidson (PLDP/730)  Laura Sutherland (PLDP/731)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/732)  A Harvey (PLDP/733)  J Smillie (PLDP/734)  S L Campbell (PLDP/735)  John Russell (PLDP/736)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/737)  Ms Linda McGregor (PLDP/738)  N Friel (PLDP/739)  C Mclearie (PLDP/740) </p>
---	--

<p>Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/742)  K Trainer (PLDP/743)  S Williams (PLDP/744)  B Glen (PLDP/745)  A Glen (PLDP/746)  Helen Fraser (PLDP/747)  Caroline Williams (PLDP/748)  M Carslaw (PLDP/749)  Allan Henderson (PLDP/750)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/751)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/752)  Y Innes (PLDP/753)  Kasia Zalewska (PLDP/754)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/755)  Laura Brown (PLDP/756)</p>	<p>L Leslie (PLDP/741)    M Love (PLDP/766)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/767)  Carol McNaught (PLDP/768)  Jacqueline Cowan (PLDP/769)  C McIntosh (PLDP/770)  William Chlosta (PLDP/771)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/772)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/773)  Brian Gibson (PLDP/774)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/775)  Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/776)  Mrs T Brown (PLDP/777)  Ian Brown (PLDP/778)  Scottish Canals (PLDP/786)</p>
<p><b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b></p>	<p>This issue relates to the City Deal Site – Esso, Bowling and Scott's Yard section of the Plan which sets out a Development Strategy and a series of place based policies for development of the area.</p>
<p><b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b></p>	
<p>The representations made to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General; Development Strategy, Development Strategy Map and Dumbarton Proposals Map; Development Policies; Ownership of Land, Proposed Road and Infrastructure; Biodiversity and Inner Clyde Special Protection Area; Road Safety; and Flooding, Drainage and Water.</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p><b>Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)</b> states that the engagement through this process has been poor and not in line with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy (CD/XX).</p> <p><u>Development Strategy</u></p> <p><b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/4)</b> supports the Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard policies, but would like to see less emphasis on industrial and business with more focus on tourism and leisure; improved pedestrian and cycling access; and the protection of the green network and infrastructure. The Community Council are particularly supportive of the restoration of Bowling Harbour and the harbour walls.</p> <p><b>SNH (PLDP/640/4)</b> recommend changes to the third and fifth bullet points within the development strategy in relation to landscape and also to accord with the wording of paragraph 207 &amp; 212 of SPP. SNH also recommend that a development brief, including a number of developer requirements, and a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is required for the Esso and Scott's Yard site.</p>	

**RSPB (PLDP/649/4)** support the commitment to enhancing the green network through this development and believe that the area to the west of the site should be retained as greenbelt as it was in the Proposed Plan (2016).

**Peel Land & Property (Ports) Ltd (PLDP/650)** supports the inclusion of the wider Esso/Scott's Yard site as a Business and Industrial Opportunity Site as part of the City Deal Project for Esso and Scott's Yard, Bowling. However, they suggest that the wider site could accommodate a range of business and industry opportunities, such as biomass; waste from energy facility and a stop for cruise liners.

They also are of the view that the scale of development proposed is not sufficient to be able to finance the formation of a new access road at Bowling or the road running parallel to the A814. Therefore it is suggested that the LDP should indicate the sources of funding which will secure the provision of this road.

**Peel Land & Property (Ports) Ltd (PLDP/650)** also support the identification of the site at Scott's Yard as a Housing Opportunity Site H2(7) and are of the view that a residential development on H2(7) would increase the viability of an enhanced and expanded park and ride facility at Bowling Station. They state that they are committed to bringing the site forward and it is already subject to decontamination works at Scott's Yard.

#### Development Strategy Map and Dumbarton Proposals Map

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** state that there are inconsistency between the Development Strategy Map and the Dumbarton proposals Map which shows the part of the site within the SPA to the south of the 'indicative access route' ( as shown on Strategy Map) and the part to the north of the 'indicative access route' as having an underlying allocation to Policy GB1: Green Belt. The Development Strategy Map, shows the underlying allocation as 'Green Network Enhancement' (hatched green). To ensure protection of the SPA and consistency between the Proposals Map and the Strategy Map, SNH recommend that the area south of the indicative road line which is within the SPA, should not be subject to any enhancement measures.

**SNH** also state that it is unclear why only the part of the area north of the disused railway is allocated as Open Space (GI1) on the Proposals Map whilst the other part to the south of it is not. They also ask why all the area to the south is identified as Green Network Enhancement on the Strategy Map. However, SNH state that despite this lack of clarity, SNH welcome the proposal for Open Space (GI1) / Green Belt (GB1) and Green Network Enhancement within the west of the site. Although it is disappointing that this Open Space does not extend through the site to the east (including linking to Scott's Yard), following the SPA and to enable recreational access and landscape enhancement along the river shore.

In relation to the comments above, **SNH** go onto recommend that consideration is given to allocating part of this area for Business and Industry (E1(16)) if this would enable some of the area currently allocated for Business and Industry along the river shore to be allocated as Open Space (GI1).

**SNH** also highlight that the current proposals for the Dunglass Castle and Henry Bell Obelisk Memorial are surrounded by Business and Industry land designation (E1(16)). This is likely to result in significant landscape and visual effects, compromising the



prominence and value of these structures as distinct landscape focal features, and reduce future opportunities for recreation around these and via links to the wider path network, Scott's Yard and the settlement of Bowling. SNH therefore recommend that the Council reallocates the land surrounding the Castle and obelisk as Open Space (GI1) and identifies important green access links to these.

### Development Policies

In relation to Esso Bowling Policy 3, **SNH (PLDP/640/4)** suggest the addition of a new bullet point to ensure comprehensive integration with the landscape and other natural heritage interests and also suggest an amendment of the first bullet point to strengthen and ensure protection of natural heritage interests.

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/4)** state that

they are pleased that this development will contribute to the enhancement of the green infrastructure already available on site. The Trust would like to see urban native trees included as part of the development, with appropriate native trees selected to provide benefits and be best adapted in the urban environment, as part of the enhancement of the existing green infrastructure. Urban trees offer essential ecosystem services such as pollution absorption, habitat for wildlife and surface water runoff management. Therefore, the Trust would like to see this request incorporated within Esso Bowling Policy 3.

**Network Rail (PLDP/662/4)** acknowledge that the proposed new link road is indicative but state that the final position of the route connection at the western edge will cross either over or under the railway line. Network Rail state that early engagement with them is essential to ensure that their rail assets are protected and train service delivery is not compromised. Network Rail therefore require that the second paragraph of the supporting text is amended to include this fundamental requirement.

Network Rail, in relation to Esso Bowling Policy 2, state that a level crossing exists to the north of Scott's Yard which is not currently used by the public. In considering any links between Scott's Yard and Bowling village using the level crossing, Network Rail's concern over the adverse impacts on safety, service provision and traffic queues as a result of any proposed usage should be noted. Network Rail also broadly welcome the commitment of an accessible rail overbridge to the east of the Esso Bowling site in Esso Bowling Policy 2, subject to design details and existing asset protection. However, they state that it is not clear whether this is being promoted in acknowledgement of the difficulties of using the level crossing and this should be clarified within the text of Policy 2.

**SEPA (PLDP676/4)** recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies. This strategy is the primary mechanism for the delivery of the key locations and it is anticipated these will be delivered over the next 5 to 10 years. One of these sites is Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard.

**SPT (PLDP/675/4)**, in relation to Esso Bowling Policy 2, are supportive of the new link road and the requirement to provide bus stops and associated infrastructure. However, SPT recommend that this is qualified due to this not always being sufficient to ensure bus service provision.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/4)**, in relation to the Development Strategy Map, support the

indicative waterfront walkway identified on the map and suggest that City Deal funding could be used to help fund delivery of this connection as well as inclusion of it within the redevelopment of Scott's Yard.

They also support Scott's Yard Policy 1, but suggest that this should be reinforced to ensure the developer delivers or contributes to the clearance of the harbour, restoration of the harbour walls and the path link as well as making reference to the need for dredging within the harbour.

#### Ownership of Land, Proposed Road and Infrastructure

PLDP/027; PLDP/028; PLDP/029; PLDP/030; PLDP/031; PLDP/032; PLDP/033; PLDP/034; PLDP/035; PLDP/036; PLDP/037; PLDP/038; PLDP/039; PLDP/040; PLDP/041; PLDP/042; PLDP/043; PLDP/044; PLDP/045; PLDP/046; PLDP/047; PLDP/048; PLDP/049; PLDP/050; PLDP/051; PLDP/053; PLDP/054; PLDP/055; PLDP/056; PLDP/057; PLDP/059; PLDP/060; PLDP/061; PLDP/062; PLDP/063; PLDP/064; PLDP/065; PLDP/066; PLDP/067; PLDP/069; PLDP/070; PLDP/071; PLDP/072; PLDP/073; PLDP/074; PLDP/076; PLDP/077; PLDP/078; PLDP/079; PLDP/080; PLDP/081; PLDP/082; PLDP/083; PLDP/084; PLDP/085; PLDP/086; PLDP/087; PLDP/088; PLDP/089; PLDP/090; PLDP/091; PLDP/092; PLDP/093; PLDP/094; PLDP/095; PLDP/096; PLDP/097; PLDP/098; PLDP/099; PLDP/100; PLDP/101; PLDP/102; PLDP/103; PLDP/104; PLDP/105; PLDP/106; PLDP/107; PLDP/121; PLDP/122; PLDP/123; PLDP/124; PLDP/125; PLDP/126; PLDP/127; PLDP/128; PLDP/129; PLDP/130; PLDP/131; PLDP/132; PLDP/133; PLDP/134; PLDP/135; PLDP/136; PLDP/137; PLDP/138; PLDP/139; PLDP/140; PLDP/141; PLDP/142; PLDP/143; PLDP/144; PLDP/145; PLDP/146; PLDP/147; PLDP/148; PLDP/149; PLDP/150; PLDP/151; PLDP/152; PLDP/153; PLDP/154; PLDP/155; PLDP/156; PLDP/175/4; PLDP/200; PLDP/201; PLDP/202; PLDP/203; PLDP/204; PLDP/205; PLDP/206; PLDP/207; PLDP/208; PLDP/656 all object to the proposed road and associated infrastructure being built on land owner by Ms Susan Dick on the basis of the designation of the land as greenbelt; that the owner of the land does not wish the development on her land; and that the land owner should not be forced to sell the property through compulsory purchase order.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)** states that she owns an area of land within the site (SI xx provides a map of the area in question) and raises various issues which are grouped under the sub-headings of this Schedule 4. In relation to the issue of landownership and the proposed route, Mrs Dick states that her land has been zoned as Greenbelt and has also been identified as an employment opportunity E1(16).

Ms Dick states she is opposed to the development of the land on a fundamental point of principle and that there is considerable local opposition to this proposal. She is of the view that the continued greenbelt designation is intended to suppress the value of compensation offered for any compulsory purchase. She states that half of the proceeds from any sale must go to the original owner and believes that fair compensation would require the Council to identify a suitable alternative site for grazing and for this to be offered by way of excambion as well as the remaining land not required to be retained. Ms Dick states that the horses which graze this field are in poor health and it is suggested that the disturbance of relocation would exacerbate these health issues or may result in them having to be euthanised.

In relation to the proposed road, Ms Dick states that specific reference to the road



realignment and new road proposals should be made in the text and proposals map. She believes that Councillors have been misled about whether all landowners are satisfied with the proposed road layout and states that the relief road is incidental to the plan for the site, is overly complex and will have an impact on the SPA and asks if the proposed route is the most feasible. Ms Dick questions if the route could be changed and supplies alternative options within her supporting information. She suggests that these routes have previously been supplied to the Council and questions whether these have been considered.

#### Biodiversity and Inner Clyde Special Protection Area

**PLDP/116; PLDP/117; PLDP/157; PLDP/164; PLDP/175/4; PLDP/185; PLDP/187; PLDP/188; PLDP/189; PLDP/190; PLDP/191; PLDP/192; PLDP/193; PLDP/194; PLDP/195; PLDP/196; PLDP/197; PLDP/198; PLDP/199; PLDP/651; PLDP/656; PLDP/672; PLDP/722; PLDP/723; PLDP/724; PLDP/725; PLDP/726; PLDP/727; PLDP/728; PLDP/729; PLDP/730; PLDP/731; PLDP/732; PLDP/733; PLDP/734; PLDP/735; PLDP/736; PLDP/737; PLDP/738; PLDP/739; PLDP/740; PLDP/741; PLDP/742; PLDP/743; PLDP/744; PLDP/745; PLDP/746; PLDP/747; PLDP/748; PLDP/749; PLDP/750; PLDP/751; PLDP/752; PLDP/753; PLDP/754; PLDP/755; PLDP/756; PLDP/766; PLDP/767; PLDP/768; PLDP/769; PLDP/770; PLDP/771; PLDP/772; PLDP/773; PLDP/774; PLDP/775; PLDP/776; PLDP/777; PLDP/778** all object to the proposal due to the land belonging to Susan Dick being in the greenbelt and development would be contrary to the council's greenbelt policy GB1.

The respondents also raise issues relating to the impact on wildlife and the existing use of the site for grazing and community activity; the impact on the right of way and ability to comply with policy of CON3 Core Paths and Natural Routes; the impact on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area. Concerns about contamination on site and potential impact on public health whether the planned roads can be rerouted away from this greenbelt site are also raised.

**Ms Caitlin Flynn (PLDP/031); Ms Cardine McAuley (PLDP/062); Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/080); Ms Laura Gebbie (PLDP/138); Ms Leigh McAulay (PLDP/188); Joseph McAulay (PLDP/189); A Yannelta (PLDP/190); Ms Agnes Scott (PLDP/191); S Wade (PLDP/192); G Allan (PLDP/194); I Bell (PLDP/195); Ms Julie Richardson (PLDP/196); Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/197); Ms Joanne Hollem (PLDP/198); Mr Iain Dalrymple (PLDP/199); Mr Scott Howie (PLDP/204); Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/205); Ms Marie Husband (PLDP/206); Ms Kathryn Provan (PLDP/207); and Mr Mark Dougal (PLDP/208)** all state that the site supports a wide range of biodiversity, including a wildlife pond, over 200 trees, meadow grasses and wildlife and that the removal of the greenbelt designation would result in the destruction of this natural resource.

**Ms Leigh McAulay (PLDP/188); Mr Joseph McAulay (PLDP/189); A Yannelta (PLDP/190); Ms Agnes Scott (PLDP/191); S Wade (PLDP/192); G Allan (PLDP/194); I Bell (PLDP/195); Ms Julie Richardson (PLDP/196); Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/197); Ms Joanne Hollem (PLDP/198); and Mr Iain Dalrymple (PLDP/199)** all state that they do not believe the appropriate studies have been undertaken of the potential impact on the Special Protection Area. They also state that there are Bats on site and question whether Bat surveys have been undertaken.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)** believes the relief road will have an impact on the SPA and

that the proposed use is not sufficient to be identified as an exceptional circumstance which would justify a negative impact on the internationally significant site. Ms Dick also believes that required ecological surveys have not been undertaken.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend a change in in wording the paragraph relating to the Special Protection Area (SPA) to ensure consistency throughout the plan. SNH note that the indicative route of the new road is now wholly outwith the SPA and suggest that should further alterations to this route bring it within the SPA then this would have implications for the adoption of LDP 2.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/4)** state that they are concerned about the potential impact on the Inner Clyde SSSI/SPA but welcome the commitment to protect the qualifying interest and qualities of the SPA and SSSI. The RSPB suggest that the wording in the introductory text could be simplified and should be cross referenced to Policy ENV1.

#### Road Safety

**Ms Leigh McAulay (PLDP/188); Mr Joseph McAulay (PLDP/189); A Yannelta (PLDP/190); Ms Agnes Scott (PLDP/191); S Wade (PLDP/192); G Allan (PLDP/194); I Bell (PLDP/195); Ms Julie Richardson (PLDP/196); Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/197); Ms Joanne Hollem (PLDP/198); and Mr Iain Dalrymple (PLDP/199)** all question the safety of having a pavement or cycle lane next to a road as an alternative to the right of way.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)** questions if the proposed road would have a positive impact on safety or congestion.

#### Flooding, Water and Drainage

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)** states that the site has been subject to flooding and further investigation into this is required.

**Scottish Water (PLDP/674/4)** state that a Water and Drainage Impact Assessment will be required at Esso Bowling to assess impact on Scottish Water's network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/4)** state that are generally supportive of the proposed development uses of all of the key sites, but strongly emphasise that in circumstances, such as Scott's Yard/Esso Bowling, where a more vulnerable residential use is being proposed, the recommendations of the Flood Risk Assessment will be critical to the viability of the site. This will be particularly relevant, as new data emerges on flood risk and climate change which could further restrict sustainability of residential development at this location.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**PLDP/027; PLDP/028; PLDP/029; PLDP/030; PLDP/031; PLDP/032; PLDP/033; PLDP/034; PLDP/035; PLDP/036; PLDP/037; PLDP/038; PLDP/039; PLDP/040; PLDP/041; PLDP/042; PLDP/043; PLDP/044; PLDP/045; PLDP/046; PLDP/047; PLDP/048; PLDP/049; PLDP/050; PLDP/051; PLDP/053; PLDP/054; PLDP/055; PLDP/056; PLDP/057; PLDP/059; PLDP/060; PLDP/061; PLDP/062; PLDP/063;**

PLDP/064; PLDP/065; PLDP/066; PLDP/067; PLDP/069; PLDP/070; PLDP/071;  
 PLDP/072; PLDP/073; PLDP/074; PLDP/076; PLDP/077; PLDP/078; PLDP/079;  
 PLDP/080; PLDP/081; PLDP/082; PLDP/083; PLDP/084; PLDP/085; PLDP/086;  
 PLDP/087; PLDP/088; PLDP/089; PLDP/090; PLDP/091; PLDP/092; PLDP/093;  
 PLDP/094; PLDP/095; PLDP/096; PLDP/097; PLDP/098; PLDP/099; PLDP/100;  
 PLDP/101; PLDP/102; PLDP/103; PLDP/104; PLDP/105; PLDP/106; PLDP/107;  
 PLDP/121; PLDP/122; PLDP/123; PLDP/124; PLDP/125; PLDP/126; PLDP/127;  
 PLDP/128; PLDP/129; PLDP/130; PLDP/131; PLDP/132; PLDP/133; PLDP/134;  
 PLDP/135; PLDP/136; PLDP/137; PLDP/138; PLDP/139; PLDP/140; PLDP/141;  
 PLDP/142; PLDP/143; PLDP/144; PLDP/145; PLDP/146; PLDP/147; PLDP/148;  
 PLDP/149; PLDP/150; PLDP/151; PLDP/152; PLDP/153; PLDP/154; PLDP/155;  
 PLDP/156; PLDP/200; PLDP/201; PLDP/202; PLDP/203; PLDP/204; PLDP/205;  
 PLDP/206; PLDP/207; PLDP/208 all state that the road and associated infrastructure  
 should not be built on land belonging to Ms Susan Dick.

PLDP/116; PLDP/117; PLDP/157; PLDP/164; PLDP/175/4; PLDP/185; PLDP/187;  
 PLDP/188; PLDP/189; PLDP/190; PLDP/191; PLDP/192; PLDP/193; PLDP/194;  
 PLDP/195; PLDP/196; PLDP/197; PLDP/198; PLDP/199; PLDP/651; PLDP/656;  
 PLDP/672; PLDP/722; PLDP/723; PLDP/724; PLDP/725; PLDP/726; PLDP/727;  
 PLDP/728; PLDP/729; PLDP/730; PLDP/731; PLDP/732; PLDP/733; PLDP/734;  
 PLDP/735; PLDP/736; PLDP/737; PLDP/738; PLDP/739; PLDP/740; PLDP/741;  
 PLDP/742; PLDP/743; PLDP/744; PLDP/745; PLDP/746; PLDP/747; PLDP/748;  
 PLDP/749; PLDP/750; PLDP/751; PLDP/752; PLDP/753; PLDP/754; PLDP/755;  
 PLDP/756; PLDP/766; PLDP/767; PLDP/768; PLDP/769; PLDP/770; PLDP/771;  
 PLDP/772; PLDP/773; PLDP/774; PLDP/775; PLDP/776; PLDP/777; and PLDP/778 all  
 request that the road is rerouted to avoid the greenbelt land and the amount of roads  
 required reduced.

**Susan Dick (PLDP175/4)** requests that if the development is deemed to be suitable for  
 development as a road, it should be removed from the greenbelt. Also requests that  
 specific reference to the road realignment and new road proposals connecting the site to  
 the A82 and A814 should be made in the text and on the Proposals Map. Further  
 requests that a definition of an exceptional circumstance, which would justify potential  
 harm to an internationally significant site, and who decides whether such a circumstance  
 exists should be set out within the plan.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend that the Paragraph 4 on Page 20 is amended to:

*“Development must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area  
 (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be  
 accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations  
 Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of  
 the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account  
 should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially  
 required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the  
 Development.”*

SNH further recommend the third bullet point of the Development Strategy is amended to  
 (proposed amendment in bold):

‘To use the development of the sites to enhance the Green Network **and access links  
 and for the proposals to reflect the distinctive landscape and visual characteristics**

***and qualities of the site, including the features of Dunglass Castle and the Henry Bell Obelisk Memorial’.***

SNH also request that the fifth bullet point of the Development Strategy is amended to the following text:

*“To ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI)”.*

SNH further recommend that the Development Strategy Map is amended as follows:

The area south of the indicative road line which is within the SPA, should not be subject to any enhancement measures. This should be shown as Greenbelt (GB1) and that the hatching showing ‘Green Network Enhancement’ is removed from the Strategy Map at this location.

SNH recommend consideration is given to allocating part of this area for Business and Industry (E1(16)) if this would enable some of the area currently allocated for Business and Industry along the river shore to be allocated as Open Space (GI1). They also recommend that the Council reallocates the land surrounding the castle and obelisk as Open Space (GI1) and identifies important green access links to these.

SNH also request that the Council require a development brief and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) for the Esso and Scott’s Yard site and sets out developer requirements. These should include consideration of the following:

- In the north-east of the site, retention of the eastern-most woodland area adjacent to Littlemill Place to protect the landscape character and amenity value of residents.
- Plant trees along the A814 adjacent to the west and east of the site to reinforce the landscape pattern, enhance the green network and mitigate landscape and visual effects on adjacent residents.
- Design the waterfront spaces to relate to the distinct landscape characteristics of the site, provide a high-quality built environment, provide green network enhancements and access for recreation, and integrate and protect the natural environment.
- Retention of existing mature trees within and around the edge of the site, especially where these collectively create landscape features.
- Spatial linkage and access between Scott’s Yard and Bowling across the railway to assist integration of the two areas. Enhancement of existing elevated views from Bowling over the site.
- Spatial linkage and access between the Esso and Scott’s Yard sites (taking into account the different timescales for development of these), including between the latter and Dunglass Castle, whilst ensuring retention of the existing line of mature trees along the western edge of the Scott’s Yard site.

- Mitigation of vehicle noise within residential and open green spaces where this strongly affects residential amenity and the landscape experience.
- How the site would be viewed from the southern side of the River Clyde, particularly the siting and scale of structures in relation to the foreground river expanse, the hill backdrop and foci such as Dunglass Castle.
- If flood defence structures are required, ensure these are designed to relate to the landscape character and visual amenity.

SNH, in relation Esso Bowling Policy 3, recommend a new bullet point is added to the start of the Policy as follows:

*“To deliver a designed waterfront edge, that demonstrates successful integration of proposals within wider views, delivers appropriate waterfront recreational access and frames key views”.*

SNH also request the first bullet of the Policy is amended as follows (proposed amendment in bold):

*“To ensure that **proposals** reflect and help to strengthen the biodiversity and landscape character of the site and respond to the surrounding landscape context and wider assets: and...”*

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/4)** requests the following text to be added to Esso Bowling Policy 3:

*‘To include native trees planting with appropriate species for urban residential environments in order to make a significant contribution to the increase in tree canopy cover of the area.’*

**RSPB Scotland (PLDP/649/4)** in reference to Paragraph 5 on Page 20, state that the wording should be simplified to the following:

*‘There must be no adverse impact on the integrity of the Inner Clyde SPA’.*

They also request that there is a cross-reference to Policy ENV 1 within the text.

The RSPB would like to see the position taken in Proposed Plan (2016) with regards to the west of the site to be reiterated. Namely:

*‘that the west of the site may have potential in the long-term to enable coastal realignment, mitigating the impact of climate change and allowing the migration of Inner Clyde habitats in response to sea level rise and that it should therefore be retained as greenbelt.’*

**Peel Land & Property (Ports) Ltd (PLDP/650)** state that sources of funding for the provision of the road accesses should be indicated within LDP 2.

**Network Rail (PLDP/662/4)** request that the following text is added to the end of the fourth paragraph (proposed amendment in bold):

*"....the Development Strategy Map as indicative only. **As shown, the new access road at the western edge of Esso Bowling site will require a crossing of the existing railway line. Early engagement with Network Rail is essential to ensure the regeneration of this site and to ensure that rail assets are protected and train service delivery is not compromised.**"*

Network Rail also request that the following amendment to the second bullet point within Esso Bowling Policy 2 is made (proposed amendment in bold):

*"A new accessible rail overbridge, to the east of the site **and as an alternative to utilising the existing level crossing**, to enable access from Bowling Railway Station, and to link into the wider active travel network."*

**SPT (PLDP/675/4)** request that the third bullet point of Esso Bowling Policy 2 is amended as follows (proposed amendment in bold):

*"Provision of bus stops and associated infrastructure to encourage public transport provisions within the site **subject to discussion with SPT and bus operators.**"*

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/4)** request that Scott's Yard Policy 1 is reinforced to ensure the developer of Scott's Yard delivers or financially contributes to the costs of clearance of the Harbour, restoration of harbour walls and the path link. The policy should also refer to the need for the western half of the harbour to be dredged.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council's responses to the representations made to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General; Development Strategy; Development Strategy Map and Dumbarton Proposals Map; Development Policies; Ownership of Land, Proposed Road and Infrastructure; Biodiversity and Inner Clyde Special Protection Area; Road Safety; and Flooding, Drainage and Water

##### General

The comments from **Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)** in relation to engagement are disputed. The Council is of the view that it has fully complied with its participation statement which was set out in the Development Plan Scheme and Participation Statement (September 2018).

##### Introductory Text

The Council has no objection to the proposed modification to Paragraph 4 on Page 20 in relation to the SPA, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/4)**, should the Reporter be agreeable to this amendment and considers that a change to Paragraph 4 is required. Should this be the case then the Council suggests that Paragraph 4 is amended as suggested by SNH.

The support from **Silverton and Overton Community Council (PLDP/182/4)** is welcomed. The reduced emphasis that is placed by the Community Council on industrial business is duly noted. However, the Council would point out that the history of the site is



one of industry and the continued use of the site for business and industry is entirely appropriate due to its historic and former uses and is part of the wider City Deal Project for the Glasgow City Region which is about investment in infrastructure to stimulate economic growth. The Business and Industrial Report (April 2018) (CDxx) scored the site highly and did not propose any de-allocations of allocated business and industrial land. This site is one of the allocated sites for those uses within the Plan and, as a result, no modifications to the Plan are considered necessary in this regard.

### Development Strategy

In response to **Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)** who is of the view that her land is both included within the greenbelt and within the Employment Opportunity E1(16). The Council would point out that her land is only located with the Greenbelt and, for the avoidance of doubt, is not located within the safeguarded business and industrial area..

The Council has no objections to the proposed modifications to the Development Strategy, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/4)**, should the Reporter be agreeable to these amendment and considers that these changes to the Development Strategy are required. Should this be the case then the Council suggests that the Development Strategy, in relation to the Green Network, is amended as suggested by SNH.

In response to comments from **SNH** in relation to Dunglass Castle and Henry Bell Obelisk, the Council agrees that sensitive treatment of these assets is required. The Council is therefore of the view that a modification to the Development Strategy Map may be necessary to provide a landscaped setting around these important assets. Should the Reporter be agreeable to this amendment and considers that this change to the Development Strategy Map is required. Should this be the case then the Council suggests that the Development Strategy Map should show an indicative area of safeguarded open space around these assets.

The comments from **SNH** on landscape and open space matters, raised within their representation, will be addressed by the masterplan and the modification suggested above.

The Council would point out, in relation to **SNH's** request for a developer brief, that Esso Bowling Policy 1 and Scott's Yard Policy 1 requires a masterplan for both sites to be provided. Therefore, there is no need for a development brief to be produced as well. In relation to the request for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), the Council would point out that Outline Business Case, Appendix D, states that Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Esso site as part of the Environmental Baseline with the aim of preserving the setting of these heritage assets. Therefore, the Council is of the view that there is no requirement to explicitly state that an LVIA requires to be undertaken as this assessment has already been done and will guide the future masterplan for the site and, as a result, no modification to the Plan is necessary.

However, should the Reporter not be of the same view of the Council on this matter, the Council would suggest that Esso Bowling Policy 1 and Scott's Yard Policy 1 is amended as follows (the proposed amendments are made in bold):

Esso Bowling Policy 1

*“.....A comprehensive masterplan for development of the site is required to be submitted*

*as part of any planning application for the site and development proposals should be in accordance with the masterplan for the site. **The masterplan should be informed by Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and this assessment should also be provided alongside any planning application for the site.***

#### Scotts Yard Policy 1

*“.....A comprehensive masterplan for development of the site is required to be submitted as part of any planning application for the site. **The masterplan should be informed by Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and this assessment should also be provided alongside any planning application for the site.....**”*

The Council, however, does not agree with SNH's request that developer requirements for the sites should be set out within the Plan, as these are matters that would normally be considered through the Development Management process for a planning application. However, it is considered that Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Plan will help to address the concerns expressed by the respondent when an application is considered. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

With regard to the representation from **RSPB (PLDP/649/4)**, the text in the Plan in relation to the SPA has been agreed with SNH. Simplifying this text would also be at odds with the mitigation specified in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (CD xx), which again SNH are happy with. No modification to the text is therefore required in this regard.

However, the Council is of the view that an amendment to make a cross reference to Policy ENV1 may be appropriate to relate to requirements of Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation and to ensure that developers fully accord with the requirements of the Plan in that regard. The Council would therefore have no objection if the Reporter is agreeable to this amendment and considers that a change to the final paragraph on page 20 of the text is required and the Council suggests that the last sentence is amended as follows (amendment in bold):

*“Development which could harm an internationally important site will only be approved in certain circumstances **as detailed within Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation.**”*

With regard to the **RSPB's** request to reintroduce a section of the 2016 Proposed Plan strategy for the west of the site in relation to coastal realignment, climate change and migration of habitats, the Council would point out that the project has been adjusted due to further technical work taken between the Proposed Plan (2016) and Local Development Plan 2 and these adjustments have resulted in the area of land previously allocated within the Proposed Plan (2016) being removed within this Plan. The Council would point out that wider area of green network enhancement has been provided to the immediate west of the land the RSPB are commenting upon. As SNH have not raised any issues with the change in strategy, no modifications to the Plan are required in this regard.

The support from **Peel Land and Property (Ports) Ltd (PLDP/650)** for the overall regeneration of both sites and the allocation of Site H2(7) within Scott's Yard is noted.

In response to comments from **Peel Land and Property (Ports) Ltd** regarding identifying the source of funding for the access road within Local Development Plan 2, the Council would point out that delivery of the road is one of the key parts of this Council's City Deal project which will enable this site to be developed for the proposed uses.



The Outline Business Case (CDxx) details what is funded by City Deal for delivery on the site and the Council is of the view that Local Development Plan 2 does not need to replicate the exact sources of funding as this is a detailed matter which is outwith the scope of the Plan to influence. That being said, Esso Bowling Policy 1 requires a masterplan for this site and Policy CP4 Masterplanning and Development Briefs requires a phasing delivery and strategy to be included within the masterplan. The Council therefore considers that the appropriate place for this level of detail is within the phasing and delivery strategy of the Plan. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

In response to the representation from **Network Rail (PLDP/662/4)** regarding the need to emphasise the requirement for early engagement with them in relation to the indicative access route, which is proposed to cross the railway line, is not considered necessary. The Council would point out that Network Rail are a statutory consultee within the development management process and early engagement with Network Rail is underway in relation to development of the site. Furthermore, the Council's City Deal project team have already been in discussions with Network Rail on this issue. No modification to the Plan is therefore necessary in this regard.

The comments of **SEPA (PLDP676/4)** on the purpose of the development strategy and policies within the section are acknowledged.

#### Development Strategy Map and Dumbarton Proposals Map

In response to comments from **SNH (PLDP/640/4)** which identify an inconsistency between the Strategy Map for this site and the Proposals Map, the Council considered that it is appropriate to include areas identified for Green Network Enhancement on this strategy map, as the Development Strategy Map will inform any future masterplan for the site. In this case, the area which **SNH (PLDP/640/4)** have queried was identified on the strategy map as both greenbelt and Green Network Enhancement; however, it is accepted that this is not clear enough and a non-notifiable change to the plan will be undertaken to clarify where these designations are overlapping, by amending the colours used to identify these parts of the Map to be more readily identifiable to the reader..

It is accepted that this area, which is part of the SPA, should not be subject to any enhancement measures; therefore, the Council would have no objection to the removal of the Green Network Enhancement allocation from this area, should the Reporter be agreeable to this amendment and considers that this change to the Development Strategy Map is required.

In response to the comments from **SNH (PLDP/640/4)** with regard to open space and greenbelt designations, the Council is of the view that area of land, between the railway line and the A82 is amenity greenspace and has been allocated as safeguarded open space within the Adopted Local Plan (March 2010) (CD/XX), the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) (CD/XX). The Council is of the view that this area of land is not Greenbelt and should remain as safeguarded open space within Local Development Plan 2.

The other area of land, between the railway line and the proposed new access road, which SNH question is, in the Council's view, Greenbelt land, which is also in need of enhancement; hence why the land has a dual designation. It is designated as Green

Network Enhancement as the area of land could contribute better to the Green Network if it is enhanced as part of the development. The land in question is also required to assist with flood risk management within the site, No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

To provide the clarity that **SNH** seek, the Council would have no objection to a further modification to the Development Strategy Map and the Dumbarton Proposals Map, should the Reporter be agreeable to this amendment and considers that this change to both maps are required. Should this be the case, the Council would suggest that this area of land is shown as Greenbelt on both maps, as well as, Green Network Enhancement on the Development Strategy Map.

With regard to the request from **SNH** to allocate a part of the business and industrial land designation (E1(16)) as open space along the river shore to be allocated as Open Space (G11), the Council would point out that both the Development Strategy Map and the Dumbarton Proposals Map show a space between the allocated industrial site and the river shore which is intended to be a buffer. The Council would have no objection to the area of land being changed to safeguarded open space, should the Reporter be agreeable to this amendment and consider that this change to the Development Strategy Map and Dumbarton Proposals Map is required. Should this be the case, the Council would suggest that this area of land is shown on the Development Strategy Map should be altered to show this land as safeguarded open space and as a Green Network enhancement. The Dumbarton Proposals Map could then be amended to show the area of land as safeguarded open space.

#### Development Policies

With regard to the representation from **Network Rail (PLDP/662/4)** in relation to Esso Bowling Policy 2, the Council does not agree with the proposed modification as the access to Scott's Yard will be via the new link road and by means of a path link to Bowling Station. It is not proposed that there will be a further access to the Scott's Yard site across the railway line and no further access is shown within the Development Strategy Map. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

The Council has no objection to the proposed modification to the third bullet point of Esso Bowling Policy 2, as requested by **SPT (PLDP/675/4)** should the Reporter be agreeable to this amendment and considers that a change to the bullet point is required. Should this be the case then the Council suggests that the bullet is amended as suggested by SPT.

In relation to Esso Bowling Policy 3, the Council also has no objection to the proposed modifications requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/4)**, should the Reporter be agreeable to this amendment and considers that a change to the Policy is required. Should this be the case then the Council suggests that the modifications, as suggested by SNH, are made.

The Council does not agree with the representation from the **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/4)** that Esso Bowling Policy 3 requires to be amended in relation to native trees. The Council considers that species of trees which require to be planted as part of the green infrastructure approach to the site is a detailed matter which is best addressed at the Development Management stage. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

The support from **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/4)** in relation to the indicative waterfront

walkway, as required by Esso Bowling Policy 2, is welcomed. The Council believes recreational access to and within the site is an important part of the sites redevelopment as is public access to and along the foreshore for recreational access, which is a requirement of Policy WD 1. The masterplan will have to address this requirement.

The scope of the City Deal project is set out within the Outline Business Case; therefore, it is not appropriate for Local Development Plan 2 to direct City Deal funding to delivering an access route into Scott's Yard. The Policy does, however, require road infrastructure which enables access to the Scott's Yard site as part of the infrastructure requirements for the Esso Bowling site. No modification to the Plan is considered necessary in this regard.

The support from **Scottish Canals** for Scott's Yard Policy 1 is also acknowledged. In response to the comments about reinforcing this policy to ensure that the developer of the site delivers or financially contributes to the specific requirements set out in the three bullet points with the Policy, the Council considers that the Policy is strong enough to ensure that that the delivery of these requirements is undertaken prior to development of the site. The Council would however point out that Local Development Plan 2 can only relate to developments on land and, as such, cannot require any developer to dredge the harbour prior to development and is outwith the scope of the Plan. No modifications to the Plan are therefore required in this regard.

#### Ownership of Land, Impact on the Greenbelt, Proposed Road and Infrastructure

The respondents all object to the use of **Ms Susan Dick's** land being used for the development of the site. The Council would point out that in regard to the ownership of land, this is not a consideration that Local Development Plan 2 requires to address and issues relating to the ownership of land or the negotiations for the sale land are outwith the scope of the Plan and the Examination. The Council respectfully asks the Reporter to disregard the objections received in relation to this particular issue on those grounds. The Council would also ask the Reporter to dismiss any of the substantive claims made by **Ms Dick** about compensation, value of the land and Councillors being misled should also be disregarded as these are irrelevant considerations about the potential of the whole site for development. The Council's position on this issue is supported by that the Reporter considering the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) and stated that land ownership considerations are not relevant matters for the Examination (CD/XX)

As nothing has materially changed from the previous Examination Report and abiding by the Reporters decision on the grounds of ownership, the main issues that the Council will respond to in relation to the representations are in relation to the impact on the Greenbelt and the proposed road and infrastructure.

From the outset, the Council considers this site to be of strategic importance to the Regeneration aims of the Council and for future Business and Industrial Use within West Dunbartonshire. Re-development of the site will also contribute to the wider Glasgow City Region Economic Strategy and the delivery of the aspirations of City Deal, not only within West Dunbartonshire, but for the wider city region as a whole.

An Outline Business Case for the Exxon Site Development was approved by the City Region Cabinet in March 2017 (CD/XX). This has been adapted to reflect adjustments to the scope of the project resulting from further technical work to form an updated Outline Business Case, which was approved by the City Region Cabinet in January 2019 (CD/XX). The Outline Business Case sets out the need for supporting infrastructure in

order to realise the development potential of the Exxon site, as well as, defining the scope of the required works.

The January 2019 Outline Business Case also sets out the significant difference in the potential benefits that could be realised if the whole package of development is not delivered, in particular highlighting the opportunity that would be lost if the A814 link road is not completed or if only a single access is delivered for the Esso and Scott's Yard site. The A814 link road is thereby identified as being one of the fundamental infrastructure requirements for unlocking the Esso and Scott's Yard, Bowling site.

The majority of the points raised in the representations were also raised at the Examination into the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016). The Reporter concluded that the principle of the development and the link road are appropriate. In specific relation to the greenbelt designation, the Reporter found that the use of this land to enable a link from the Dunglass roundabout to the Dumbuck junction took precedence over its use as agricultural pastureland for grazing horses and associated activity. It was also found that its continued inclusion within the greenbelt strengthens its importance in relation to the development of the site.

The Council therefore disagrees with the respondents that the proposed road is contrary to Policy GB 1 of the Plan, which allows infrastructure with a site specific locational need to be developed within the Greenbelt, which the development of this site clearly has. The Council also consider that the proposed use would be acceptable within the greenbelt, and even with the development of this infrastructure, retaining the undeveloped land within the greenbelt would help to continue to define the edge of Milton and Dumbarton.

As a result of the above, the Council does not agree with **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)** and the respondents stating that this land should not be removed from the greenbelt. The Council, in further response to **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)**, is also of the view that the Business and Industrial units and the road are critical to the future regeneration of this site and economic growth within West Dunbartonshire and the wider City Region. No modifications to the Plan are therefore required in this regard

In relation to the representations in relation to the alignment of the road and the request of to consider alternative proposals for the road, that the route of the A814 link road, as shown within Local Development Plan 2, is still considered to be indicative, pending detailed design. It now reflects the preferred accesses identified within the January 2019 Outline Business Case, which have been developed through Concept Design, Feasibility and Options Appraisal. This work has been undertaken to demonstrate that any engineering issues are identified, as well as, ensuring that Transport Scotland and Network Rail requirements can be met. The optimal solutions, which are set out in the Outline Business Case and represented indicatively within Local Development Plan 2, are the solutions which best meet these requirements. The Council is therefore of the view that no modifications to the Plan are necessary in this regard.

#### Biodiversity and Inner Clyde Special Protection Area

The respondents are of the view that development of the road and the site will have a significant impact on the SPA. The Council would however advise that SNH are satisfied that the proposed route of the road will have no impact on the SPA and SSSI as it lies outwith the boundary of both of these natural resources. The Council has worked with **SNH** to ensure that the approach to the development of this site protect the qualifying

interests and qualities of the SPA and SSSI.

The comments of **SNH (PLDP/640/4)** stating that any revisions to the road alignment, which would result in the road being located within the SPA and SSSI, and the issues it would raise for the adoption of the Plan are duly noted.

The Council does not accept that a definition of “exceptional circumstances” should be set out within the Local Development Plan, as suggested by **Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)**. The Council’s strategy for the site is intended to protect and not have a detrimental impact on the redshank. SNH have been clear through their representations that they are satisfied with the approach taken, subject to some proposed changes noted above, to this site. SNH also have not objected to the Habitats Regulation Appraisal of the Plan (CDxx).

Contrary to the view of the majority of the respondents, the Plan requires a study of the redshank to be carried out and a project level Habitats Regulation Appraisal. These studies will be carried out by independent consultants and the project level Habitats Regulation Appraisal. The Council considers that the required surveys will be undertaken at the appropriate time. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

It is also noted that a number of respondents questioned whether the required habitat, biodiversity and bat surveys have been undertaken. It will be requirement for any planning application for the site to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment. These studies will be undertaken as part of that process and the findings and any required mitigation will be included within the Environmental Statement for that planning application. No modifications are therefore required in this instance.

Furthermore, the Council disagrees that that proposal is contrary to Policy CON3: Core Paths and Natural Routes. Although there may be disruption to the right of way through the site, Policy CON3 details the requirements to mitigate and overcome this adverse impact. Site specific requirements in relation to Esso Bowling Policy 2 requirements for improving active travel across the site are detailed matters for the Development Management stage to address. It should be pointed out that there is little access to the site at this moment and these issues will be considered at the development management stage.

With regards to comments relating to public safety and contamination, remediation work on the centerfield part of the site has been completed, with further remediation on the remaining part of the site is due to commence shortly. There is no development currently on the site; therefore, public safety is not considered to be at risk at this point and this issue is outwith the scope of the Plan to address. No modifications are considered necessary.

### Road Safety

In relation to the representation from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)**, that the proposed link road will provide an alternative relief road should the A82 become blocked/closed and that the road should help to ease congestion and traffic safety.

In response to the representations from **Ms Leigh McAulay (PLDP/188); Mr Joseph McAulay (PLDP/189); A Yannelta (PLDP/190); Ms Agnes Scott (PLDP/191); S Wade (PLDP/192); G Allan (PLDP/194); I Bell (PLDP/195); Ms Julie Richardson (PLDP/196); T- (PLDP/197); Ms Joanne Hollem (PLDP/198); and Mr Iain Dalrymple (PLDP/199)**,



that the detailed design of the roads and paths is still to be undertaken; however, any proposal, which created an issue for public safety as suggested by some respondents, would not be considered acceptable by the Council or given permission.

#### Flooding, Drainage and Water

With regards to comments from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/4)** in relation to Flood Risk, a number of studies in relation to water, hydrology and flood risk, have been undertaken following EIA Scoping, as detailed in Appendix D of the Outline Business Case, (CD/XX D.1.14-D.1.18). As detailed below, **SEPA (PLDP/676/4)** are supportive of the proposed development of this key site, and acknowledge that an updated Flood Risk Assessment will be required to accompany any forthcoming planning application.

The Council has no objection to the amendment to the supporting text of this section of the plan, in relation to the points raised by **Scottish Water (PLDP/674/4)**, to note that Water and Drainage Impact Assessment will be required and that early contact with Scottish Water should be made. Should the Reporter wish to amend this section of the Plan, the Council would have no objection to a change being made and would suggest that a new paragraph is inserted after Paragraph 5 (which starts with 'The Council as...') as follows:

*'Furthermore, a Water and Drainage Impact Assessment is required for the site. Early contact with Scottish Water is required in relation to this assessment and any potential impacts on Scottish Water's network.'*

In relation to the representation from **SEPA (PLDP/676/4)**, the comments in relation to Flood Risk Assessment for Housing Opportunity Site H2(7) Scott's Yard are noted. As set out in Schedule 2 of the Proposed Plan, this site will require a Flood Risk Assessment to be provided as part of any forthcoming planning application.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 5	Carless, Old Kilpatrick	
Development plan reference:	Delivering Our Places: Carless, Old Kilpatrick (Pages 24-28)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<p>Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2) Malin Group (PLDP/177/1) Silverton and Overton Community Council (PLDP/182/2) SNH (PLDP/640/4) Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/4) Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668) Clydebelt (PLDP/673/7) Scottish Water (PLDP/674/2) SEPA (PLDP676/2) (Support) Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1) Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/1) Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1) Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757) Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758) Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759) Scottish Canals (PLPD/786/4)</p>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Carless, Old Kilpatrick section of the Plan which sets out a Development Strategy and a series of place based policies for development of the area.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>The representations made to this site have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General; Inner Clyde Special Protection Area; Development Strategy and Development Strategy Map; Carless Policy 1; Carless Policy 2; Carless Policy 3; Carless Policy 4; Proposals Map; Nature Conservation; and Forth and Clyde Canal Scheduled Monument.</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p><b>Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)</b> object to the size of the building; the future plans for mixed-use and residential; and the additional access route. The respondents are of the view that the whole area should be an extension of the Saltings Nature Reserve as this would fit in with many of the policies contained within LDP 2. The respondents also refer to illegal driving of motor bikes in the area and highlights equestrian accidents etc.</p> <p><b>Silverton and Overton Community Council (PLDP/182/2)</b> do not object to development of the site, but have reservation about the height of any proposed buildings. They refer to one building being 43 metres in height which the respondent considers inappropriate for</p>		

this environmentally sensitive site and almost impossible to visually shield.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend that the Council require a development brief and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) for the Carless site and sets out developer requirements in this regard.

**SEPA (PLDP676/2)** recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies. This strategy is the primary mechanism for the delivery of the key locations and it is anticipated these will be delivered over the next 5 to 10 years. One of these sites is Carless.

**Scottish Water (PLDP/674/2)** state that a Water and Drainage Impact Assessment will be need to be carried out to assess the impact on their water network and that early engagement is critical.

#### Inner Clyde Special Protection Area

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** suggest that an independent HRA should be carried out as the Council has too close an interest in developing this site in particular as some of the land is in its ownership (community park at end of Durban Avenue is earmarked as an access route).

A study of Redshank should be insisted upon as the site is within and adjacent to the SPA. This development must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA). The plans for this site involve heavy industry and with that will come associated pollution (various forms, noise, light etc), new roads, increased traffic, pedestrian and vehicular etc. The respondents are therefore of the view that development of the site cannot fail to have an impact/effect on the SPA.

The respondents are also of the view that a mixed use development and secondary access to the site should not take precedent over the impacts on the SPA. The respondents also state that the Plan should make it clear the parameters on how these impacts are outweighed by the development and who decides this.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** require the fourth paragraph on Page 23 to be amended in relation to the HRA to ensure there is no confusion between the information required to inform the Habitats Regulation Appraisal (HRA) and the HRA itself. Subsequent changes to the section on Carless in the HRA (CD xx) and SEA (CD xx) will also be need to be made.

#### Development Strategy and Development Strategy Map

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** state that whilst the supporting text on page 24 identifies the contaminated land designations affecting the site, the need for remediation is not stated within the Development Strategy itself, nor within the Carless site specific policies which follow. There is also no recognition in policy terms of the need for remediation to follow a “*suitable for use*” approach, as required by Scottish Government Planning Advice Note 33: Development of Contaminated Land, and the consequently logical approach of allowing remediation to proceed on a phased basis as end use proposals are progressively defined, funded and implemented. An amendment to reflect this approach is essential as



the timing, extent and type of remediation required on different parts of the site will vary depending upon the nature of localised contamination, and the intended end use.

In relation to access, the second bullet point within the Development Strategy considers site access and includes a requirement to *'provide a secondary access point to the site and upgrade the existing access.'* However, neither the strategy nor the subsequent policies explore the circumstances under which a secondary access would be required, or the detail of the 'upgrades' to the existing. It is implicit within Carless Policy 3 that a secondary access is required if residential is to come forward on the site. This is accepted, but it is not clear from the proposed plan that, in the absence of residential development, the single existing access, possibly upgraded, is sufficient to cater for a mixed-use business and industrial development. This has already been discussed and confirmed with the Council's Roads team of the Council and should be made clear within the Plan.

With regard to the Green Network, the respondent is of the view that the Development Strategy should make it clear that the primary role of the Green Network at the Carless site is one of habitat connectivity rather than recreation or access.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend, in the order of consistency in the Plan and to accord with the wording of paragraph 207 & 212 of SPP, that the fifth bullet be amended.

**Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668)** are of the view that no houses or development should be allowed on the area of land between the railway line and the canal as it is this area that makes it a haven for wildlife.

#### Carless Policy 1: Business and Industrial Development

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** are of the view that no area of the site should be used for this type of development.

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** states that the hard delineation of Business and Industry allocation E1(17) on the Carless Development Strategy combined with the wording in Carless Policy 1 that business and industrial proposals will be supported *"on the areas identified for uses within the Development Strategy Map"* is of concern as it could unnecessarily restrict redevelopment proposals. Moreover, the Carless Development Strategy Map excludes the existing jetties and land surrounding these from the business and industry land allocation, except for a narrow *"indicative access route"* to link the jetties with land allocation E1(17). This is misaligned with the introductory supporting text to the Carless Development Strategy which identifies the jetties and deep water access as being the key assets of importance for shipping and marine related redevelopment proposals. Given the economic importance of the jetties and that industrial led regeneration of the entire Carless site is in fact predicated upon their use, it is recommended that the Carless Development Strategy Map should be amended to include the existing jetties and an area of adjoining land as clearly being within Business and Industry allocation E1(17).

#### Carless Policy 2: Mixed Use Development

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** are of the view that no area of the site

should be used for this type of development.

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** state that the diagrammatic segregation of the proposed Mixed Use Allocation from the Green Network corridor is unnecessary and should be removed such that the boundary of the allocation and corridor should overlap along the River Clyde frontage (i.e. the Green Network corridor should provide the frontage of and be within the Mixed Use allocation, rather than these being shown as functionally separate). This would provide greater flexibility for redevelopment on the eastern part of the site, where further inward investment is still required to deliver appropriate remediation and regeneration, without undermining proposals for environmental enhancement. It would not interfere with the qualifying interests and integrity of the Inner Clyde SPA and SSSI, as the eastern part of the Carless site is not bounded by these ecological designations and appropriate protections would continue to apply.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend that criterion (c) is amended in order to be consistent and to accord with the wording of paragraph 207 & 212 of SPP.

### Carless Policy 3: Residential Development

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** are of the view that no area of the site should be used for this type of development. They are also of the view that any planned/potential or proposed development on the community park earmarked as a possible route for the road access should be removed.

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** state that they only intend to bring this land forward for housing if it is not possible to secure a business or industrial use for it, or if a higher value use is required on the land to pay for remediation activities on the wider Carless landholding. To this end it is considered inappropriate to designate the land for housing use only and the designation should be changed to that of mixed use, to match the remainder of the Carless site. The text of the strategy and the Carless Policy 3 are sufficient to preserve the possibility of use for housing under certain circumstances. The requirement for a secondary access to serve housing is acknowledged; however it may be that other alternative access routes become available that would be equally acceptable. The new access should not be specific to Dumbarton Road. Also request that an area of land currently zoned as safeguarded open space is re-designated as a residential site.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** question the allocation of Housing Site H2(33) given the sensitivity of the landscape features and Green Network Enhancement either side of the Canal. They recommend either that the housing is incorporated within the Mixed use area, which would allow the proposed housing site to remain as open space that could link to the north side of the Canal; or the housing allocation could be split either side of the disused railway line and provide some open space within the existing allocated site; or the number of units could be reduced.

They also recommend that a new sentence is added to the end of the Policy to ensure development relates to key landscape characteristics and visual amenity of the site in accordance with Policy ENV2 of the Plan.

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/7)** state that they cannot see the justification for a new road and bridge to the proposed residential site if this road is only serving the residential area. State

that they have been informed that the development can use the existing Ferry Road, subject to improvements and that this road would bisect the only sizable area of playing space South of Dumbarton Road. Are of the view that the site in question could be used as wildlife enhancement to replace the area of land being lost to the construction yard. Raise issues of residential amenity and state that it would create an isolated community and that development of the site is contrary to Carless Policy 4.

#### Carless Policy 4: Green Network and Green Infrastructure

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** support part of the Policy where it refers to protecting and enhancing the disused railway line/wildlife corridor and states that this is a well-used core path/natural route used extensively by locals. The respondents however cannot see how a planned road right across it and major development on either side can possibly adhere to this Policy.

The respondents refer to Policy Con 3 in relation to the protection of core paths, bridleways and footpaths states the development of the site and proposed road will affect the wildlife corridor and the cycle path/canal towpath. They are of the view that the proposed secondary access will also not allow for freedom of movement of wildlife; would endanger wildlife; and will also create fragmented areas.

The Policy also mentions upgrading existing open space and providing new green spaces within the site, as well as, retaining natural species and habitats within the site. Development of the site should not be used as compensatory green space and should be tidied up instead as it is a varied natural habitat and a well-used walking area. The respondent is strongly of the view that if it is developed for the intended uses then the Council will have ruined it for all future generations.

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** is of the view that the requirement in Carless Policy 4 that “development of the site is required to deliver habitat, access, green and open space enhancements site” does not provide a clear statement regarding the Green Network role of the site or how this should be enhanced. To address this, it is recommended that Carless Policy 4 should be amended to clearly define the primary role of green network enhancements within the Carless site as one of habitat connectivity rather than recreation, amenity or access, which are fulfilled by the canal and tow path immediately to the north east.

The Malin Group is of the view that there is one location on site where green network enhancements could be used to provide a recreational and access function. In the SE portion of the site, adjacent to the Auchentoshan Burn, there is an opportunity to provide green network connectivity back to the canal towpath and thereby allow recreational riverside access. The Development Strategy Map could be amended to indicate this opportunity

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** is of the view that another bullet point is required in relation to the design of the green network and spaces.

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/4)** state that they have identified strips of woodland present on the NWSS at site allocation H2 (33). As woodland loss is a potential negative impact of development at this site, the respondent would like to ensure that

appropriate compensatory planting with native trees is specific in the policy section for this development area.

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/7)** would like to see improvement to the unmade footpath near the river around the whiskey bond forming a walking loop with the canal footpath and Sustrans ex rail track.

**Scottish Canals (PLPD/786/4)** states that because of the nature of the waterside proposal at the Carless site it might not be possible to provide a continuous Riverside Walkway along the north bank of the Clyde at this location. The Forth & Clyde Canal towpath could be upgraded by the Carless development to provide an alternative access route set back from the River. The policy should also recognise the importance of the proposed development at Carless providing new access connections to the Canal towpath and for the potential of the canal to provide a conduit for surface water discharge from the development site if feasible.

#### Proposals Map

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** state that due to the modifications they are seeking, corresponding changes to the Proposals Map in relation to the site will require to be made as detailed within Figure 7.1 of their representation.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** state that areas within the Green network enhancement are not allocated as open space within the site and recommended that they are allocated as such on the proposals maps

#### Nature Conservation

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** refer to Policies WD 1, CP 1, CP2 and ENV 1 in relation to impacts on nature conservation within the site. Request that the site is kept natural looking and free from development. Also advises that Bats, as well as, water voles are in the area/on the site and asks if surveys have been carried out on these species and other wildlife within the and adjacent to the site. The respondents also suggest that the ponds on the site should be safeguarded as should the wildlife corridors and that no exceptions should be allowed that go against the aim of protecting nature conservation or protected species.

**Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668)** adds that if the site is not kept natural no birds will visit it.

#### Forth and Clyde Canal Scheduled Monument

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** quote Policy FCC 1 and states that a bridge over the Forth and Clyde Canal will have an adverse impact on the Scheduled Monument and will destroy its natural setting, disturb wildlife and the have an impact on the use of the canal during and post construction. Asks if Historic Environment Scotland have given consent for this and also refers to the fact that the Antonine Wall may also be in the vicinity of the site.

**Scottish Canals (PLPD/786/4)** note that an indicative access route is shown on the Plan for the Carless site. Any access bridges proposed over the Forth & Clyde Canal will need the approval of Scottish Canals and will also require Scheduled Monument Consent.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### General

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend that the Council require a development brief and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) for the Carless site and sets out developer requirements as follows:

- Establishing spatial links and paths between the site and the housing area to the north in several places, across the canal in-between, and not just at the eastern end of the site.
- Retention of existing mature trees along the south side of the Forth and Clyde canal as well as opening-up some framed views from the cycle route towards the River Clyde.
- Retention of existing mature trees upon the site where possible.
- Design of landscape elements and pathways that link between the Forth and Clyde Canal cycle route, the disused railway and the shoreline.
- Design of the open space in the north-east of the site to create an attractive space for local residents, including focal areas and mitigation of the effects of vehicles travelling along the A814.
- The route of powerlines across the eastern part of the site and associated wayleave restrictions.
- Design of the waterfront spaces to relate to the distinct landscape characteristics of the site, provide a high-quality built environment, provide green network enhancements and access for recreation, and integrate and protect the natural environment.
- How the site would be viewed from the southern side of the River Clyde, particularly the siting and scale of structures in relation to the foreground river expanse.

**Scottish Water (PLDP/674/2)**, although not specifically seeking a modification to the Plan, is of the view that the Plan should require developers to provide a Water and Drainage Impact Assessment and engage early in this regard with Scottish Water.

##### Inner Clyde Special Protection Area

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** suggest that an independent HRA should be carried out and therefore is seeking an amendment to the Carless section in this regard.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend that the fourth paragraph on Page 23 is amended to:

*Development at Carless must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level*



*Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development*

Subsequent changes to the section on Carless in the HRA will also be need to be made.

#### Development Strategy and Development Strategy Map

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** request that the Carless Development Strategy is requested that the following modifications are made to the Carless Development Strategy on page 58 of the West Dunbartonshire LDP Proposed Plan:

- At the start of the Development Strategy text box, insert: *“Development proposals will be expected to support the implementation of the Development Strategy for Carless. As illustrated on the Carless Development Strategy Map, this seeks...:*
- Amend the second bullet point in the Development Strategy text box to read: *“To provide suitable and adequate infrastructure, including access, to accommodate redevelopment proposals”;*
- Amend the third bullet point in the Development Strategy text box to read: *“To use development of the site to remediate contamination, deliver environmental betterment and to enhance the Green Network through improving habitat connectivity. Remediation and redevelopment proposals should make land suitable for future intended uses”;*
- Amend the fifth bullet point in the Development Strategy text box to read: *“To safeguard the qualifying interests, integrity and conservation objectives of the Special Protection Area and SSSI”;* and

Amend the Development Strategy map to include the modifications shown in Figure 2.1 of the respondent’s representation.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend that the fifth bullet point of the Development Strategy is amended to the following:

*“To ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).”*

#### Carless Policy 1: Business and Industrial Development

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** although not inherently stating it in these terms, are of the view that the proposed use and this Policy should be deleted from the Plan.

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** seek the following modifications to the Carless Development

Strategy Map on page 59:

- Amend Carless Development Strategy Map as per Figure 2.2 of the respondents representation to include the existing jetties and an area of adjoining land as clearly being within Business and Industry allocation E1(17). In consequence, remove the light blue “Route Access (indicative)” line from the map.

#### Carless Policy 2: Mixed Use Development

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** although not inherently stating it in these terms, are of the view that the proposed use and this Policy should be deleted from the Plan.

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** that the following modifications should be made to the Carless Development Strategy Map on page 59:

- Amend Carless Development Strategy Map to expand the yellow boundary of the mixed-use area to align with the red line site boundary, and retain the green network notation so that it is within the yellow boundary of the mixed-use area.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend that the criterion (c) is amended to the following:

*“To ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).”*

#### Carless Policy 3: Residential Development

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** although not inherently stating it in these terms, are of the view that the proposed use and this Policy should be deleted from the Plan.

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** seek the following modifications:

- That the mixed-use designation on the Carless site be expanded to include the land currently earmarked for housing H2(33)1;
- That Carless Policy 3(b) be amended to read: “A second access has been provided to serve the residential development.”

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend that a new sentence is added to the end of the Policy as follows:

*‘The siting and design of residential development should relate to the key landscape characteristics and visual amenity of the site in accordance with Policy ENV 2’.*

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/7)** request that Carless Policy 3 and Site H2(33) are deleted from the Plan.

#### Carless Policy 4: Green Network and Green Infrastructure

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** state that the LDP should steer development of the site to become a wildlife park. Bridleways should also be a feature of the site.

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** seek the following modifications:

- Amend the first sentence to read: “As the site is identified as a strategic opportunity for the enhancement of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Green Network, development proposals should protect and enhance the green network within and surrounding the site. Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate adequate open space provision and the improvement of habitat connectivity within Green Network corridors as identified on the Development Strategy Map”.
- The development strategy map should be amended as per Figure 2.3 of the respondents representation to clarify where the possibility for improved access, as a function of the Green Network, can be achieved.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** recommend that an another bullet point is added to the Policy and suggest the following:

- *‘Designing the green network and spaces to reflect and enhance the distinctive landscape characteristics and visual amenity of the site.’*

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/4)** request that the following additional bullet point is inserted into the Policy:

*‘Additional native tree planting with species appropriate to the site conditions should be part of the green space provision and green network enhancement.’*

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/7)** wish to see the requirement to upgrade the unmade footpath near the river around the whiskey bond to form a walking loop with the canal path and the former railway track added to the list of Policy requirements.

**Scottish Canals (PLPD/786/4)** wish to see the Policy amended to allow the Forth & Clyde Canal towpath could be upgraded by the Carless development to provide an alternative access route set back from the River. The Policy should also be amended to recognise the importance of the proposed development at Carless providing new access connections to the Canal towpath and for the potential of the canal to provide a conduit for surface water discharge from the development site if feasible.

#### Proposals Map

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** state that due to the modifications they are seeking, corresponding changes to the Proposals Map in relation to the site will require to be made as detailed within Figure 7.1 of their representation.

**SNH (PLDP/640/4)** state that areas within the Green network enhancement are not



allocated as open space within the site and recommended that they are allocated as such on the proposals maps.

#### Nature Conservation

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** wish to see the site undeveloped and its natural environment retained.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

As detailed above, the representations made to this site have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General; Inner Clyde Special Protection Area; Development Strategy and Development Strategy Map; Carless Policy 1; Carless Policy 2; Carless Policy 3; Carless Policy 4; Proposals Map; Nature Conservation; and Forth and Clyde Canal Scheduled Monument. The Council's responses to the representations have been grouped under these same headings and are provided below.

#### General

With regard to the representations from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** it should be noted that this site has had legacy of business and industrial development over a significant number of years. The site boundaries have a natural environmental quality which must be protected, but re-development of the site and the proposed uses for it can be developed in such a way that the natural environment is protected. Although the site has become naturalised since it ceased its previous use as an oil refinery, this is due to inactivity and the Council is of the view that the site should not become a Local Nature Reserve and should be redeveloped as proposed in the development strategy and policies for the site.

In relation to the size of the building and other design issues, raised by the respondents above and **Silverton and Overton Community Council (PLDP/182/2)**, the Design policies of the Plan will ensure that the redevelopment of the site is to an acceptable design quality and is screened to an appropriate manner. However, these issues are considered to be detailed design considerations which are best addressed at the development management stage in terms of any future planning applications. No modifications to the Plan are required in this instance.

The other issues that **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** raise, such as alleged illegal driving of motor bikes, are matters that should be raised with the appropriate authorities i.e. Police Scotland. These issues are therefore not the responsibility of the Plan to address.

In relation to the representation from **SNH (PLDP/640/4)**, the Council is aware that there may be landscape and visual impacts associated with development of the site and that an Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) would help to understand what the

impacts may be and what mitigation may be required if there are adverse impacts associated with development of the site. The Council is therefore of the view that it may be appropriate to amend the Policy to require an LVIA to be provided as part of any application for planning permission within the site.

However, the Council considers that the majority of the modifications sought are provided by Carless Policy 4, although not in a prescriptive form as suggested by SNH. That being said, it may be appropriate to incorporate some of the suggested modifications from SNH, in order to strengthen the requirements of the Policy, where they have not been referenced previously.

Should the Reporter wish to amend Carless Policy 4, the Council would have no objection to the policy being changed and would suggest the following amendments (proposed amendments are in bold):

*'Carless Policy 4*

#### *Green Network and Green Infrastructure*

*As the site is identified as a strategic opportunity for the enhancement of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Green Network, development of the site is required to deliver habitat, access, green and open space enhancements site, as identified on the Development Strategy Map. This will entail the following:*

- *Protecting and enhancing the disused railway corridor;*
- *Retaining natural screening of the site along the River Clyde corridor **and the Forth and Clyde Canal, but where appropriate, open up some of the trees and vegetation to provide views of the River Clyde from the N7 Cycle Route;***
- ***Integrate and protect the natural environment by retaining, where appropriate, natural species, habitats and mature trees within the site;***
- *Upgrading existing open space and providing new green spaces within the site;*
- ***Provide links and paths throughout the site, where these would not have adverse health and safety issues or conflict with operational security of the end uses, and ensure that connections are made to existing path networks outwith the site;***
- *Providing enhancements to the green network **and access for recreation** along the Canal and former Railway Line; the western and eastern parts of the site and the waterfront. **The enhancements to the Green Network and Green Infrastructure, including access to them for recreation, should take into account issues of health and safety and operational security of the end uses to avoid any adverse impacts or safety risks with public access to the site.***

*Prior to remediation or development of the site, temporary uses which enhance the green network value of the site will be supported and encouraged, as will advanced greening of the site in accordance with Policy ENV7, until the site is fully developed.*

***Masterplanning and development of the site should be informed by Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and this assessment should be provided alongside other relevant information, such as, but not limited to, a landscape strategy and a design and access statement, at the planning application stage.'***

The Council is also strongly of the view that there should a masterplan for overall development of the site due to the long term nature of its redevelopment. Taking into account that a planning application has been recently submitted for a business and industrial development, the Council is of the view that the masterplan should provide a development framework for the rest of the site.

The requirement for this is to ensure that the long-term development of the site is undertaken in a comprehensive manner. Should the Reporter be agreeable to this modification, the Council would suggest that a new paragraph is added to the end of Carless Policy 2 as follows:

*“A masterplan is required to be prepared in advance of any development proposals for the mixed use areas identified on the Development Strategy Map, taking into account the requirements of Policy CP 4. The Masterplan should be submitted as part of any planning application for these sites and development proposals should be in accordance with the masterplan.”*

The Council would point out to SNH that a development brief is not required as Policy CP 3 requires a masterplan for the site. The Council’s proposed modification, as suggested above, reinforces this. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

The Council has no objection to the amendment to the Carless section of the plan, in relation to the points raised by **Scottish Water (PLDP/674/2)**, to note that Water and Drainage Impact Assessment will be required and that early contact with Scottish Water should be made. Should the Reporter wish to amend this section of the Plan, the Council would have no objection to a change being made and would suggest that a new paragraph is inserted after Paragraph 5 (which starts with ‘The Council as...’) as follows:

*‘Furthermore, a Water and Drainage Impact Assessment is required for the site. Early contact with Scottish Water is required in relation to this assessment and any potential impacts on Scottish Water’s network.’*

The comments of **SEPA (PLDP676/2)** on the purpose of the development strategy and policies within the section are acknowledged.

#### Inner Clyde Special Protection Area

The Council has undertaken an Habitat Regulations Appraisal (HRA) (CD xx) of Local Development Plan 2 which SNH, subject to some amendments, have approved at this stage. Development of the site will require to provide a project level HRA and a study of the redshank within the area. Therefore, the Council is of the view that the representations by **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)** on this matter have already been addressed in the Plan. The Council also do not agree that the Plan should define what an ‘exceptional circumstance’ is and who defines what it is, as this is on a case by case basis and is really a matter for consideration at the development management stage where all information, studies and assessments are considered together. In terms of the Plan, the HRA and other environmental assessments all point to the fact that, subject to mitigation, the site can be developed. It should be noted that SNH have not objected to development of the site and have raised no issues in relation to the SPA or the HRA’s assessment. No modifications to the Plan are therefore required.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to paragraph 4 on Page 24 being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/4)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the paragraph.

#### Development Strategy and Development Strategy Map

In response to the representation from **Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)**, the Council would have no objection to the proposed modification in relation to the need for remediation being inserted into the Development Strategy. In relation to the issues of access, the Council is also of a view that a modification to the Development Strategy may be required to clarify the Council's position on access issues, namely that a secondary access is only required if residential development is brought forward and that the existing access, once upgraded, is sufficient for the business and industrial and mixed use parts of the site.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the Development Strategy, the Council would have no objection to a change being made and would suggest that the Strategy is amended as follows (the proposed amendments are made in bold):

#### *Development Strategy*

*The Development Strategy for Carless is:*

- ***To remediate the Carless site to enable redevelopment for business and industrial uses, appropriate commercial uses and, where appropriate and justified, housing and day-to-day convenience retail uses;***
- ***To provide a secondary access point to the site, where residential development is brought forward, and to upgrade the existing access in relation to the Business and Industrial and Mixed Use areas of the site;***
- *To use development of the site to enhance the Green Network;*
- *To protect the Forth and Clyde Canal and its setting; and*
- *To protect the qualifying interests and qualities of the Special Protection Area and SSSI*

However, the Council does not agree that the primary role of Green Infrastructure within the site should be of habitat connectivity only. The Reporter in the Examination of the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan stated in the Examination Report (CD xx) that:

*“One of the key elements of the strategy for the development of the Carless site is the enhancement of the green network. Access for recreation should be provided along this green network, enhanced as appropriate, although I recognise that access may need to be restricted along the foreshore at certain times of the year to protect the integrity of the special protection area. The disused railway line and canal together provide an ideal opportunity to combine the interests of recreation and nature conservation, in the context of the development of the site for the uses proposed.*

*Exactly how the area between the canal and disused railway line (where they are significantly separated in the southern part of the site) should be developed is a matter of detail for the masterplan to address. In addition, the areas for green network enhancements shown on Map 7 are clearly indicative, and the exact areas would be determined through the masterplan process. The type of access (walkers, cycles or horses) and the prospect of providing a footpath link to the south of the bonded*

*warehouses are also matters that should be addressed through the masterplan process.”*

It is clear that the Reporter within the previous Examination saw access for recreation as an integral part of the green infrastructure and green network enhancement proposals within the site. The site is still used by the public for recreational access and this should continue to be provided taking account of health and safety issues and issues relating to the operational security of the proposed end uses on the site. The Council believes recreational access to and within the site is an important part of the sites redevelopment. No modifications to the Plan are considered necessary in this regard.

The Council also does not agree with the suggested modification in relation to the SPA, as the Plan and development within the site is required to protect the integrity of the SPA and its conservation objectives and to not merely safeguard them. The modifications suggested by the **Malin Group** would not be consistent with these objectives and would potentially not be in accordance with legislation and Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (CD xx) in this regard.

Furthermore, the respondent seeks the removal of Green network designation on certain parts of the Development Strategy map. Firstly, it should be noted that the areas for green network enhancements annotated on the Development Strategy Map are clearly indicative and the exact areas are to be determined through the masterplan process and identified by a thorough landscape strategy for the site taking on board the requirements of Carless Policy 4.

The Council, however, does not agree with some of these changes, as detailed below, and is concerned that the removal of these map designations could adversely impact on the overall strategy for green network and green infrastructure enhancements and the requirements to compensate for the loss of open space within the site. The Council is strongly of the view that the removal of the green network enhancement designation between the proposed housing site (Site ref: H2 (33)) and the mixed use area could have a significant adverse impact on the loss of open space and nature conservation in the area. The requirement for green infrastructure in this location is to have a natural buffer and screening between the mixed use area and the proposed residential area to provide an area of separation between the uses. Therefore, the Council is of the view that no modification should be made to the Development Strategy Map in this regard.

The request to remove the area of green infrastructure between the business and industrial and mixed use site and the jetties is discussed below in relation the representation to Carless Policy 1; but for completeness and cross-referencing, the Council acknowledges that a modification may be appropriate in this regard and the suggested modification is contained within the Councils response within Carless Policy 1 to avoid duplication within this section of the Schedule 4.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the fifth bullet point of the Development Strategy on Page 24 being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/4)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the Strategy.

With regard to the representation by **Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668)** in relation to the area of land between the railway line and the canal, the Council does not agree with the respondent that no development should be allowed in this area. The Reporter in the Examination of the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan stated in the Examination Report (CD xx) that:



*“The disused railway line constitutes an extensive area of dense woodland which would provide a significant habitat for local wildlife species, and may also be relevant in ensuring there would be no adverse effect on the qualifying interest of the special protection area. I note the concern expressed within the representations that the proposed development, and particularly the proposed new access road, would cause disruption to the wildlife corridors.*

*However, I find that this is a matter for the proposed masterplan, and subsequently the development management process, to address. Appropriate mitigation measures could be taken to ensure that local wildlife can access the whole of the site which is designated for open space and green network enhancement; and since this extends through and beyond the site along the former railway line, and also along the whole of the perimeter of the site, I find that there is plenty of scope for this.*

*I do not consider that there is evidence to suggest that this site contains a wildlife habitat of sufficient importance to justify its designation as a local nature reserve. I find that the strategy strikes the correct balance between development of the site, in the terms examined above, and protecting the nature conservation interests of the site.”*

The Council agrees with the Reporters findings in this regard that there is nothing of intrinsically environmental importance within this area that would prevent its development. The Council therefore contends that the Reporters views are still relevant in the consideration of this representation. The Council is also of the view that the green network and green infrastructure requirements of Carless Policy 4 will help to compensate for the loss of this area of land. Therefore, no modifications to the Plan are required in this regard.

#### Carless Policy 1: Business and Industrial Development

In response to the representations from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)**, the Council does not agree that the site allocation and Policy should be deleted from the Plan. The site is designated as ‘Contaminated Land’ under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, primarily as a result of past evidence of mobile oily product in soils and groundwater below the ground posing a risk to the River Clyde and affecting the ecological designations. The central area of the site is also designated - under the same legislation - as a Special Site (1 of only four such sites in Scotland). Remediation would be carried out in a phased manner with the aim of facilitating the removal of the site’s current contaminated land and Special Site designations under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. No remediation is proposed on the smaller northern parcel of the site as it is not categorised as contaminated land having not been part of the former Oil Terminal.

As well as remediating the site, redevelopment of it will bring about green network enhancements and provide new housing and/or opportunities for employment. National, regional and local planning policy seeks to direct development in particular to brownfield sites such as Carless. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

With regard to the representation from **Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)**, the Council has met with SNH to discuss the amendments sought to the site boundaries and the implications of this on the SPA and SSSI. SNH raised no issues with the proposed changes in relation to

the SPA and SSSI; however, they did raise issues with the loss of a natural buffer between the SPA and the site which helps to mitigate against adverse impacts on the SPA and also helps with screening of the site and enhancements to green infrastructure. However, taking operational requirements and health and safety into consideration, especially as this would become a functional jetty, the Council consider that an amendment to the Development Strategy Map may be required in this regard.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the Development Strategy Map, the Council would have no objection to this change being made and would suggest that the Strategy Map is amended as follows:

*Extend the Business and Industrial Designation colour at the south east corner southwards and eastwards to the mirror the extent of the jetties.*

SNH are content with this suggested modification but the Reporter may wish to contact SNH directly for their views in this regard.

The Council is also of the view that Carless Policy 4 requires to be amended to ensure that where there are operational areas within the Business and Industrial part of the site, which could have health and safety issues for members of the public and operational security for the occupier, that these are taken into account when designing publicly accessible green infrastructure within the site. The suggested modification to the policy is detailed above within the general section of the Council's response.

The Council however, does not agree that the Jetties themselves should be included within the Business and Industrial location as they are located within the River Clyde, which is the jurisdiction of Marine Scotland. LDP 2 should only allocate and/or provide policy direction to development on 'land' as detailed within legislation. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Carless Policy 2: Mixed Use Development

In response to the representations from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)**, the Council does not agree that this site allocation and Policy should be deleted from the Plan. The site is designated as 'Contaminated Land' under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, primarily as a result of past evidence of mobile oily product in soils and groundwater below the ground posing a risk to the River Clyde and affecting the ecological designations. The central area of the site is also designated - under the same legislation - as a Special Site (1 of only four such sites in Scotland). Remediation would be carried out in a phased manner with the aim of facilitating the removal of the site's current contaminated land and Special Site designations under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. No remediation is proposed on the smaller northern parcel of the site as it is not categorised as contaminated land having not been part of the former Oil Terminal.

As well as remediating the site, redevelopment of it will bring about green network enhancements and provide new housing and/or opportunities for employment. National, regional and local planning policy seeks to direct development in particular to brownfield sites such as Carless. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

With regard to the representation from **Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** the Council does not agree that the green network designation on the Development Strategy map should be included within the Mixed Use site boundary. The Reporter at the previous examination clearly stated that there should be recreational access within the site and along the River Clyde foreshore, which he noted may need to be restricted at certain times of the year to protect the integrity of the SPA.

By expanding the mixed use designation to the red line boundary, but retaining the green network designation within it, would, in the Council's view, dilute the importance of recreational access and the need for green network enhancements in this area, which would be against the strategy of Clydeplan (CD xx) for Carless. Public access to this part of the site is required within Carless Policy 4 and the Council has already agreed to a modification to remove the green network and access requirements associated with land around the jetties on health and safety and operation security issues. Any further loss of public access to the River, would as stated above, dilute the enhancements sought for the site. Furthermore, the inclusion of the designation within the mixed use area could result on lesser screening etc which could make the site more visually intrusive when viewed from the opposite side of the Clyde.

It must be further noted that, as previously stated, green network enhancements annotated on the Development Strategy Map are clearly indicative and the exact areas are to be determined through the masterplan process and identified through a thorough landscape strategy for the site taking on board the requirements of Carless Policy 4. As a result, no modifications to the plan are considered necessary in this regard.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to Criterion (c) of the policy being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/4)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

#### Carless Policy 3: Residential Development

In response to the representations from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)**, the Council would point out similar representations were received in relation to the Carless site in the previous Examination Report. The Reporter concluded in relation to loss of this area of land:

*"The disused railway line constitutes an extensive area of dense woodland which would provide a significant habitat for local wildlife species, and may also be relevant in ensuring there would be no adverse effect on the qualifying interest of the special protection area. I note the concern expressed within the representations that the proposed development, and particularly the proposed new access road, would cause disruption to the wildlife corridors.*

*However, I find that this is a matter for the proposed masterplan, and subsequently the development management process, to address. Appropriate mitigation measures could be taken to ensure that local wildlife can access the whole of the site which is designated for open space and green network enhancement; and since this extends through and beyond the site along the former railway line, and also along the whole of the perimeter of the site, I find that there is plenty of scope for this.*



*I do not consider that there is evidence to suggest that this site contains a wildlife habitat of sufficient importance to justify its designation as a local nature reserve. I find that the strategy strikes the correct balance between development of the site, in the terms examined above, and protecting the nature conservation interests of the site.”*

The Council, at that time, concurred with the findings of the Reporter and nothing has materially changed since the Reporter's decision on this matter through to the publication of LDP 2: Proposed Plan. The Council is still of the view that this part of the site is suitable for development and that the loss of open space in this area can be compensated throughout the rest of the site in accordance with Carless Policy 4.

In relation to the issues of the road, the Reporter stated within the previous Examination Report that:

*“Some concern is expressed within the representations about the new access road crossing the canal. However, I am satisfied that this could be undertaken in a manner which ensures that the operation and character of the canal is not adversely affected..... I find that a new access road is necessary to facilitate the development of the site. It appears to me from my site inspection that taking an access from the roundabout on the A814 is both feasible and appropriate. In the circumstances, I consider that the consequences of providing this new access road can be satisfactorily addressed through the masterplan, and the subsequent development management process.”*

The Council agreed with the views of the Reporter in this regard and still is of the opinion that a secondary access is required to provide access to the residential site in order to separate residential traffic from the business and industrial and mixed use areas on health and safety grounds but also to provide a secondary access to the site, in case access to Ferry Road is disrupted or closed off for a period of time. A secondary access from Dumbarton Road is considered feasible by the Council's Roads service subject to a Transport Appraisal detailing the optimum point for safe access to this part of the site.

No modification to the Plan is therefore required in relation to these representations.

In relation to the representations by **Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)**, the Council would have no objection to the Reporter amending the Plan to change the designation of the site from residential to mixed-use, should the reported be agreeable to this amendment and considers that a change to the site designation is required. The Council is of the view, that this would give further flexibility to the long-term development of the site and give greater scope for marketing of the site to wider range of uses, which is in conformity with the Development Strategy for the site and the other mixed use area to the south of this part of the site. The indicative capacity of the site has not been counted as part of the Housing Land Requirement as it is a long-term release site. Therefore, the change in designation would have no implication for the Housing Land Requirement of the Plan. However, the Council is of the view that Carless Policy 3 should remain to provide a long-term development strategy should residential development be brought forward on this part of the site in the future and to ensure that the requirements of the Council in this regard are maintained.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the Development Strategy Map and Carless Policy 3, the Council would have no objection to these changes and would suggest the Development Strategy Map and Carless Policy 3 is amended as follows (the proposed amendment is in bold where required):

Development Strategy Map:

*Amend the current designation of the site from residential to mixed-use but retain the H2(33) residential site reference.*

**Carless Policy 3**

*Carless Policy 3 Residential Development*

*Proposals for residential development will be restricted to the area identified on the Development Strategy Map as **Site H2 (33)** and will only be supported where they meet all of the following criteria:*

- a) The areas identified for business, industrial and mixed-use, identified on the Development Strategy Map, have been substantially developed; and*
- b) A new access from Dumbarton Road has been provided to serve the residential development*

*The capacity of residential development on the site should take account of the site's topography, landscape capacity, infrastructure and green network enhancement requirements and be in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP2.*

In relation to the points raised regarding the secondary access, the Council is of the view that a secondary access should still be facilitated from Dumbarton Road, instead of the revised secondary access proposed by the respondent. The alternative access from Beardmore Place would require a significant length of new road to be developed which would bisect the bonded warehouse site and therefore, the potential for residential traffic to be taken through an industrial site would still exist. Also, it would increase the journey time for users accessing the site from this area than providing an access from Dumbarton Road, as proposed in the Development Strategy Map and the more straightforward option of access to public transport that this route would provide. It should also be noted that the Malin Group themselves proposed this access route at the Main Issues Report stage.

The Council's Roads section is not supportive of this alternative access for the reasons explained above and as a result, the Council would not be supportive of the Development Strategy Map being changed in this regard.

The Malin Group has also proposed a new residential site for inclusion within the Carless section. The Council is not supportive of this new allocation for the following reasons:

- The site would be difficult to access and would raise the same access issues as detailed above;
- It is adjacent to a business and industrial development and within the HSE safety zone;
- The site provides a natural buffer between the bonded warehouses and the Forth and Clyde Canal;
- It is used as recreational open space and is safeguarded as open space within the Proposed Plan (2016) and LDP 2; and
- The Council do not considered that this is an effective housing site and there is no

shortfall in the Housing Land Requirement of the Plan that would require allocation of additional sites.

The Council is of the view that this area of land should be enhanced to compensate for the loss of open space elsewhere in the site and should remain as protected open space. No modifications to the Plan are therefore required in this regard.

The Council does not agree that the current residential allocation (Site Ref H2:33) should be moved to the mixed-use area of the site or split up as suggested by **SNH (PLDP/640/4)**, as in the interests of health and safety, as well as, residential amenity, the Council is of the view that it is not good planning to include residential development among the other proposed uses for the mixed-use area and as that area of the site is within the inner area of the HSE zone surrounding the adjacent bonded warehouses. Also, as detailed in the response to **Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** above, having residential traffic using the same access roads as business and industrial traffic would also raise health and safety concerns. Therefore, the Council is of the view, for sound planning reasons, that the proposed residential area, albeit this would now be within a mixed use area if the proposed modifications is accepted, should remain in its current location as detailed on the Development Strategy Map.

SNH also suggest reducing the capacity of the site. Carless Policy 3 states that the capacity of the site will be decided through a design led approach. Although the Plan does put an indicative capacity on the site, this is notional and represents the maximum number of units that the Council anticipates could be provided on the site. This capacity could be amended based on the design of the site and, as detailed above, does not form part of the Housing Land Requirement of the Plan. No modification to the Plan in this regard is therefore considered necessary.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to Carless Policy 3 being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/4)**, and would suggest that the last paragraph of the policy is amended as follows (proposed amendments are in bold)

*'The capacity of residential development on the site should take account of the site's topography, landscape capacity **and characteristics, visual amenity, infrastructure and green network enhancement requirements and be in accordance with Policies CP1, CP2 and ENV 2.**'*

#### Carless Policy 4: Green Network and Green Infrastructure

In response to the representations from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)**, the Council's response to the objections raised in relation to Carless Policy 3, the residential site and the proposed access above also apply to the representations raised to this Policy. No modifications to the Policy are therefore required for the reasons set out above.

In relation to the representation from **Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)**, the Council, as stated in response to the respondents representations to the Development Strategy as discussed above, does not agree that the primary role of Green Infrastructure within the site should be of habitat connectivity only. The Councils detailed response to that representations is also the Councils view in relation to this representation. No modifications to the Plan are

therefore required in this regard. With regard to the opportunity for green network enhancements as suggested by the respondent, the Council would have no objection to the Development Strategy Map being modified in this regard.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the policy being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/2)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

The Council is of the view that the requirements contained within Carless Policy 4 already provide the protection requested by **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/4)**, but would have no objection if the Reporter wished to make an amendment to the Policy as the respondent suggests.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the policy being made, as requested by **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/7)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

With regard to the representation from **Scottish Canals (PLPD/786/4)**, the Council agrees that the Carless development could contribute to the upgrading of the Canal towpath but that this should not be a specific requirement of the Policy and should be considered at the development management stage in relation to Policy GI4: Developer Contributions. The Council would point out that the Forth and Clyde Canal and connections to and from it are a Strategic Green Network Project which developer contributions can be directed towards. Furthermore, the Council has already suggested an amendment to the Forth and Clyde Canal Strategic Green Network Project to allow developer contributions to be used towards upgrading of the towpath. See Issue 19: Green Infrastructure in this regard.

However, the Council does not agree that Policy should be amended to make reference to the Canal being used as a conduit for surface water drainage as this is a detailed requirement that should to be investigated through the masterplan process and at the development management stage. The Reporter in the last Examination Report (CD xx) agreed with this approach.

No modifications to the Plan are required in this regard.

#### Proposals Map

In relation to the representation by **Malin Group (PLDP/177/1)** in this regard, the Council has agreed to some of the modifications sought as detailed in the sections above.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to Clydebank Proposals Map being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/2)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the proposals map.

#### Nature Conservation

In response to the representations from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)**, the Council does not agree that the site should remain undeveloped. The site is designated as 'Contaminated Land' under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, primarily as a result of past evidence of mobile oily product in soils and groundwater below the ground posing a risk to the River Clyde and affecting the ecological

designations. The central area of the site is also designated - under the same legislation - as a Special Site (1 of only four such sites in Scotland). Remediation would be carried out in a phased manner with the aim of facilitating the removal of the site's current contaminated land and Special Site designations under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. No remediation is proposed on the smaller northern parcel of the site as it is not categorised as contaminated land having not been part of the former Oil Terminal.

As well as remediating the site, redevelopment of it will bring about green network enhancements and provide new housing and/or opportunities for employment. National, regional and local planning policy seeks to direct development in particular to brownfield sites such as Carless. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

It should be noted that SNH have not raised any issues with wildlife on the site or objected to its development in this regard. The other issues raised by the respondent are for the development management stage to address. No modification to the Plan in this regard is considered necessary.

#### Forth and Clyde Canal Scheduled Monument

In response to the representations from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/2); Mr M and Mrs J Smith (PLDP/668); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/1); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/1); Mr B Campbell (PLDP/757); Mr M Campbell (PLDP/758); and Mrs J Wintersgill (PLDP/759)**, the Council would point out that the Development Strategy seeks to protect the Forth and Clyde Canal and its setting and that development of the site would not destroy, as the respondent's states, its natural setting etc. Furthermore, neither Historic Environment Scotland nor Scottish Canals have objected to the development of the site or the proposed bridge/access over the Canal. No modifications to the Plan are therefore required in this instance.

In response to the representation from **Scottish Canals (PLPD/786/4)**, the Council is of the view that is best addressed at the development management stage and other Policies within the Plan cover this requirement, No modification is considered necessary.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 6	Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront	
Development plan reference:	Delivering Our Places: Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront (pages 28 to 33)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<p>Mr Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/6)</p> <p>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)</p> <p>SNH (PLDP/640/6)</p> <p>Legal and General UK Property Fund (PLDP/660/6)</p> <p>SEPA (PLDP676/6) (Support)</p> <p>SPT (PLDP/675/6) (Support)</p> <p>Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/6)</p>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront section of the Plan which sets out a Development Strategy and a series of place based policies and proposals for development of the area.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>The representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront Supporting Text; Development Strategy; Dumbarton Policy 1: High Street and Retail Development; Dumbarton Policy 2 St James Retail Park/Morrisons Commercial Centre; Dumbarton Policy 3: Quayside and Riverside Lane; Dumbarton Policy 5: Sandpoint Marina; Dumbarton Policy 6 - Dumbarton Waterfront Path: Development Contributions; Dumbarton Policy 7: Dumbarton Castle; Dumbarton Proposal 1: Dumbarton Football Club; and Dumbarton Proposal 2: Dumbarton Town Centre Conservation Area.</p> <p><u>Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront Supporting Text</u></p> <p><b>SEPA (PLDP676/6)</b> recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies. This strategy is the primary mechanism for the delivery of the key locations and it is anticipated these will be delivered over the next 5 to 10 years. One of these areas is Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront.</p> <p><u>Development Strategy</u></p> <p><b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)</b> are supportive of the Development Strategy but suggest a list of potential uses for vacant shops or new units. They also urge the Council to consider the demolition of the Artizan Centre and are seeking greater clarity in the Development Strategy as to the nature of, and timescale for delivering improvements to the Town Centre.</p> <p><b>Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/6)</b> state that the Development Strategy should</p>		



make reference to the value of Dumbarton Football Club to the town and to its need for a new stadium. It should also include support for the redevelopment of the Dumbarton FC stadium at Castle Road for residential and other uses in order to facilitate the relocation of the football club.

**SNH (PLDP/640/6)** seek modifications to both the policy and the supporting text relating to the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) to provide additional clarity and consistency across the Plan and with the Habitats Regulation Appraisal (HRA) text.

#### Dumbarton Policy 1: High Street and Retail Development

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** support a wider range of uses for the High Street, as detailed in their response to the Development Strategy, as well as the conversion of empty premises into joint residential/business premises, as most of the High Street shops are two or three storeys high. They would resist any planning applications for any increase in betting shops, pay day lenders, fast-food shops, and electronic cigarette shops. The Community Council also suggest improving and opening up the entire length of the back of the High Street, or even reversing the whole frontage of the High Street to face the River Leven.

#### Dumbarton Policy 2: St James Retail Park/Morrisons Commercial Centre

**Legal and General UK Property Fund (PLDP/660/6)** state that it is ambiguous on the Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront Map whether the St James' Retail Park is identified within the town centre or not, and that this should be clarified. They would, however, support it being included in the town centre.

**The representation also makes reference to Policy SC1 of the Plan and this is considered fully within Issue 17: Supporting Town Centres.**

#### Dumbarton Policy 3: Quayside and Riverside Lane

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** are supportive of the policy, in particular the aspiration to link the town centre to Levensgrove and Posties Park by a footbridge, but remind the Council of the need to mitigate the threats of climate change and flood risk.

**SPT (PLDP/675/6)** are supportive of the long term aspiration of the Council to link the town centre to Levensgrove and Posties Park by a footbridge as it would support and encourage sustainable travel.

#### Dumbarton Policy 5: Sandpoint Marina

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** support residential use on the site in principle, but would not support development of more than 3 storeys, or 'high density' housing. They welcome the requirement for a waterfront path around the whole site that is consistent with Access legislation.

**SNH (PLDP/640/6)** are seeking a modification of the policy text to ensure the protection of the Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

**SPT (PLDP/675/6)** welcome the requirement for additional public transport infrastructure on Bridge Street and West Bridge Street, along with improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes between Sandpoint Marina and these stops as a requirement for the regeneration of this site.

#### Dumbarton Policy 6: Dumbarton Waterfront Path: Development Contributions

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** strongly support the Waterfront Path policy but would like the policy to make reference to the former Denny Tidal Basin and potential tourism links to Bowling Basin and Harbour and to the other side of the River Clyde.

**SNH (PLDP/640/6)** are seeking a modification of the policy text to ensure the protection of the Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

**SPT (PLDP/675/6)** welcome Development Contributions in support of the delivery of the Dumbarton Waterfront Path.

#### Dumbarton Policy 7: Dumbarton Castle

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** welcome this policy but wish the policy to also include support for rock climbing on Dumbarton Rock, where it would not damage the natural or cultural environment, as it is “the birthplace of the modern sport of rock climbing” and would encourage visitors to the area. They also suggest a potential campsite at the base of the Rock.

#### Dumbarton Proposal 1: Dumbarton Football Club

**Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/6)** would like the Council to reinstate explicit support for the relocation of the club and redevelopment of the existing stadium for residential and commercial uses in order to help financially enable the club’s relocation.

Please note, the respondents’ further request for the insertion of a policy into LDP 2 in support their preferred stadium relocation site of Young’s Farm, Dumbarton is addressed in **Issue 31: Non Allocation of Young’s Farm, Dumbarton**.

#### Dumbarton Proposal 2: Dumbarton Town Centre Conservation Area

**Mr Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/6)** is strongly supportive of the proposed Conservation Area but would like to see additional areas included within it, including an area of land at Meadowbank Street, the full extent of Dumbarton Central Station, platforms and supporting walls, and potentially Dumbarton Old Bridge (1765).

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/3)** note their strong support for a Conservation Area, particularly the inclusion of Dumbarton Central Station.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**



## Development Strategy

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** seek to include the following list of potential uses for vacant shops or new units:

- Food stalls or farmers' market on weekly or monthly basis
- 'Pop-up' shops
- Premises for 3rd sector/social enterprises/community groups
- Sport and leisure activities
- Arts and crafts workshops /book shops
- Restaurants and cafes
- Nurseries/soft play area for families
- Tourist information/Museum (possibly in Glencairn House),

The Development Strategy should also provide details of the nature of, and timescales for improvements to the Town Centre.

**Dumbarton Football Club Ltd. (PLDP/783/6)** seek the insertion of words to the effect of:

*'the redevelopment of the existing Dumbarton FC stadium at Castle Road for residential and other appropriate uses so as to support the councils' objectives for maximising the tourism potential of the castle and to support the development of a new replacement stadium and community sport and recreation centre elsewhere'*

**SNH (PLDP/640/6)** recommend replacing the wording in paragraphs 5 and 6 of this section of the Plan (supporting text) with the following:

*"Development at Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront must also not have an adverse effect on the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC) for which Atlantic salmon, Brook lamprey and River lamprey are the qualifying interests or on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest.*

*Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development".*

SNH also seek the insertion of the following additional bullet point to the Development Strategy text itself:

*"Protecting and enhancing the natural heritage and ensuring no adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA), the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)."*

## Dumbarton Policy 1: High Street and Retail Development

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** are seeking that the policy should support a more diverse range of uses in the Town Centre as detailed under their comments for the Development Strategy, above, and should also support joint

residential/retail uses for empty premises of several storeys. The policy should also resist any increase in betting shops, pay day lenders, fast-food shops, and electronic cigarette shops. Finally, there should be a reference in the policy to supporting improvements and renovation to the rear of the High Street facing the River.

#### Dumbarton Policy 2: St James Retail Park/Morrisons Commercial Centre

**Legal and General UK Property Fund (PLDP/660/6)** are seeking a change to the Map to place the St James Retail Park/Commercial Centre within the boundaries of the Town Centre.

#### Dumbarton Policy 5: Sandpoint Marina

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** seek that the policy should not support residential development that is more than 3 storeys high or of 'high density'.

**SNH (PLDP/640/5)** recommend an amendment and addition to the policy text as follows:

*"Any development of the site should:*

- *Provide high quality design, layout and materials to reflect the sites close proximity to Dumbarton Castle and Rock as well as Levensgrove Park,*
- *Provide a waterfront path; and*
- *Ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura site"*

#### Dumbarton Policy 6: Dumbarton Waterfront Path: Development Contributions

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** are seeking a change to the policy to include a direct reference to the former Denny Tidal Basin as part of the Waterfront Path.

**SNH (PLDP/640/6)** recommend adding a final sentence to the Policy:

*"Proposals for development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of a Natura 2000 site"*

#### Dumbarton Policy 7: Dumbarton Castle

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** are seeking a modification to the policy to include support for rock climbing on Dumbarton Rock where it would not damage the natural or cultural environment, and potentially an organised campsite at the base of the Rock.

#### Dumbarton Proposal 1: Dumbarton Football Club

**Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/6)** seek the insertion of words similar to the following:

*'The Council acknowledges the need for and benefits of Dumbarton Football Club relocating from its present site so as to allow the Club to develop and play from a new, modern, fit for purpose community stadium and sports facility, this because its existing site is too small and constrained to support a new stadium development. So as to assist this*

*process the Council will support the redevelopment of the existing stadium site for residential and appropriate complementary commercial uses. The site is in a sensitive location, adjacent to Dumbarton Castle, and careful consideration should be given to the layout, scale and design of the proposed development. To ensure that the development is appropriate and of a sufficient quality the Council will require any planning application to be supported by a masterplan and design statement. A waterfront path would be required within the development linking to paths on either side. Uses that would increase the attractiveness of Dumbarton Castle to visitors will also be supported on this site.'*

#### Dumbarton Proposal 2: Dumbarton Town Centre Conservation Area

**Mr Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/6)** seeks to make the following extensions to the proposed Dumbarton Town Centre Conservation Area shown in the Dumbarton Map, to include:

- A triangle of land at Meadowbank Street
- The full extent of Dumbarton Central Station, platforms and parapeted supporting walls, including the Bankend Road frontage.
- Include or make reference to Dumbarton Old Bridge.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council's responses to the representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront Supporting Text; Development Strategy; Dumbarton Policy 1: High Street and Retail Development; Dumbarton Policy 3: Quayside and Riverside Lane; Dumbarton Policy 5: Sandpoint Marina; Dumbarton Policy 6 - Dumbarton Waterfront Path: Development Contributions; Dumbarton Policy 7: Dumbarton Castle; Dumbarton Proposal 1: Dumbarton Football Club; and Dumbarton Proposal 2: Dumbarton Town Centre Conservation Area.

#### Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront Supporting Text

The comments of **SEPA (PLDP676/6)** are welcomed.

#### Development Strategy

In response to the representation from **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** to include their list of potential uses for units in the town centre, it is considered that the LDP 2 already fully supports all of these uses within Dumbarton Town Centre, as articulated in the Dumbarton Development Strategy, Dumbarton Policy 1: High Street and Retail Development, Policy SC2: Core Town Centre Areas and Policy SC3: Other Town Centre Areas. In terms of the requested setting of timescales for improvement works to the town centre, it is firstly noted that the Community Council does not specify which particular improvements are being referred to. While Local Development Plan 2 sets out broad policy support and a policy framework for a range of changes and improvements to the town centre, the delivery of most physical improvement projects will be dependent on the work and funding from a range of other Council services, public sector organisations and private sector developers and businesses. The Local Development Plan 2: Action Programme (CD xx) sets out timescales and lead partners for each Dumbarton Policy and Proposal in Local Development Plan 2; however, these details are considered beyond the scope of the Plan policies themselves. No modifications are therefore required

to the Plan in this regard.

With regard to **Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/6)**, this issue is addressed in the Dumbarton Proposal 1: Dumbarton Football Club, below.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to Paragraphs 5 and 6 and the Development Strategy on Page 28 being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/6)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the strategy.

#### Dumbarton Policy 1: High Street and Retail Development

As set out in the response to the Development Strategy issue, it is considered that the list of proposed town centre uses **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** are seeking to be included are already fully supported within Local Development Plan 2. The Plan also sets out planning restrictions and appropriate guidance on town centre uses, including betting shops and payday lenders, through Policies SC2 and SC3 and Planning Guidance. Improvements to the rear of the High Street are already supported in Dumbarton Policy 3: Quayside and Riverside Lane. As such, it is considered that no modifications to the Plan are required in this regard.

#### Dumbarton Policy 2: St James Retail Park/Morrisons Commercial Centre

With regard to the request from **Legal and General UK Property Fund (PLDP/660/6)** to clarify that the St James' Retail Park is within Dumbarton Town Centre, the Council considers that the Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront Map and associated policies do make it clear that the Retail Park is not within the Town Centre but is instead identified as a separate Commercial Centre on the edge of the Town Centre. The Plan seeks to maintain the complementary role of the Commercial Centre, which would be jeopardised if it were to be included within the Town Centre boundaries and would likely cause harm to, and divert trade and retailers away from, the High Street particularly. This would run counter to the overall strategy of Local Development Plan 2 and the aims of SPP (CD xx) to protect and support Town Centres. As such it is considered that no modification is required.

#### Dumbarton Policy 3: Quayside and Riverside Lane

The support from **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** for the Policy is welcomed. In terms of the comments on climate change and flood risk, the Council is aware of the need to for measure to protect against and mitigate these risks, and the Policies within the Plan will help to ensure that this is undertaken where appropriate.

The support of **SPT (PLDP/675/6)** for the long term aspiration of connecting the Town Centre to Levensgrove Park via a bridge is acknowledged.

#### Dumbarton Policy 5: Sandpoint Marina

With regard to **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)**, seeking that the policy should not support residential development more than 3 storeys high or of 'high density', the Council would note that the Plan recognises the prominent and sensitive nature of the Sandpoint site and that it "supports development of housing on the site to a scale reflecting the site's prominence and proximity to Dumbarton Castle." It is considered

that more detailed design issues regarding height would be a Development Management matter to be assessed during the planning application process. As such, it is considered that no modifications to the Plan are required in this regard.

The Council have no objection to the proposed modification to the Policy as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/6)** should the Reporter be agreeable to this amendment and considers that a change to the Policy is required. Should this be the case then the Council suggests that the Policy is amended as suggested by SNH.

The support from **SPT (PLDP/675/6)** for improved public transport as part of the development of the site is acknowledged.

#### Dumbarton Policy 6: Dumbarton Waterfront Path: Development Contributions

With regard to **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** the Council considers that it is not the purpose of the policy to describe the different sections of the proposed Dumbarton Waterfront Path; the detail and delivery of which are set out in the Dumbarton Waterfront Path Planning Guidance. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

However, whilst looking at this section of the Plan, the Council noticed that there is a typographical error in the Policy. The reference to the Waterfront Path should be as Non-Statutory Guidance and not Supplementary Guidance. As this is more than a non-notifiable change, the Council would be appreciative if the Reporter could modify Dumbarton Policy 6 in this regard by changing the references within the Policy from 'Dumbarton Waterfront Path Supplementary Guidance' to 'Dumbarton Waterfront Path Non-Statutory Guidance' as it was not the Council's attention for this Guidance to be supplementary and that as it is a live and complex project, the guidance needs to be able to updated as quickly as possible when required.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to policy being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/6)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

The support of SPT (**PLDP/675/6**) is welcomed.

#### Dumbarton Policy 7: Dumbarton Castle

In response to **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council's (PLDP/182/6)** suggestion that the policy should be modified to include support for rock climbing or a campsite at Dumbarton Rock, it is considered that while the policy provides general support for an improved visitor experience and protection of the site, such specific proposals would be best considered at the Development Management stage of a planning application. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Dumbarton Proposal 1: Dumbarton Football Club

With regard to **Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/6)**, the Council is of the view that the proposal does not require to be modified and that the matters raised are best addressed at the Development Management stage. The other part of the representation is addressed fully in **Issue 31: Young's Farm**, rather than in this issue.

No modifications to the Plan are therefore considered necessary in this regard.

## Dumbarton Proposal 2: Dumbarton Town Centre Conservation Area

In response to the representation from **Mr Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/6)**, the Council welcomes the suggested amendments to the proposed Conservation Area for Dumbarton Town Centre but notes that the process of designating a Conservation Area is separate to the Local Development Plan process itself and considers that the Local Development Plan Examination is not the appropriate route for determining the final Conservation Area boundaries. The Council held an extensive public consultation on the proposed Conservation Area between January and March 2019 and, based on all comments and suggestions received, including from Historic Environment Scotland, intends to take a revised Conservation Area boundary back to the Planning Committee for approval in August 2019. Nonetheless, the suggestions made by Mr Watson to Local Development Plan 2 will be included in this review (for information, Mr Watson has made further submissions to the Conservation Area consultation).

While the map in the Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront section of Local Development Plan 2 shows an indicative Conservation Area boundary proposal based on the initial recommendations from heritage consultants, it is intended that the final, adopted version of Local Development Plan 2 will include the finalised and approved boundary of the Conservation Area. The final boundaries of the Conservation Area, when approved by Scottish Ministers (which the Council hope will be before December 2019), will be submitted to the Reporter and the Council would be grateful if the Reporter would accept these as the final version and amend the Strategy map accordingly.

The strong support of **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/6)** is welcomed.

### **Reporter's conclusions:**

### **Reporter's recommendations:**



Issue 7	Clydebank Town Centre	
Development plan reference:	Delivering Our Places: Clydebank Town Centre (pages 34 to 36)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) (PLDP/640/7) Network Rail (PLDP/662/7) SPT (PLDP/675/7) SEPA (PLDP676/7) (Support) The Salvation Army Trustee Company (PLDP/781) Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/7)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Clydebank Town Centre section of the Plan, which sets out a Development Strategy and a series of place based policies and proposals for the development of the area.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
The representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Clydebank Town Centre Supporting Text; Development Strategy; Clydebank Policy 1: Clydebank Town Centre and Forth & Clyde Canal; Clydebank Policy 3: Rosebery Place and Playdrome Redevelopment Opportunity Sites; and Clydebank Proposal 1: Co-operative Building.		
<u>Clydebank Town Centre Supporting Text</u>		
<b>SEPA (PLDP676/7)</b> recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies. This strategy is the primary mechanism for the delivery of the key locations and it is anticipated these will be delivered over the next 5 to 10 years. One of these areas is Clydebank Town Centre.		
<u>Development Strategy</u>		
<b>Network Rail (PLDP/662/7)</b> broadly welcome the commitment by the Council to the creation of a transport interchange at Chalmers Street, Clydebank including improvements to the bus and train station to improve access, appearance and amenity. Due to the level challenges at the station requests early engagement with the Council and partners.		
<b>SPT (PLDP/675/7)</b> welcome and support the Development Strategy for Clydebank.		
<b>The Salvation Army Trustee Company (PLDP/781)</b> welcomes the support for the redevelopment of key sites, improvements to the public realm and for maintaining and revitalising the Town Centre retail offer. They also draw attention to the need for their premises to have appropriate parking and drop-off facilities to serve people using their worship and community centre.		

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/7)** welcome the promotion of the canal side area for “Canalside Activity Opportunities”, as shown on the Development Strategy Map. They also state that surrounding retail units should wherever possible be altered to provide active frontages onto the canalside.

#### Clydebank Policy 1 – Clydebank Town Centre and Forth & Clyde Canal

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786)** state that additional wording should be added to the policy to ensure that proposals beside the canal provide an active frontage onto the canal or at least open up onto the canal wherever possible.

#### Clydebank Policy 3: Rosebery Place and Playdrome Redevelopment Opportunity Sites

**Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) (PLDP/640/7)** comment that they would welcome engagement on pre-consultation drafts of the guidance mentioned in relation to this policy.

**Network Rail (PLDP/662/7)** state that development of the former Playdrome site, and other key regeneration sites in the vicinity of the station, should consider appropriate contributions towards the construction of any new infrastructure required in line with Policy CON1.

**SPT (PLDP/675/7)** are supportive of this policy along with the requirement for development proposals to provide a strong frontage and relationship with canal. However they state that to support the Clydebank development strategy, careful consideration of the other boundaries is also required, especially at Chalmers Street and Argyll Road frontage to enhance the attractiveness of these roads.

**The Salvation Army Trustee Company (PLDP/781)** requests that site briefs include reference to enhancements and provision of suitable access for all users of the town centre, including patrons of the Salvation Army, in order to develop a sustainable and vibrant town centre for future decades.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/7)** state that additional wording should be added to the policy to ensure that proposals beside the canal provide an active frontage onto the canal or at least open up onto the canal wherever possible.

#### Clydebank Proposal 1: Co-operative Building

**The Salvation Army Trustee Company (PLDP/781)** welcome the support for the sensitive reuse and restoration of the listed Co-operative Building.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### Development Strategy

**Network Rail (PLDP/662/7)** seek that the following text (in italics) be inserted into bullet point seven in the Development Strategy on p34:

*“\* through partnership working and developer contributions, creating a transport interchange at Chalmers Street to support development and improve the accessibility of key sites in the town centre and at Queens Quay; and ”.*



Network Rail also seek a modification to the supporting text for policy CON1 on page 106, which relates to improvements to the Bus and Train Station within Clydebank Town Centre. They request that the following text (in italics) should be inserted at the end of the second paragraph on p106:

"are also supported. *Partnership working with public transport providers and use of pooled developer contributions will be necessary to realise these improvements.*"

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/7)** seek that in addition to the proposed Strategy, additional wording should be added to ensure that retail units should wherever possible be altered to provide active frontages onto the canalside.

#### Clydebank Policy 1 – Clydebank Town Centre and Forth & Clyde Canal

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/7)** seek that in addition to the proposed policy additional wording should be added to ensure that proposals beside the canal provide an active frontage onto the canal or at least open up onto the canal wherever possible.

#### Clydebank Policy 3: Rosebery Place and Playdrome Redevelopment Opportunity Sites

**Network Rail (PLDP/662/7)** are seeking that development proposals for the former Playdrome site, and other key regeneration sites in the vicinity of the station, should make appropriate contributions towards the construction of any new infrastructure required in line with Policy CON1.

**SPT (PLDP/675/7)** seek that the following sentence is added after Policy FCC1, "... *and recognise the importance of the other boundaries to the quality of place in the town centre..*"

**The Salvation Army Trustee Company (PLDP/781)** requests that site briefs encompass the criteria for enhancement for all complementary users, including patrons of the Salvation Army.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/7)** seek that in addition to the proposed policy additional wording should be added to ensure that new developments or redevelopments beside the canal provide an active frontage onto the canal or at least open up onto the canal wherever possible.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council's responses to the representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Clydebank Town Centre Supporting Text; Development Strategy; Clydebank Policy 1: Clydebank Town Centre and Forth & Clyde Canal; Clydebank Policy 3: Rosebery Place and Playdrome Redevelopment Opportunity Sites; and Clydebank Proposal 1: Co-operative Building.

#### Clydebank Town Centre Supporting Text

The comments of **SEPA (PLDP676/7)** are noted.

## Development Strategy

**Network Rail's (PLDP/662/7)** proposed modifications, while partnership working is essential and necessary in delivering transport improvements in Clydebank; therefore, it is not considered necessary to amend the Development Strategy as the project(s) will by default be partnership based.

However the Council does not agree with the proposed reference to developer contributions, as it is considered that this would not be in conformity with the Scottish Government Planning Circular 3/2012 (CD xx) and could potentially make improvements to the transport network unviable where there are higher than usual site costs. This matter is considered more fully within the Council's response to Issue 21: Connectivity. As such, no modification to the Plan is considered necessary in this regard.

Network Rail also request a modification to the supporting text for Policy CON1 on page 106, to allow the use of pooled developer contributions to fund the train/bus station improvements. As is set out in the Council's response to Issue 21: Connectivity, the Council does not support this modification.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/7)**, the Council welcomes the support for promoting development that faces and enlivens the Canal-side area. However, it is considered that the Development Strategy already provides sufficient support for this aim, particularly through bullet-points 4 and 5 of the Strategy. As such, the Council considers that no modification to the Plan is considered necessary in this regard.

### Clydebank Policy 1 – Clydebank Town Centre and Forth & Clyde Canal

In response to **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/7)**, the Council welcomes the support for promoting development beside the canal that provides an active frontage onto the canal or at least open up onto the canal wherever possible. The Council however Policy WD1: Waterfront Development already requires developments to "*present a frontage to the waterfront and contributes to the overlooking of it*" and that the Forth and Clyde Canal is one of these waterfronts referred to in the Policy.

Therefore, adding a specific reference in to Clydebank Policy 1 on the same terms would merely lead to duplication of the requirement of Policy WD 1. Therefore, no modification to the Plan is required.

### Clydebank Policy 3: Rosebery Place and Playdrome Redevelopment Opportunity Sites

The Council notes the comments from **SNH (PLDP/640/7)** in relation to engagement on the design guidance mentioned in relation to this policy.

The Council notes **Network Rail's (PLDP/662/7)** request that development proposals at the Playdrome and other sites should make appropriate contributions towards any new infrastructure required in line with Policy CON1. As policy CON1 already provides a clear and appropriate basis for seeking any such contributions, it is considered that no further modifications to the Policy are required in this regard.

With regard to the representation by **SPT (PLDP/675/7)**, while the Council agrees that development proposals on the former Playdrome site should recognise the importance of the other site boundaries (other than the Canal frontage); however, it is considered that

these design issues will be addressed, in general terms, through Policy CP 1 of the Plan and the Creating Places Supplementary Guidance.

Furthermore, these issues will be addressed/ or are already addressed in more detail within the Playdrome Site Brief and Clydebank Can Supplementary Guidance documents. The Clydebank Can Supplementary Guidance, which will be prepared in due course, will provide a design framework and masterplan for the Canal corridor within the Centre of Clydebank, which will outline design principles for the area and take on board the outcomes and relevant projects of the Clydebank Town Centre Charrette (2015) and Clydebank Can (2019 (once the report is approved by the Council)). The Council is therefore of the view that no modifications to the Policy are required in this regard.

The Council welcomes the comments of **The Salvation Army Trustee Company (PLDP/781)** regarding maintaining appropriate parking and access to the Salvation Army Centre on Sylvania Way as part of any redevelopment proposals. However, it is considered that detailed layout and access arrangements are considerations which are best addressed at the Development Management stage once a planning application for the Playdrome site is received. No modifications to the Policy are considered necessary in this regard.

In response to **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/7)**, the Council welcomes the support for ensuring that developments or redevelopments beside the canal provide an active frontage onto the canal or at least open up onto the canal wherever possible. However, the Council, would refer the Reporter to its response to Scottish Canals within Clydebank Policy 1 above, as it is of a similar nature to their representation to this Policy. No modifications to the Policy are therefore required in this regard.

#### Clydebank Proposal 1: Co-operative Building

The Council welcomes the support of **The Salvation Army Trustee Company (PLDP/781)** for this proposal.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 8	Alexandria Town Centre	
Development plan reference:	Delivering Our Places: Alexandria Town Centre (pages 38 to 39)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
SEPA (PLDP676/8) (Support) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/8)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Alexandria Town Centre section of the Plan, which sets out a Development Strategy and a Town Centre Policy Statement which lists the projects and uses to guide development within the Town Centre.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>The representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Alexandria Town Centre Supporting Text and Alexandria Town Centre Policy Statement: Key Projects and Uses.</p> <p><u>Alexandria Town Centre Supporting Text</u></p> <p><b>SEPA (PLDP676/8)</b> recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies. This strategy is the primary mechanism for the delivery of the key locations and it is anticipated these will be delivered over the next 5 to 10 years. One of these areas is Alexandria Town Centre.</p> <p><u>Alexandria Town Centre Policy Statement: Key Projects and Uses</u></p> <p><b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/8)</b> are broadly supportive of the policy in relation to improvements to parking, access and public realm within the Town Centre. They also suggest that reference should be made to better signage for the car parks and walkways into the Main Street.</p> <p>The Trust express disappointment that an area of land within the Town Centre has been leased for 125 years to a church group as they do not believe it is in the best interests of the current residents or businesses or provides any benefit to the town centre.</p> <p>The Trust would like to see more consideration given to pedestrian access for the centre of Alexandria, particularly the pedestrian routes to and from Alexandria Station. They suggest the area around Bank Street Railway Bridge is currently well used, particularly with foot traffic from St Marys Primary School to the east of the railway bridge, but it is unsafe for pedestrians due to proximity to busy traffic, and this could be fully pedestrianised with the traffic rerouted along the Bridge Street route.</p> <p>They express disappointment that the Plan does not recognise the importance of improved public toilets for the town that would especially be fit for people that find it more</p>		

<p>difficult to use conventional toilets.</p> <p>Finally, the Trust expresses concern over the current parking issues in surrounding residential streets such as Wilson Street.</p>
<p><b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b></p>
<p><u>Alexandria Town Centre Policy Statement: Key Projects and Uses</u></p> <p><b>Vale of Leven Trust (VOLT) (PLDP/677/8)</b> are seeking a modification to the Policy Statement to include reference to improving the signage for the car parks and walkways into the Main Street.</p> <p>They are also seeking to include policy support for improvements to pedestrian routes from the town centre to Alexandria Railway Station and east along Bank Street under the railway bridge, to increase pedestrian safety and avoid crossing busy roads.</p> <p>The Trust also seeks policy recognition of the importance of improved and accessible public toilets in the town.</p>
<p><b>Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:</b></p>
<p>The Council's responses to the representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Alexandria Town Centre Supporting Text and Alexandria Town Centre Policy Statement: Key Projects and Uses.</p> <p><u>Alexandria Town Centre Supporting Text</u></p> <p>The comments of <b>SEPA (PLDP676/8)</b> are noted.</p> <p><u>Alexandria Town Centre Policy Statement: Key Projects and Uses</u></p> <p>The <b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/8)</b> request that a change should be made to the Policy Statement to support improved signage for car parks and walkways into Main Street. The Policy Statement currently includes support for, <i>"Improvements to parking and access from the rear of Main Street..."</i> In addition the Alexandria Town Centre Development Strategy includes the aim, <i>"To enhance the attractiveness of the town centre through accessibility, public realm and transport improvements."</i> It is considered that these projects would logically include better signage as part of the parking, accessibility and public realm improvements, but the determining the precise nature of these projects is not a matter for Local Development Plan 2 itself to address. As such, the Council considers that no modifications to the Plan are required in this regard.</p> <p>Similarly with regard to the Trust's request that reference be made to improvements to pedestrian access to the Railway Station and to Bank Street east of the railway. The Council welcomes these constructive comments, but would point out that the Policy Statement already includes support for such measures, within the final bullet point which supports: <i>"Improved multi-user and active travel linkages to the railway station and River Leven."</i> It is considered that specific pedestrian and road safety measures could be made as part of these improved linkages, but determining the precise requirements of this links is a detailed matter which is outwith the scope of the Plan. As such, the Council considers</p>

that no modifications to the Plan are therefore required.

With reference to the request for a modification to recognise the importance of improved and accessible public toilets in the town, the Council would point out that there are no current proposals or strategies to develop new or enhanced public toilet facilities in Alexandria. The Council would point out that the modification suggested to the Plan, within Issue 36, in relation to Community Facilities, would allow the provision of new or upgraded toilets to occur within the Town Centre in the future.

The Council would also note that the sale or leasing of land in the town centre is not a planning matter for Local Development Plan 2 to address. However, any planning application for development of the land would be considered against the relevant policies of the Plan, including the Alexandria Town Centre Policy Statement: Key Projects and Uses.

Concerns over parking issues in streets outwith the Town Centre is not a matter that can be considered within the scope of this policy, and indeed is a matter for the Council's Roads Service, rather than the Plan, to address.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>

Issue 9	Bowling Basin	
Development plan reference:	Bowling Basin (Pages 40 – 41)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9) Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/9) (Support) SNH (PLDP/640/9) Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/9) SEPA (PLDP/676/9) (Support) Bowling and Milton Community Council (PLDP/782/9) Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/9)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Bowling Basin section of the Plan which sets out a Development Strategy and a series of place based policies and proposals for development of the area.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
The representations received to this section of the Plan are grouped under the following sub-headings: Bowling Basin Introductory text; Bowling Basin: Development Strategy; Bowling Basin Policy 1: Bowling Basin; Residential Development; Mixed Use Area; Paths, Natural Environment; and Forth and Clyde Canal.		
<u>Bowling Basin Introductory text</u>		
<b>SNH (PLDP/640/9)</b> request an amendment to paragraph 4 to be consistent with text used elsewhere in the Plan and to provide clarity regarding consideration of all potential threats to the SPA.		
<b>SEPA (PLDP676/9)</b> recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies. This strategy is the primary mechanism for the delivery of the key locations and it is anticipated these will be delivered over the next 5 to 10 years. One of these sites is Bowling Basin.		
<u>Bowling Basin: Development Strategy</u>		
<b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/9)</b> note their support for the Development Strategy, but express concern about the state of Bowling Harbour and the entrance to the Canal.		
<b>SNH (PLDP/640/9)</b> state that an additional bullet point, in relation to the SPA and SSSI, requires to be inserted into the Strategy to accord with the wording of paragraphs 207 and 212 of SPP.		



## Bowling Basin Policy 1: Bowling Basin

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/9)** note their support for the Policy.

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/9)** state that site allocation H2 (6) is allocated on an area identified on the NWSS. Woodland loss could potentially occur should a planning application come forward at this site, therefore, it must be ensured that appropriate replacement planting is a requirement of any development proposals.

**SNH (PLDP/640/9)** state that an additional bullet point, in relation to the SPA and SSSI, requires to be inserted into the Policy to accord with the wording of paragraphs 207 and 212 of SPP.

### Residential Development

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)** states that there should be no residential development along the Canal as it is close to the SPA. Also she is of the view that access to the site is impractical and any additional access would be detrimental to the area, landscape and surrounding natural habitats.

**Bowling and Milton Community Council (PLDP/782/9)** strongly object to any housing on either side of the Canal, west of the Upper Bowling Basin and state that they are aware that the Council recently pulled out of the proposed construction of 76 houses either side of the canal, and that a spokesman for Scottish Canal assessed that “the housing project is not feasible at the moment”.

The Community Council state that residential development within Bowling, including this site, would result in an unacceptable population influx and loss of the village’s current social character. It would result in the loss of the village’s unique identity due to coalescence with Old Kilpatrick and that the previous refusal to accept a Section 75 agreement on the number of housing units to be built on the Basin site has the potential to exacerbate these issues further.

The Community Council are also of the view that residential development on either side of the Canal may be a deterrent to many people and would result in fewer visitors, have a detrimental effect on the trade of current commercial outlets, and as a result of the latter would not provide employment opportunities for local residents.

Residential development, according to the Community Council, also ruins green network opportunities and connections and would destroy an invaluable wildlife corridor. They refer to a report from SWT which concluded that:

*“housing would be damaging and inappropriate. There could be scope to preserve the special character of the basin as well as the wildlife value of the woodlands with a very limited development of existing buildings only. Our recommendation therefore is that woodland should be re-zoned, preferably as an LNR or LNCS but certainly as Greenbelt as a minimum.”*

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/9)** state that site H2 (96) allocation should remain. Whilst recognising that this is not going to be delivered immediately they still have ambitions to develop housing on this site as it will support the activities and uses at Bowling Basin.



Scottish Canals and the Council continue to examine further the feasibility and delivery models for bringing forward housing on this site.

#### Mixed Use Area

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/9)** state that Bowling Basin remains a priority destination which they are investing in along with others to create a visitor destination. This includes creation of a new food offer at the lower basin, visitor accommodation at Custom House and Bowling Viaduct Highline project.

The area of mixed use opportunity should be wider as shown in their attached scan – to reflect the approved masterplan for Bowling Basin (which is referred to in the Bowling Basin Policy). The Outer Harbour is also a long-term opportunity for additional moorings / marina. Scottish Canal ask if these uses can be added as a designation / allocation in the Proposed Plan.

#### Paths

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)** is concerned that when paths are mentioned they do not contain any reference to bridleways. Ms Dick is of the view that paths in this area should remain natural and grassed with maybe some ground reinforcement underneath such as ecogrid and is strongly of the view that no grey paths should be introduced within the area as these detract from the natural look of the area and will damage biodiversity during construction and afterwards.

#### Natural Environment

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)** states that care must be taken not to upset the delicate balance of this area and to protect the natural open spaces contained within it and its current footpaths/bridleways. The cycle track provides the sanitised route so the other routes should be left naturalised. Also highlights that Bats are on the site and is of the view that development will have an impact upon the bats during construction. Ms Dick asks if any surveys/assessments have been carried out in this regard. Ms Dick also raises issues to do with newt ponds on the site and supports the safeguarding of these and the wildlife corridor and asks for further engagement with a range of stakeholders before development commences in this regard.

Ms Dick, when referring to Policies CP1 and CP2, supports the green infrastructure plans and habitat enhancement, but states that there should be no exceptions allowed in the aims of protecting nature conservation and species and that the site should be left to nature, as it is a valuable natural asset and should be retained as such.

#### Forth and Clyde Canal

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)**, referring to Policies FCC1 and BE 1, is of the view that residential and more commercial development would have an impact on the Canal and its natural setting.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

#### Bowling Basin Introductory text

**SNH (PLDP/640/6)** recommend that the Paragraph 4 on Page 40 is amended to:

*“Development at Bowling Basin must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development.”*

#### Bowling Basin: Development Strategy

**SNH (PLDP/640/9)** request that a new bullet point is inserted into the Strategy as follows:

*“To ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).”*

#### Bowling Basin Policy 1: Bowling Basin

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/9)** request that an additional bullet point is added to the Policy as follows:

*“Any woodland loss should be mitigated for compensatory planting of native tree species appropriate to the site conditions.”*

**SNH (PLDP/640/9)** request that a new bullet point is inserted into the Policy as follows:

*“To avoid any adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA), or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).”*

#### Residential Development

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)** does not specifying any modifications within the representation but it is inherent that Ms Dick does not wish to see residential development on this site and reference to it should be removed from this section of the Plan.

**Bowling and Milton Community Council (PLDP/782/9)** request that Site H2(6) Bowling is rezoned from Housing to Greenbelt, as well as, it being designated either as a Local Nature Reserve or Local Nature Conservation Site.

#### Mixed Use Area

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/9)** request that the Development Strategy Map is amended as detailed in their representation. They also request that the Plan includes a designation/allocation that allows additional moorings/marina for the Outer Harbour.

#### Paths

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)** does not specifying any modifications within the representation but it is inherent that Ms Dick wishes to see a reference to bridleways made within the text and a commitment to the natural construction of paths within the site.

#### Natural Environment

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)** does not specifying any modifications within the representation but it is inherent that Ms Dick is against development within the area which would have an impact on the natural environment should be removed.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council's responses to the representations received to this section of the Plan are grouped under the following sub-headings: Bowling Basin Introductory text; Bowling Basin: Development Strategy; Bowling Basin Policy 1: Bowling Basin; Residential Development; Mixed Use Area; Paths, Natural Environment; and Forth and Clyde Canal.

#### Bowling Basin Introductory text

The Council has no objection to the proposed modification to Paragraph 4 on Page 40 as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/9)**, being made, should the Reporter wish to amend the paragraph.

The comments and support of **SEPA (PLDP676/9)** is welcomed.

#### Bowling Basin: Development Strategy

The Council has no objection to the proposed modification to Development Strategy as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/9)**, being made, should the Reporter wish to amend the Strategy.

The Council welcomes the support of **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/9)** for the Development Strategy and Policy 1.

#### Bowling Basin Policy 1: Bowling Basin

The representation from **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/9)**, the Council is of the view that the requirements of Policy ENV 4: Forestry, Trees and Woodlands will ensure that that compensatory planting is undertaken should any of the woodland be lost as a result of development. The modification sought by Woodland Trust Scotland would just be duplicating the requirements of Policy ENV 4 and, as a result, the Council is of the view that no modification to the Policy is required in this regard.

#### Residential Development

In relation to the representations from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)** and **Bowling and Milton Community Council (PLDP/782/9)**, the Council would point out that the site has Planning Permission in Principle consent (DC 15/270) for residential development in this location. The response from Scottish Canals indicates that they are still committed to bringing forward residential development on the site in accordance with the Planning Permission in Principle consent in the future.

The other issues raised by Ms Dick are considered to be matters to be addressed by Development Management when the detailed application is submitted. It should be noted that the developer will require to undertake a project level Habitats Regulations Appraisal and submit this to the Council should any new planning application come forward.

The clarification from **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/9)** of their commitment to taking the site forward for housing is welcomed and that the site is required to support the continued regeneration of Bowling Basin as a visitor destination.

#### Mixed Use Area

An amendment to the Plan may be required in relation to the representation from **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/9)** in relation to the Development Strategy Map and the mixed use area. The extent of the mixed use are depicted on the Development Strategy Map appears to not fully reflect the approved masterplan for Bowling Basin, which is a graphical error. Therefore, the Development Strategy Map requires to be amended to rectify this error. The Council suggests that Development Strategy Map is amended as suggested by Scottish Canals, should the Reporter wish to amend the Map.

In relation to the request from **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/9)** that the Plan be amended to include a reference to additional moorings and/or a marina at the Outer Harbour being acceptable uses within the Plan. Should the Reporter wish to amend the Bowling Basin Policy 1, the Council would have no objection to the policy being changed and would suggest the following new paragraph is added to the end of the Policy:

*“The Council will also support future proposals for the redevelopment of the Outer Harbour for related and compatible uses, such as additional moorings, a marina and associated facilities, to further establish Bowling Basin as tourist destination and also to help regenerate the River Clyde waterfront in conjunction with future development at Scott’s Yard and the Esso City Deal Site.”*

#### Paths

In response to **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)**, it would not be appropriate to specifically refer to bridleways for every use of the word ‘path’ in this section of the Plan. This is because the text is referring to specific paths/routes (i.e. Canal Towpath) and is not referring to all paths within the site. Also it is important to note that some types of paths within, or proposed to be within, the site may not be suitable for use as bridleways and the modification sought by Ms Dick may lead to inaccuracies within the text in this regard. The other issues raised are considered to be more detailed matters that are outwith the scope of the Plan. No modification to the plan is therefore required.

#### Natural Environment

The issues raised by **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)** in relation to the natural environment will be safeguarded by Bowling Basin Policy 1 and the other relevant policies within the Plan. The Planning Permission in Principle consent was accompanied by a number of studies (such as a Bat survey) and the conditions attached to this consent require revised surveys to be submitted as part of the detailed application. As the principle of development within the site has already been established, no modifications to the Plan are required in this regard.

### Forth and Clyde Canal

In relation to representation from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/9)**, the site has Planning Permission in Principle consent and that the potential impacts on the Forth and Clyde Canal were considered at that point. Historic Environment Scotland will be consulted on the detailed application for the residential development but for information, they have not objected to this section of the Plan in regard to the potential impacts on the Scheduled Monument.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 10	Lomondgate Business Park	
Development plan reference:	Delivering our Places: Lomondgate (Pages 42-44)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
John Handley Associates on behalf of client (PLDP/166) Strathleven Regeneration CIC (PLDP/178) SNH (PLDP/640/10) SEPA (PLDP676/10) (Support) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/10)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Lomondgate section of the Plan which sets out a Development Strategy and a series of place based policies for development of the Business Park and Roadside Services Area.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b>John Handley Associates (PLDP/166)</b> requests that the mix of uses on the Lomondgate Business Park is widened even further to include tourism and visitor related uses, including restaurants; play areas and visitor related retail development. The respondent states that this will increased market interest in the site, result in its successful development, help to deliver further investment in the area and deliver a greater number and wider range of employment opportunities.</p> <p>The respondent indicates that the business park has been marketed continuously for a number of years and has failed to attract any viable interest or investment. It is therefore unrealistic for the Council to continue to restrict development at Lomondgate to classes 4, 5 and 6 on the site.</p> <p><b>Strathleven Regeneration CIC (PLDP/178)</b> seeks the same changes to the Plan as <b>John Handley Associates (PLDP/166)</b> above.</p> <p><b>Strathleven Regeneration CIC</b> also state that there is a minor inconsistency in the way the site is described in different parts of the document. The proposals map does not reflect the new mixed-use allocation defined on the Lomondgate Development Strategy Map on page 43. The Proposed Plan Proposals Map still includes the site as an “industrial/ business opportunity”, and this should be amended.</p> <p><b>SNH (PLDP/640/10)</b> seek amendments to Lomondgate Policy 1: Lomondgate Business Park to ensure integration of the landscape and to provide for employment active travel connections and opportunities.</p> <p><b>SEPA (PLDP676/10)</b> recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies. This strategy is the primary</p>		

mechanism for the delivery of the key locations and it is anticipated these will be delivered over the next 5 to 10 years. One of these sites is Lomondgate.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/10)** support the flexible approach in potential business and industrial development at Lomondgate Business Park but state that future proposals on the Business Park should not adversely affect the vitality and viability of the Town Centres of Alexandria and Dumbarton. The Trust are of the view that a hotel, restaurant, garden centre are likely to significantly impact on local businesses or existing uses in the Town Centres and will not have an economic benefit to the local economy.

The Trust state they are concerned about the proposed '*Appropriate and compatible commercial leisure and tourist uses*;' and are of the view these proposed uses are extremely vague. These should not be the same types of uses within the Business Park as there are within Alexandria and Dumbarton Town Centres. They also state the Council should actively engage in proposals that attract people to the area, as well as, the provision of wet weather activity centres within the area and super-fast-free wifi areas.

The Trust believes that the proposed uses on the Business Park are likely to generate significant amount of traffic as there is already congestion and traffic issues associated with Lomondgate; therefore, it would be beneficial to try and reduce/resolve these issues before adding to them with additional businesses.

The Trust also raise concerns in relation to site E1(5) Lomondgate, specifically noting the potential impact of flooding on local road infrastructure as well as potential impact that non-industry and business uses might have on local towns.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**John Handley Associates (PLDP/166)** and **Strathleven Regeneration CIC (PLDP/178)** seek the following changes to Lomondgate Policy 1: Lomondgate Business Park (proposed modifications in bold; deletions in ~~italics~~) and the Dumbarton Proposals Map:

#### **Lomondgate Policy 1: Lomondgate Business**

Proposals for development within this area will only be acceptable to the Council where they meet the following criteria:

- A Masterplan for the site has been developed;
- ~~At least 50% of the site~~ **Part of the site** should be developed for Class 4, 5 or 6 business and industrial use, including storage and distribution use;
- Proposals for commercial, leisure and tourism uses within the Business Park are restricted to uses such as a garden centre, hotel, gym, **children's play areas, restaurants and other tourist related facilities, including visitor related retail uses**; and
- Landscaping within the site is required to help strengthen the local landscape character and green network within and through the site. Proposals should strengthen the landscape setting of Lomondgate and enhance linkages with the Local Nature Conservation Site associated with the River Leven and adjoining Vale of Leven Industrial Estate green network.

Proposals for Retail and Housing development on the Mixed-Use Part of the site, as



identified on the Development Strategy Map above, will not be supported by the Council, **with the exception of tourist or visitor related retail uses which will be supported by the Council within the site where it can be demonstrated that they do not have an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of Dumbarton Town Centre.**

The Dumbarton Proposals Map should also be updated to reflect the allocation of the Lomondgate Business Park as a mixed use development site.

**SNH (PLDP/640/10)** request that two new bullets points are added to Lomondgate Policy 1: Lomondgate Business Park as follows:

- Proposals should successfully integrate development within wider views. The massing and scale of development and finished materials and colours should be set out; and
- Active travel connections and route requirements to improve access to employment opportunities should be incorporated, demonstrating connectivity with the wider network.

Although **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/10)** does not request any specific changes, it is inherent in their response that they wish to see wet weather activity centres and super-fast wifi areas added to the Lomondgate Policies.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

With regard to the representations by **John Handley Associates (PLDP/166)** and **Strathleven Regeneration CIC (PLDP/178)**, the introduction of the proposed additional non-business and industrial uses within the Lomondgate Business Park could have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of Dumbarton and Alexandria Town Centres and also on the existing Roadside Services Area at Lomondgate. Restaurants and tourist related retail should be directed towards the Roadside Services area and are not acceptable on the Business Park itself.

The Council appreciates the difficulties that **Strathleven Regeneration CIC (PLDP/178)** has encountered in trying to deliver the site and attract investment to it; hence, the changes the Council has made to the designation of the Lomondgate Business Park to allow a wider range of compatible non-business and industrial uses to be developed within it. These uses specified within Lomondgate Policy 1 will help to attract investment to the business park site whilst safeguarding the majority of the site for business and industrial development.

Business and industrial development should still be the primary use of the site and this is supported by the Business and Industrial Land 2018 Report (CDxx) and that the allocated, marketable employment land supply which is currently identified should continue to be maintained and promoted. Lomondgate scored very highly on the site assessment results of the Report which indicates that it is an strategically important location for business and industry. The Report did not support any deallocations of business and industrial land for other uses.

Therefore, the Council does not agree that only part of the site should be developed for Business and Industrial use and that business and industrial development on the site

should be no less than 50% of the site area.

No modifications to the Plan are required in relation to these particular points of representation.

In relation to the points raised by **John Handley Associates (PLDP/166)** and **Strathleven Regeneration CIC (PLDP/178)** with regard to the Dumbarton Proposals Map, the site area was maintained as business and industrial as it is still safeguarded for business and industry. The requirement of Lomondgate Policy 1 is that 50% of the site should be used for business and industrial purposes; therefore, the Council is of the view that the business and industrial designation on the proposals map should remain to ensure that business and industrial uses are still the primary use on the site. The policy will then give the flexibility for other uses to come forward on the site.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to Lomondgate Policy 1 on page 44 being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/10)**, and would suggest that the policy is amended as follows (proposed amendments are in bold).

#### *Lomondgate Policy 1*

##### *Lomondgate Business Park*

*Proposals for development within this area will only be acceptable to the Council where they meet all of the following criteria:*

- *A Masterplan for the site has been developed, **which demonstrates that the site successfully integrates within the landscape and provides details of the massing, scale of development, finished materials and colours, which must not have an adverse impact on the wider landscape character of the area;***
- *At least 50% of the site is developed for Class 4, 5 or 6 business and industrial development;*
- *Proposals for commercial, leisure and tourism uses within the Business Park are restricted to uses such as a garden centre, hotel or gym;*
- *Landscaping within the site is required to help strengthen the local landscape character and green network within and through the site. Proposals should strengthen the landscape setting of Lomondgate and enhance linkages with the Local Nature Conservation Site associated with the River Leven and adjoining Vale of Leven Industrial Estate green network;*
- ***Proposals are required to incorporate access and route improvements, as well as, active travel connections in order to maximise access for employment opportunities to the Business Park and must demonstrate how they integrate and connect with the wider road and path networks within the surrounding area and to existing public transport stops.***

*Proposals for Retail and Housing development on the Mixed-Use Part of the site, as identified on the Development Strategy Map over, will not be supported by the Council.*

The comments of **SEPA (PLDP676/10)** on the purpose of the development strategy and policies within the section are acknowledged.

With regard to the representation from **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/10)**, the Council is

of the view that Development Strategy for Lomondgate in relation to '*appropriate and compatible commercial leisure and tourism uses*' is not vague and that the requirements for the Business Park and Roadside Services Area give significant protection to the viability and vitality of Dumbarton Town Centre. It is not considered that the proposed uses would have a significant and detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of Alexandria Town Centre.

The Council is also of the view that the proposed non-business and industrial uses considered to be appropriate for the site will encourage investment into the area and will not have an adverse impact on local businesses and existing facilities within the area. The existing hotel at Lomondgate has not had an detrimental impact on the hotel facilities within Dumbarton since it has been in operation and the addition of another hotel will add to the range and choice of visitor facilities within the area.

The Council is also of the view that wet weather activity centres are covered within the term 'commercial leisure and tourism uses' and that a specific reference to them is not required. The Council is similarly of a view that there would be no benefit from adding a requirement for super-fast Wi-Fi locations to the Policy's requirements, as this is something the Council cannot insist upon being provided. Policy CON 4 of the Plan requires new developments to provide superfast broadband within them and it would then be up to individual end users whether or not they wished to provide Wi-Fi within their premises or the area itself.

With regards to the potential impact that development of E1(5) Lomondgate might have with regards to flooding and roads infrastructure, it is considered that assessment of potential flood impacts would be considered during the planning application process once specific proposals are available. Other policies of the plan would ensure that that this requirement would be met and it should be noted that SEPA have not objected to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

The Council is therefore of the view that no modifications are required in relation to this particular representation.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>

Issue 11	Vale of Leven Industrial Estate	
Development plan reference:	Vale of Leven Industrial Estate (Pages 46-48)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Woodland Trust Scotland (PDLP/646/11) Clydebelt (PLDP/673/11) SEPA (PLDP/676/11) (Support) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11) Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council (PLDP/780)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate section of the Plan which sets out a Development Strategy and a series of place based policies and proposals for development of the area.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>The representations contained within this issue relate solely to the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate section of the Plan. Representations relating to Business and Industrial sites within the Industrial Estate are considered within Issue 16: Revitalising our Economy where they do not have wider impacts on the Industrial Estate.</p> <p>The representations have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Supporting Text; Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Proposal 1: Trees; Built and Natural Environment; and Footpaths, Rights of Way and Cycle Paths.</p> <p><u>Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Supporting Text</u></p> <p><b>SEPA (PLDP676/11)</b> recognises that a number of strategies and policies, contained within the Plan, will be in place to implement the spatial strategy and these will focus on ensuring the delivery of these key places and will be, where required, by supported the use of detailed place-based strategies and policies. This strategy is the primary mechanism for the delivery of the key locations and it is anticipated these will be delivered over the next 5 to 10 years. One of these sites is the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate.</p> <p><b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)</b> continues to express concern that MacPhersons Transport Hub will result in adverse impacts in relation to traffic, air pollution and contamination of land.</p> <p><u>Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Proposal 1: Trees</u></p> <p><b>Woodland Trust Scotland (PDLP/646/11)</b> supports this proposal to explore a TPO for the trees at this site. In addition to this, it should be specified that additional planting with native trees should take place as compensatory planting, in instances where tree removal is required. Any veteran and ancient trees at this site should be protected from any adverse impacts which may occur. A tree survey should be requested by the Council in</p>		

order to identify any such trees.

#### Built and Natural Environment

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/11)** object to the allocation of Sites E1(1), E1(2) and E1(4) as these sites were once part of a designed landscape adjacent to a listed building and a new housing estate. These areas contain some valuable mature woodland and provide a landscape setting to Strathleven House. Clydebelt are of the view that the allocation of these sites are in complete contradiction to Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Policy 3 and Proposal 1, as well as, Policy ENV 2. The industrial estate is struggling and there is plenty of vacant potential industrial development land at Lomondgate without the need to develop these sites.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)** believes that the setting of Vale of Leven Industrial Estate amongst a Greenbelt area and a Local Nature Conservation Site needs to be given significant protection. In particular suggest consideration in relation to strengthening waste management to ensure no seepage into the River Leven / water courses with a long term consequence on the river / Loch Lomond and Endrick Waters.

The Trust state that they would not support any further incursion into the Green Belt outlined in this Proposal and are concerned that the River Leven is the main outflow for Loch Lomond and acts as a critical wildlife corridor for wild salmon running and other general wildlife.

**Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council (PLDP/780)** want site E1(2) designated as greenspace and as the remainder of the site is the most attractive part of Strathleven House and it would be unfortunate to let industry encroach here. The Community Council also state that their proposed Bonhill to Dumbarton cycle route crosses this site and they cannot envisage how the route would work otherwise. They also point out that the site abuts the Strathleven residential estate and question development of this type in close proximity to housing.

#### Footpaths, Rights of Way and Cycle Paths

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/11)** state that their previous suggestion for an off-road footpath/cycle path along the dangerous A 813 also seems to have been ignored and yet the Plan claims that.....“the Council is seeking to further enhance the Green Network in the Industrial Estate in order to boost the attractiveness of its location and also to encourage workers within the estate to use the green network assets for leisure and recreation....”; and perhaps just be able to walk or cycle safely to work.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)** believes that there should be improved infrastructure to result in safe cycle & pedestrian pathways with investment in lighting. The Trust question Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Policy 3 and the Council's commitment to this when the path from Bonhill to the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate is inherently dangerous. The Trust ask that the Council considers a commuter pedestrian/cycle route from Bonhill reaching out to Alexandria and Dumbarton. The Trust also note that the right of way path in E1(2) across the green belt has been lost in the proposed change of status.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)** state that they require the reinstatement of the Right of Way around the Kilmalid Extension Boundary: Site E1(12) and would also require the Right of Way to be maintained.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:
<p><u>Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Proposal 1: Trees</u></p> <p><b>Woodland Trust Scotland (PDL/646/11)</b> request that the following sentence is added to the proposal:</p> <p><i>“A tree survey will be required, and any ancient and veteran trees which are of high nature value should be protected from adverse impacts resulting from development at this site. Any tree loss should be mitigated for with compensatory native tree planting appropriate for this site.”</i></p> <p><u>Built and Natural Environment</u></p> <p><b>Clydebelt (PLDP/673/11)</b> seek the removal of sites E1(1), E1(2) and E1(4) as potential development sites.</p> <p><b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)</b> wishes the Plan to state that there should be no seepage into the River Leven / water courses with a long term consequence on the river / Loch Lomond and Endrick Waters as a result of development in this area.</p> <p><b>Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council (PLDP/780)</b> re-designate Site E1(2) from business and industrial to greenspace.</p> <p><u>Footpaths, Rights of Way and Cycle Paths</u></p> <p><b>Clydebelt (PLDP/673/11), Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11) and Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council (PLDP/780)</b> wish the Plan to indicate a potential foot/cycle path south of the A813 to link the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate and Dumbarton to Bonhill.</p> <p>Although not specifically requesting a modification to the Plan, it is inherent in the <b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)</b> that they wish to see the Right of Way within Site E1(2) remain.</p> <p><b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)</b> state that the Plan should reinstate the Right of Way around the Kilmalid Extension Boundary: Site E1(12) and that a commitment to maintaining this Right of Way should be made within the Plan.</p>
Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:
<p>The Councils responses to the representations received have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Supporting Text; Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Proposal 1: Trees; Built and Natural Environment; and Footpaths, Rights of Way and Cycle Paths.</p> <p><u>Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Supporting Text</u></p> <p>The comments and support of <b>SEPA (PLDP676/11)</b> is noted.</p> <p>In response to the representation for the <b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)</b>, the Council</p>



would point out that the MacPhersons Transport Hub has planning consent for this use and that the issues raised by the Trust were considered during the planning application. Therefore, the points raised by the Trust are not relevant to the consideration of this section of the Plan.

#### Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Proposal 1: Trees

The support of the **Woodland Trust Scotland (PDLP/646/11)** for a Tree Preservation Order within the site is welcomed. The protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees requested by the Trust is provided by Policy ENV 4 Forestry, Trees and Woodland, which requires compensatory planting to be provided should there be any loss of woodland within the site, regardless of their being a TPO in place or not. The type of compensatory planting to be provided, including species, is considered to be a detailed matter for the development management process to address as is the request for a tree survey to be provided. As a result, the Council is of the view that no modification to the proposal is required.

#### Built and Natural Environment

In response to the representation from **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/11)**, the Council does not agree that Sites E1 (1), E1(2) and E1(4) should be deleted from the Plan due to the impact on the setting of Strathleven House and the wider natural environment. Scottish Planning Policy (CD xx) requires Local Development Plan 2 to allocate sites that meet the diverse needs of different sizes of businesses and to allow new economic development opportunities. The Council's Business and Industry Review (April 2018) (CDxx) undertook a review of these sites and they scored highly in the assessment. The review also did not propose any de-allocation of these sites from the business and industrial land supply. The sites have been allocated for business and industrial use within the Adopted Local Plan (2010) (CD xx) and the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) (CDxx) and form an important part of the marketable business and industrial land supply for the Plan. However, the Council would expect that future proposals for development of these sites should take into account the impact on Strathleven House and where an adverse impact arises, mitigation measures are put in place to ameliorate or avoid the impact.

Any loss of woodland etc will require compensatory planting to be provided via the provisions of Policy ENV 4: Forestry, Trees and Woodland. Moreover, the Council is of the view that the provisions of the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate Policies 2 and 3, in conjunction with Creating Places Policies 1 and 2; Policy ENV 2: Landscape Character and Policy BE 2: Listed Buildings of the Plan, will help to protect the setting of Strathleven House and the wider landscape of the area. However, these matters would be addressed by any future planning applications for the sites.

As a result no modification to the Plan is therefore required.

With regard to the representation from the **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)**, the Council is of the view that the policies within the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate section of the plan; Policy GB1: Greenbelt and Countryside; and Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation provides significant protection to the natural environment of the Industrial Estate. The Council would also point out that Policy ENV 5: Water Environment will ensure that the watercourses mentioned by the Vale of Leven Trust are protected from any pollution. No modifications to the Plan are therefore required in this regard.



In relation to representation to site E1(2) from **Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council (PLDP/780)**, the Council do not anticipate any adverse impact on the existing residential use and that the Creating Places and other policies within the Plan will ensure that there is no adverse impacts on the amenity of the residential area. Also, the proposed cycle route, mentioned by the Community Council, could be designed and integrated into the site layout by the developer and connected into the Council's proposed footpath/cyclepath – see response on this issue in the subheading below - should the ownership issues be addressed and funding be obtained for the whole route. However, all of these matters are considered to be detailed issues to be addressed at the Development Management stage.

#### Footpaths, Rights of Way and Cycle Paths

In response to the representations from **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/11)**, **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)** and **Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council (PLDP/780)** seeking a proposed off-road footpath/cycle path linking the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate and Dumbarton to Bonhill and beyond, the Council has been looking to upgrade a section of the route which is within Council ownership (between the Industrial Estate and Strathleven Drive) and a number of options have been investigated on how this can be delivered when funding becomes available. However, a section of the proposed route is outwith the ownership of the Council. As a result of funding not being available and the proposed route not being fully within the control/ownership of the Council, it would not be appropriate to include a reference to the proposed footpath/cycle path within the Plan as it cannot be implemented at this time. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

The representation from **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)** regarding the Right of Way bisecting Site E1(2) being lost in the proposed change of status, the Council would point out that the information for Rights of Way on the Council's GIS system, which comes from Scotways, does not show a Right of Way through this site. However, there is a Core Path bisecting the site (ref Core Path 46) and this Path is given protection under Policy CON 3: Core Paths and Natural Routes. The route is shown on the Development Strategy Map. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

Regarding the representation seeking the reinstatement of a Right of Way within site E1(12) by the **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/11)**, the Trust are correct that there is a Right of Way running within the site which is further north than the Core Path, which runs alongside the western boundary of the site as depicted on the Development Strategy Map. The route is not lost, it is just not shown on the Development Strategy Map. The Council is of the view that incorporating every environmental designation on the Development Strategy Maps within the Delivering our Places section of the Plan would make the maps incomprehensible and difficult to navigate. No modifications to the Plan are therefore required in this regard.

If a Right of Way is within Council ownership then the responsibility for maintenance is that of the Council. However, the land in question is not within the ownership of the Council and, as such, responsibility for the maintenance of this Right of Way lies with the landowner. However, there is no duty within legislation that requires the landowner to maintain the Right of Way or for the Council to enforce this. The only responsibility the Council has with these types of paths is that we have a duty to ensure that access to these routes is open at all times and to keep the routes free of any man-made obstruction such as a fence, wall, hedge, locked gate, etc that would restrict access to the Right of Way.

No modifications to the Plan should be made in this regard.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 12	Our Key Assets	
Development plan reference:	Our Key Assets – Pages 52 - 65	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
SportsScotland (PLDP/026/12) (Support) Mahlin Group (PLDP/177/12) Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12) SNH (PLDP/640/12) Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/12) RSPB (PLDP/649/12) (Support) Clydebelt (PLDP/673/12) SEPA (PLDP/676/12) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/12) Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/12)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates the key built and natural environment assets within West Dunbartonshire. Each key asset has either a policy or strategy, which seeks to protect each of these assets through identifying which types of development may be appropriate or the criteria that development will have to accord with.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>The representations made to this section have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General, Greenbelt and Countryside, Our Waterfront, Kilpatrick Hills, Strategic Green Network, and Forth and Clyde Canal.</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p><b>SEPA (PLDP/676/12)</b> are supportive of this section of the Plan and welcome the use of the proposal maps as use of proposal maps as a measure for providing an initial overview of the location of the key assets and that the water environment is integral to some of these assets.</p> <p><u>Greenbelt &amp; Countryside</u></p> <p><b>Sportscotland (PLDP/026/12)</b> support the flexibility of the policy which states that leisure and tourism related development may be acceptable beyond the urban area and it is presumed this includes for recreational and sporting use which may have such specific locational need.</p> <p><b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)</b> support Policy GB1 and the proposed restrictions on development. In relation to the support give to the non-allocation of Young's Farm, Dumbarton, this is addressed in Issue 31 which relates to that particular site.</p>		

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/12)** support Policy GB 1, in particular, the continued efforts to direct new housing to brownfield sites.

#### Our Waterfront

**Sportscotland (PLDP/026/12)** welcome the Policy approach in this section which seeks to protect and enhance access and recreational opportunities

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/12)** broadly supports Policy WD 1 and criterion (c). However, they are of the view that the criterion does not provide a fully objective and transparent policy test to determine the acceptability of development proposals which may restrict public access to the waterfront edge. The criterion also does not recognise the potential for increased public access along the River Clyde foreshore to result in disturbance effects on the qualifying interests of the Inner Clyde SPA and SSSI. In this regard, public access should actually be restricted rather than encouraged. The criterion should therefore be amended for clarity, objectivity and in the interests of providing robust protection for ecological interests

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)** support Policy WD 1 in principle, but raise points in relation to the Carless site. These points are addressed within Issue 5 in relation to Carless.

**SNH (PLDP/640/12)** are of the view that the third paragraph of the text needs to be amended to account for the River Leven which is a tributary to the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and to reflect our previous comments made in respect of wording used elsewhere in the Plan and HRA to protect Natura sites.

They also advise that it may be useful to have associated Planning Guidance for Developers advising that any designs to increase levels of recreational access along the foreshore will need to be accompanied by proposals to try to minimise disturbance to sensitive and important feeding waders during the winter months. This could include for example, simple measures like signage explaining the situation with mitigation to address the matter or other measures incorporated into the design.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/12)** welcome the recognition that recreational usage can have adverse impacts on natural heritage sites and that there is a need to ensure that this is avoided.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/12)** would recommend that policy WD1 should apply to canal-side development opportunities.

#### Kilpatrick Hills

**Sportscotland (PLDP/026/12)** welcome the Policy approach in this section which seeks to protect and enhance access and recreational opportunities

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)** support Policy KH 1. However, they would oppose any large-scale renewable energy applications or any recreational projects which are not consistent with this Policy. Further opportunities to improve the Kilpatrick Hills are suggested.

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/12)** are pleased to see areas of woodland

represented on the map and this is an excellent first step in protection of these areas. Ancient woodland is a key asset and should be protected and enhanced. These areas of woodland appear to be fragmented and that the local authority can play an important role in enhancing these areas. However, they wish the Policy to be strengthened in relation to protected Ancient Woodland within the Kilpatrick Hills.

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/12)** is supportive of Policy KH 1 but states they are concerned by the potential for wind farm development and its impact on the remoteness and landscape of the Kilpatrick Hills. Also wish to be assured that the various waterbodies within the area will not be completely drained so they no longer be used as a water supply as they are extremely important for biodiversity and in terms of landscape character. Also concerned that the Kilpatrick Hills have been degraded by unauthorized quarrying and other commercial activities at former farms which should not be permitted in green belt . They are of the view that Policies GB1 and MIN1 need more policing.

#### Strategic Green Network and Strategic Green Network Projects

**Sportscotland (PLDP/026/12)** are supportive of the approach within this section of the Plan which seeks to protect and enhance access and recreational opportunities.

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/12)** is of the view that reference to Supplementary Guidance on Green Infrastructure within this section of the Plan is not clear and should be clarified. In relation to the Strategic Green Network Projects map on Page 61 of the Plan, indicates that open space is in dark green but is not clearly labelled as such on the map. Whilst open spaces are shown clearly on the separate map on page 59, the inclusion of additional dark green circles on the map on page 61 (presumably to denote habitat / green corridors) without a separate entry on the key means it is difficult to interpret this map.

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)** support the Green Network Strategy.

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)** support the all the aspirations within the Green Network Projects and the opportunities to enhance cross boundary access.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/12)** recommend the same level of safeguarding given to green infrastructure should exist for all waterbodies and their associated habitats and, in particular, for those associated within the key assets section of the Plan. The inclusion of text recognising the protection of the water environment and the provision of blue/green networks should be incorporated into the Green Network Strategy thus strengthening the aims of this policy.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/12)** support the strategy to safeguard the Green Network but request that better commuter cycle and pedestrian paths to be built within road infrastructure to enable less reliance on cars. There is support rebuilding Alexandria footbridge across River Leven.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/12)** is of the view that the requirements of Policy WD 1 should be expressly referenced in relation to a number of sites within the Plan and that the Policy should be amended to add that canal-side development sites should utilising the Canal as a receptor for surface water.

### Forth and Clyde Canal

The representation from **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)** mentions the Canal in relation to Bowling Basin and Scott's Yard. However, the respondent doesn't raise any specific points in relation to text of the section or Policy FCC 1, other than provide their comments under the Policy reference.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/12)** support the recognition of the Forth & Clyde Canal as a Key Asset. They state that the Policy should reference the fact that third party works procedures will be applicable for any development or works affecting the Forth and Clyde Canal and that they should be consulted on all planning applications affecting the Canal

### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

#### Our Waterfront

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/12)** requests that Criterion (c) of Policy WD 1 – Waterfront Development is modified as follows:

*“Access to and along the water's edge shall be provided, protected or enhanced where appropriate. Public access to the water's edge should normally be facilitated, except where restrictions may be required for reasons of public safety, to protect the qualifying interests of statutory ecological designations or to avoid land use conflicts. Development proposals which restrict access to the water's edge should demonstrate a specific locational need for the proposal and provide sufficient justification for the restrictions in environmental and amenity terms”.*

**SNH (PLDP/640/12)** seek the following amendment to paragraphs 2 and 3:

*“Proposals for development which promote recreational access on or adjacent to the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA), for which redshank are the qualifying interest, and/or including the River Leven which is a tributary to the Endrick Water Special Area for Conservation (SAC), where Atlantic salmon, Brook lamprey and River lamprey are the qualifying interest, must not have an adverse effect on any Natura Site. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development”.*

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/12)** request that the requirements of Policy WD 1 is expressly referenced in relation to a number to housing sites H2: (13), (14), (33), (39), (41) and (53) within the Plan and that the Policy should be amended to add that canal-side development sites should utilising the Canal as a receptor for surface water.

#### Kilpatrick Hills

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/12)** seek the following wording included within Policy KH 1:

*'Any development likely to negatively impact on ancient woodland should be located away from these sites. The areas of ancient woodland should also be enhanced through additional native tree planting where this is appropriate to ensure they are better connected.'*

### Strategic Green Network

**Malin Group (PLDP/177/12)** request the following modifications are made to the Strategic Green Network section of the Plan:

- Green Network Strategy supporting text on page 58: Remove the first sentence of the second paragraph of the Strategic Green Network section (supporting text);
- Green Network Map – Page 59: remove green 'open space' designation from the playing fields land to the north of Dalmuir Bonded warehousing, for the reasons cited in Section 5 of the respondents representation.
- Strategic Green Network Projects Map – Page 61: Amend colouring / notation to distinguish between designated open spaces and other green network features.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/12)** seek the inclusion of text within this section recognising the protection of the water environment and the provision of blue/green networks.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/12)** although not specifically requesting a modification to the Plan, wish to see the list of Strategic Green Network Projects to be expanded to include enhancements/improvements to the NR7 Cycle Route.

### Forth and Clyde Canal

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/12)** state that the Policy should reference the fact that third party works procedures will be applicable for any development or works affecting the Forth and Clyde Canal and that they should be consulted on all planning applications affecting the Canal

### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

As detailed above, the representations made to this section have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General, Greenbelt and Countryside, Our Waterfront, Kilpatrick Hills, Strategic Green Network, and Forth and Clyde Canal. Where sections identified above only contain support for the Strategy and/or Policy they have not been replicated below.

#### General

The support of **SEPA (PLDP/676/12)** is welcomed.

#### Greenbelt & Countryside

The support of **Sportscotland (PLDP/026/12)** and **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)** is welcomed.

#### Our Waterfront



The support of **Sportscotland (PLDP/026/12)** is welcomed.

The representation from **Malin Group (PLDP/177/12)**, the Council does not agree that the criterion does not provide an objective and transparent policy test or that the criterion does not recognise the potential impacts on Natura 2000 sites. The intention of the criterion is to reconnect people with their watercourses and ensure that new development incorporates or fronts onto them wherever possible whilst protecting the water environment at all times. The text within the section clearly notes that there may be impacts of this Policy on Natura 2000 sites and an Habitats Regulation Appraisal of the Policy has been undertaken. It should be noted that criterion D of the Policy states that proposals that promote recreation use on or adjacent to a watercourse should have no adverse impact on a Nature 2000 site or the Forth and Clyde Canal.

Therefore, the modifications to the criterion sought by the respondent would, in the Councils view, complicate and duplicate what is already contained within the criterion or within other Policies in Plan, for example Policy ENV 1 which deals with nature conservation. It should also be noted that SNH have not objected to the criterion or suggested any amendments to it in relation to Natura 2000 sites and neither have Historic Environment Scotland or Scottish Canals objected in relation to the Forth and Clyde Canal. No modification is therefore required.

The issue raised by **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)** in relation to this section of the Plan is referring to the representations they raise to Carless. Therefore, the Councils response to the Community Councils representation is best dealt with within Issue 5.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to Paragraphs 2 and 3 being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/12)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the paragraphs. In relation to the comments on Planning Guidance for developers, the Council intend to provide this as part of the Creating Places and Green Infrastructure and Green Networks Supplementary Guidance documents. The comments of the respondent will be therefore taken on board when preparing these documents.

In relation to the representation from **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/12)**, the Council would point out that the Policy is applicable to all development sites fronting a watercourse. The Council does not agree that Policy should be amended to make reference to the Canal being used as a conduit for surface water drainage as this is a detailed requirement that should to be investigated through the masterplan process and at the development management stage. No changes to the Plan are therefore required.

#### Kilpatrick Hills

The support of **Sportscotland (PLDP/026/12)** is welcomed.

In relation to the opportunities to further improve the Kilpatrick Hills raised by **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)**, the Council is of the view that, subject to more detail being provided, these suggestions have the potential to be Green Infrastructure projects that could be funded through Developer Contributions as long as they meet with Policy GI 4; are in line with the types of Green Infrastructure Projects set out in Table 7 and meet the developer contributions tests. No modification to the Plan is considered necessary in this regard.

The Council does not agree with **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/12)** that the Policy requires to be modified to specifically refer to and protect Ancient Woodland within the Kilpatrick Hills. This is because it would be a duplication of Policy ENV 4 which already offers this protection and sets out the Policy requirements where development would result in a loss or fragmentation of this resource.

In relation to the issues raised by **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/12)**, the Council would point out that Policy KH 1 and Policy ENV 2 seek to protect the landscape character of the Kilpatrick Hills and West Dunbartonshire respectively. There are clear policy requirements within Paragraph 169 of SPP for wind energy proposals to demonstrate and provide evidence that the landscape can accommodate these types of development without any significant adverse impact on the landscape character. The Council would also point out that Policy ENV 5 relating to Waterbodies will provide protection to these resources within the Kilpatrick Hills.

In relation to the other issues raised by the respondent, these are considered to be enforcement issues and where there respondent has evidence of these alleged incidents occurring, then they should contact the Council's Compliance Officer directly as this is not a matter that the Plan can address.

#### Strategic Green Network

The support of **Sportscotland (PLDP/026/12)** is welcomed.

The Council is of the view that the purpose of the Supplementary Guidance on Green Infrastructure is clear and does not require any further clarification as suggested by **Malin Group (PLDP/177/12)**. No modifications to the text are therefore required.

In relation to the issue raised by **Malin Group (PLDP/177/12)** regarding the Green Network Map, this particular request should be viewed in the context of the respondents overall representation to Issue 5 – Carless and the request that this site be allocated for residential. The Council's response to this particular issue is addressed in detail within Issue 5; but for completeness within this section, the Council does not agree that the Open Space designation should be removed from the playing fields to the north of the Dalmuir Bonded Warehouse nor should they be allocated for residential use.

However, it is accepted that the green colouring used to detail various parts of the green network needs to be changed to different colours to add clarity to the map and consequential changes will be needed to the key in this regard. The Council does, however, regard these as non-notifiable changes of a technical nature but would have no objection if the Reporter is of a different opinion and is of the view that the Strategic Green Network Projects Map should be modified as suggested above.

Although the points raised by **SEPA (PLDP/676/12)** are understood, the text on Page 100 of the Plan in relation to the Water Environment and Policy ENV 5 of the Plan gives sufficient protection to waterbodies. The suggested modification of the text within the Strategic Green Network section of the Plan would just be repeating and duplicating what is already in the Plan. The terms 'green infrastructure' and 'green network' incorporate blue networks and the Glossary on Page 132 of the plan in relation to these elements clearly points this out. However, the Supplementary Guidance on Green Infrastructure will provide more detail on the elements that make up both of these resources. The Council is

of the view that the text within the section does not require to be modified.

In relation to the suggestion by **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/12)** that better cycle and pedestrian paths be built, the Plan sets out Policies which should achieve this aim, specifically Policy CP 1 in relation to creating places. The Council will explore the possibilities of making these improvements with relevant stakeholders, with regard to the enhancements/improvements to the NR7 national cycle route. However, the Council does not view improvements/enhancements to the NR7 as a Strategic Green Network Project as it is more to do with cycle safety. No modifications to this section of the Plan are therefore required.

#### Forth and Clyde Canal

The points raised by **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/12)** in relation to Scott's Yard and Bowling Basin and the potential impacts on the Canal are addressed within Issues 4 and 9 respectively.

The support from **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/12)** in relation to the Forth and Clyde Canal being recognised as a key asset is welcomed. The Council is also of a view that that it may be appropriate to modify Policy FCC 1 to implicitly state that Scottish Canals third party works procedures will be applicable for any development or works affecting the Forth and Clyde Canal. The Council is also of the view that paragraph 3 of the introductory text may require to be amended to state that Scottish Canals are required to be consulted on any planning applications.

Should the Reporter be agreeable to the amendments proposed above, then the Council suggests that the following modifications to the Plan are made (the proposed amendment is in bold):

Insert new sentence within paragraph 2 on Page 64 of the Plan after 'Scheduled Monument Consent' and before 'The Clydebank' as follows:

*'Scottish Canals and Historic Environment Scotland should be consulted at an early stage in any planning proposals which may affect the Forth and Clyde Canal and also when a planning application is lodged.'*

Insert new second paragraph within Policy FCC 1 as follows:

*Where development and/or works affect the Canal, they will be required to accord with Scottish Canal's Third Party Works procedures.*

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 13	Communities and Place	
Development plan reference:	Communities and Place (Pages 68-69)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/13) Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/13) Network Rail (PLDP/662/13) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/13)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to Council's aim to give Communities a greater say in how their place is developed through Locality Place Plans being adopted as Supplementary Guidance where they accord with the Policy Framework. This section of the Plan also sets out when, where and how these Plans are to be considered by developers.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/13)</b> seeks clarification on the timescales for these projects to be developed and implemented; and clarification of the envisaged role of Community Councils related to this. The respondent also proposed that LDP 2 explicitly endorses/embodies the national standards for community engagement and West Dunbartonshire Council's Engaging Communities Framework to underpin Locality Place Planning, and the design and implementation of Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p><b>Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/13)</b> welcomes in principle the context of Locality Place Plans and whilst being supportive of these Plans, consider it essential that they should not undermine the principle of the plan-led decision-making process. The respondent states that the plan led decision making process is set out in statute and is helpful in providing confidence to investors that sites allocated in the Plan will be supported for development. They quote the Scottish Government Chief Planner's letter of 15 January 2015 in relation to overreliance on Supplementary Guidance and refer to the ambitions of the proposed Planning Bill to remove such guidance.</p> <p>The respondent considered that changes are necessary to the Policy Framework to ensure that home builders and other stakeholders who will play a role in delivering the LDP are involved. Furthermore the changes are necessary to ensure that further supplementary guidance does not place in jeopardy the delivery of allocated sites, reduces the negative impact upon investor confidence the adoption of such guidance could have, whilst allowing LPPs to facilitate increased engagement in the planning system.</p> <p><b>Network Rail (PLDP/662/13)</b> supports the principle of community engagement and actively engages with communities in relation to its own projects. However development of a railway requires consideration of national and local issues and there is concern that the aspirations of local communities will not always match with the national priorities of the respondent. They are concerned that the adoption of locality place plans as</p>		

supplementary guidance creates an additional level of plan-making which may not contribute to a more efficient planning system, although the respondent welcomes that only major or significant developments are required to take on board the aspirations of the Locality Place Plans.

Network Rail notes that the concept of Locality Place Planning is further developed in West Dunbartonshire than the Place Plans being promoted in the current Planning Bill (Stage 2, Nov 2018) and suggests a modification that will enable secondary legislation requirements on Place Plans to be incorporated into the policy framework and Policy LPP1.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/13)** suggests each town and village is developed with their individual and identifiable identities and character and the difference in character of the towns and villages should play a part in their regeneration. The respondent wishes to see a mandatory requirement for all reasonable sized developments, regardless of developer to provide in depth visual and graphic information at pre-planning stage and gives an example of recent event in Alexandria Town Centre where they were disappointed with the information available. Although the respondent acknowledges the Council has little influence on this they would welcome any changes that the Council could make to this practice.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/13)** seeks changes to the Policy Framework: Locality Place Plans as detailed below (**addition, deletion**):

*~~“The Local Development Plan Authority will adopt Locality Place Plan(s) prepared within West Dunbartonshire as Supplementary Guidance where they meet the following criteria:~~*

- *a) Accords with the provisions of the Local Development Plan;*
- *b) Reflects the land use allocations contained within the Local Development Plan and does not propose alternative uses for these allocations which would be contrary to the Plan;*
- *c) Reflects the aspirations of the Local Development Plan, through Policies CP1 and CP2, to create and deliver high quality and successful places;*
- *d) A place based assessment of the area has been undertaken and provides justification for any development or improvement proposals;*
- *e) A spatial map detailing the Communities’ aspirations for their Place; and*
- *f) The Locality Place Plan has been subject to significant and wide-ranging engagement and consultation with different ages, groups and individuals within that community or communities **including landowners and developers with interests within the area covered;***

***g) The supplementary guidance will place no additional financial burdens upon allocated sites or otherwise impact upon their viability through additional restrictions or requirements over and above those which are set out in the***

***development plan.”***

**Network Rail (PLDP/662/13)** requests that the following text should be inserted at the end of Policy LPP1 (in red) on p69 and before the first Note:

"Note: Should the Place Plans be altered at the final stages of the Planning Bill, further guidance on how this Policy should apply will be published by the Council.

Note: Should the Pre-application . . . . ."

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

With regard to the representation from **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/13)**, there is no specific timescales for the production of Locality Place Plans. The Council envisages the Community Council having an extremely important role in the preparation and production of Locality Place Plans, but wishes to see the preparation and delivery of these Plans undertaken by a wider range of community groups and members of the community so that the Locality Place Plan is as inclusive as it can possible be and that the implementation of the Locality Place Plan is not the sole responsibility of one group. Who leads and steers the Locality Place Plan is a matter for the Community to address supported by the Community Planning Partnership.

The Council is however of the view that an amendment to Paragraph 3, on Page 68, may be appropriate to reinforce that the Council approach to consultation with communities is in accordance with the national standards for community engagement and West Dunbartonshire Council's Engaging Communities Framework.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the paragraph, the Council would have no objection to the paragraph being changed and would suggest that the last sentence is amended as follows (the proposed amendment is in bold):

.... "This approach will give our Communities a strong voice in how their area can be enhanced and will be prepared jointly by the Council and Communities for defined neighbourhoods within West Dunbartonshire **following the guidance set out in the National Standards for Community Engagement and in accordance with the Council's Engaging Communities Framework.**"

In response to the representation from **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/13)**, the Policy Framework for Locality Place Plans is clear that the Locality Place Plan must accord with the provisions of the Local Development Plan and not propose any alternative uses for allocations within the Local Development Plan, otherwise, they will not be adopted as Supplementary Guidance and will not form part of the Plan. Therefore, the Council is of the view that the suggested additional criteria proposed by the respondent is not required as the Policy Framework itself ensures, through criteria (a) to (c), that the primacy of the Plan is protected.

That being said, the Council does consider that an amendment to the Policy Framework may be appropriate to state that the Council not the Local Development Plan will adopt Locality Place Plans as Supplementary Guidance and that an amendment to criteria (f) may also be appropriate to ensure that developers and landowners are part of the consultation on the Locality Place Plan.



Should the Reporter wish to amend the policy framework, the Council would have no objection to the framework being changed and would suggest the following amendments (the proposed amendments are in bold):

“The **Council** will *adopt Locality Place Plan(s) prepared within West Dunbartonshire as Supplementary Guidance where they meet the following criteria:....*”

*(f) The Locality Place Plan has been subject to significant and wide-ranging engagement and consultation with different ages, groups and individuals within that community or communities **including, where relevant, landowners and developers.***

In response to **Network Rail (PLDP/662/13)**, the Council has undertaken the commitment to Locality Place Plans under the Community Empowerment Act and not in response to the proposed Local Place Plans as part of the forthcoming Planning Bill. Therefore, regardless of the introduction or not of Local Place Plans, Community Planning West Dunbartonshire and the Council will move forward with the introduction of Locality Place Plans as our approach to basing place at the heart of our service delivery and interventions for our communities. Should Local Place Plans become part of the new Planning legislation, the approach within the Local Development Plan is flexible enough to allow communities to decide whether they wish to undertake a Local Place Plan as part of the locality plan using this framework, or to undertake their own Local Place Plan independent of the policy framework.

The Council is therefore of the view that the suggested change to the Policy LPP 1 is not required for the reasons set out above.

The points raised by **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/13)**, although understood, do not have any implication for the Communities and Place section of the Local Development Plan and are clearly in relation to the pre-application process. The Council is therefore of the view that no modification to this section of the Plan is required in this regard.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>



Issue 14	Creating Places	
Development plan reference:	Creating Places (Pages 71 -73)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Sport Scotland (PLDP/026/14) Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/14) Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/14) SNH (PLDP/640/14) RSPB (PLDP/649/14) SEPA (PLDP/676/14) (Support) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/14)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the development policies of the Plan which set out the Councils requirements in terms of creating places; green infrastructure; masterplans; and the Place and Design Panel.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
The representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General; Creating Places Introductory Text; Policy CP1: Creating Places; Policy CP2: Green Infrastructure; and Policy CP 3: Masterplanning and Site Briefs.		
<u>General</u>		
<b>Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/14)</b> believe that the residential design guide is too restrictive in terms of parking arrangements and gable to gable spacing.		
<u>Creating Places Introductory Text</u>		
<b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/14)</b> are supportive of the approach taken in the Proposed Plan to ensuring West Dunbartonshire is a great place to live, work and visit by creating new places and delivering high quality development. The Trust are of the view that this approach should be adopted by the Council as a whole but state that their experience is that the current policies and procedures of different departments can directly contradict what is best for areas and places.		
<u>Policy CP1: Creating Places</u>		
<b>SEPA (PLDP/676/14)</b> supports the reference to the provision of green infrastructure within placemaking within Policies CP1.		
<u>Policy CP2: Green Infrastructure</u>		
<b>Sport Scotland (PLDP/026/14)</b> welcome the comprehensive approach to the design and delivery of green infrastructure and inclusion of the need to protect and improve user access including recreation routes.		

**SNH (PLDP/640/14)** recommend that proposals should contribute to both the green and blue network and wording should reflect this.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/14)** welcomes Policy CP2, but would welcome a requirement that major developments and energy consents must deliver a 'net gain' for biodiversity, defining this as development that leaves biodiversity in a better state than before.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/14)** supports the reference to the provision of green infrastructure within placemaking within Policies CP2.

#### Policy CP 3: Masterplanning and Site Briefs

**Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/14)** seek clarification on who would be responsible for the preparation of masterplans or development briefs, as well as, what the difference is between them.

It is also suggested that the requirement for masterplans to set out a phasing and delivery strategy is contrary to the development strategy for Carless set out in the Delivering Our Places section of the Proposed Plan. It is suggested that the Carless Development Strategy within the Proposed Plan, is sufficient for the Council to base development management decisions on and that a masterplan would not provide further phasing or implementation details due to the nature of this site. It is suggested that, for Delivering Our Places sites, masterplans should only be required where there is a departure from the development strategy.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/14)** support the requirement for Master Plans at appropriate-scale developments.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### Policy CP2: Green Infrastructure

**SNH (PLDP/640/14)** request that the first sentences of criteria (a) and criteria (f) are amended as follows (proposed amendments in bold):

*a) Green Infrastructure and Design Requirements: Development shall..... contribute to the green **and blue** network.....Guidance...."*

*f) Stewardship: Developers must consider the long-term management and maintenance of green **and blue** infrastructure....."*

**RSPB Scotland (PLDP/649/14)** suggests the addition of a requirement for major developments and energy consents must deliver a 'net gain' for biodiversity should be added to the Policy.

##### Policy CP 3: Masterplanning and Site Briefs

**Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/14)** requests the following modifications should be made to Policy CP3 – Masterplanning and Development Briefs:

*"Development on sites identified within the Delivering Our Places section of this Plan*

should proceed in accordance with the Development Strategy set out for each site. Additionally, planning applications will require to be accompanied by masterplans in respect of:

- Development proposals on the Delivering Our Places Sites where the proposal(s) depart from the stated Development Strategy;
- Development proposals on major or smaller complex development sites, sites within a sensitive area (such as a Conservation Area) or sites likely to have significant impacts on the environment. The need for a Masterplan to accompany a planning application for development proposals on such sites should be determined through pre-application discussions between the Applicant and the Council”.

Masterplans for these sites are required to set out a phasing and delivery strategy which is realistic to market conditions. Development proposals should be brought forward in line with the proposed phasing”.

#### General

**Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/14)** would like guidance to allow parking requirements to be justified through a design and access statement.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council’s responses to the representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General; Creating Places Introductory Text; Policy CP1: Creating Places; Policy CP2: Green Infrastructure; and Policy CP 3: Masterplanning and Site Briefs.

#### General

In response to the comments from **Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/14)** in relation to the Residential Development: Principles for Good Design Planning Guidance, the Councils considered that as this representation relates to an existing piece of Planning Guidance it is therefore outwith the scope of the examination to consider. The comments are however noted and will be considered when preparing the Creating Places Supplementary Guidance, which will be subject to full public consultation.

#### Creating Places Introductory Text

The support from the **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/14)** is welcomed.

In relation to the Trust’s other comments, the Council would point out that LDP 2 fully accords with the Local Outcome Improvement Plan: the Plan for Place 2017-2027 (CD/XX) and contributes to the delivery of the Council’s strategic priorities. In relation to the Trust’s view that Council services should be embracing the approach set out in this section of Local Development Plan 2 in order to create high quality developments, it should be noted that internally, the Council works collaboratively to ensure that its own development proposals are to the highest quality and fully in accordance with the Local Development Plan. Many of the Council’s proposed developments have already been to the Place and Design Panel with their recommendations taken on board. This process has

ensured that the Council's developments are to a high quality whilst taking on board other Departments responsibilities etc. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

#### Policy CP1: Creating Places

The support of **SEPA (PLDP/676/14)** for the inclusion of green infrastructure within the policy is welcomed.

#### Policy CP2: Green Infrastructure

The support of **Sport Scotland (PLDP/026/14)** for the inclusion of protection and improvement of access, as well as, recreation within the policy is welcomed.

With regard to the representation from **SNH (PLDP/640/14)**, the Council considers that the green network includes water courses, as set out in the Glossary (page 132) of Local Development Plan 2 and that green infrastructure includes water features, such as rivers, ponds and sustainable drainage systems, as detailed within page 71 of the Plan. The Council is therefore of the view that it is unnecessary to distinguish the green and blue network as SNH suggest. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

The support of **RSPB (PLDP/649/14)** for the Policy is welcomed. The Council would however point out that Criteria e) of the Policy requires that all development proposals "*protect, restore and enhance biodiversity habitat networks and environmental quality*". It is considered that the requirement that all development must '*enhance biodiversity habitat networks*' of the Policy achieves the intention of a 'net gain' for biodiversity. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

The support of **SEPA (PLDP/676/14)** for the inclusion of green infrastructure, in relation to placemaking within the policy, is welcomed.

#### Policy CP 3: Masterplanning and Site Briefs.

The support of **RSPB (PLDP/649/14)** for the Policy is welcomed.

In relation to the representation from **Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/14)**, Policy CP3 indicates that Development Briefs and/or design guidance will be prepared by the Council for sites as indicated by the policy. Schedule 1 of the plan indicates the current status and requirements for spatial guidance in relation to the Delivering Our Places sites, as well as, the Golden Jubilee National Hospital. The Schedule also details who is taking forward the masterplan and its current status. It is accepted, however, that the relationship between Policy CP3 and Schedule 1 could be further clarified by the insertion of a new sentence at the end of Policy CP 3 on Page 73 of the Plan.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the policy, the Council would have no objection to policy being changed and would suggest that a new sentence is added to the end of the Policy as follows:

*"Schedule 1 of the Plan details the type and status of the detailed spatial design guidance that has been prepared/ is being prepared for key regeneration sites as contained within the Delivering our Places section of Local Development Plan 2."*

The Council, however, does not agree with the Malin Group that masterplans should only

be required where there is a departure from the development strategy for each of the regeneration sites contained within the Delivering our Places section of the Plan. The Council considers that masterplans are required for all of these sites and should take into account the Development Strategy; Development Strategy Map and the place-based policy requirements of the Plan. The Development Strategy Map is considered to be an indicative high level overview of the appropriate uses within these sites and other requirements. A detailed masterplan for the site is necessary to provide details of the development, in a spatial form, to ensure the proper planning and phasing of the development is set out in order to create a high quality place. As set out in Policy CP3, the proposed phasing and delivery strategy should be realistic to market conditions. The strategy could thereby indicate where site constraints and challenges require a greater degree of flexibility and propose measures to address this in the future.

Given that there continues to be a degree of flexibility around the long-term strategy for Carless, the Council considers it to be appropriate to require a further and more detailed development framework to be prepared when subsequent parts of the site are brought forward, in accordance with any forthcoming masterplan for the area and applicable policies of Local Development Plan 2. With regard to the other comments raised by the Malin Group in relation to Carless, these are addressed within Issue 5.

No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>

Issue 15	Housing Land	
Development plan reference:	Delivering our Homes (pages 76 to 79)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<p>Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15) Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/15) Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/15) SNH (PLDP/640/15) Avant Homes (Scotland) Limited (PLDP/642/15) Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15) Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15) SPT (PLDP/675/15) (Support) SEPA (PLDP/676/15) (Support) Vale of Leven Trust (VOLT) (PLDP/677/15)</p>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Delivery Homes section of the Plan with particular regard to the Housing Land Supply and Policy H1: Housing Land Supply.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b>This section of the Plan relates solely to representations raised in relation to the Housing Land Supply and the Policies contained within this section. Representations relating to specific sites allocated for residential development or non-allocation of land for residential development are dealt with within Issues 5; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30; 32; 33; 34 and 35.</b></p> <p>The representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General; Housing Land Supply; and Policy H1: Housing Land Supply.</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p><b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/15)</b> consider that housing developments will only benefit the area if they are supported by infrastructure within the new build communities – including shops, cafes, health clinics, schools, open green spaces, etc. Local focal points such as community centres, pubs and clubs would enhance community cohesion and promote a sense of identity. The current housing plan serves only developers, especially in areas designated for private housing, not the communities around which they will be built, or the new communities themselves.</p> <p><b>Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15); Avant Homes (Scotland) Limited (PLDP/642/15); and Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)</b> support the approach of not seeking affordable housing provision on a quota basis from private development.</p> <p><b>Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/15)</b> state that the allocation of land within Carless (Site H2(33)) as a long term release site should not be included in the Council's housing supply</p>		

figures. This area of the Carless site will only come forward for housing if it is not possible to secure a business or industrial use for it, or if a higher value use is required on the land to pay for remediation activities on the wider Carless landholding. It should not therefore be relied upon as a component of the Council's housing land supply. The respondent also suggests an additional area of land for housing which is considered within Issue 5.

**SNH (PLDP/640/15)** continue to highlight the potential challenges that some of the new allocations pose for safeguarding and enhancement of the natural heritage, particularly in landscape terms. To ensure the protection and enhancement of the natural heritage SNH make the following comments and recommendations in respect of the new housing allocations for inclusion in the Plan and/or associated development briefs.

**SPT (PLDP/675/15)** welcome the prioritisation of sites in sustainable locations.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/15)** acknowledge the Scottish Government's drive to deliver a strong and well-functioning housing system and that the emerging Plan is aligning itself with this aim and that the policies H1 – H4 are key to ensuring these outcomes are achievable. SEPA advise that their primary role is to ensure that the sites selected in LDP 2 are in sustainable locations and, in this context, SEPA state that they satisfied that Policies H1 and H2 are considered to be capable of meeting these requirements and support the linkage to Schedules 2 & 3 (where further site specification studies might be required, e.g. undertaking of a FRA).

**Vale of Leven Trust (VOLT) (PLDP/677/15)** agree that a range and choice of new homes require to be built to meet the housing needs of West Dunbartonshire. The Trust expresses a preference for greater variety of house types and less reliance on flatted development. It is also suggested that greater consideration should be given to the location and capacity of schools and the layout of associated local road systems and other relevant infrastructure in relation to sites before they are put forward for housing.

#### Housing Land Supply

**Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15)** state that by utilising the information from Clydeplan alongside historic Scottish Government completions it is clear that the all private surplus in supply referred to on page 76 of the Proposed Plan is not +494 units as suggested, but is actually only +113. Undertaking the same analysis, using annual completions over the same period and utilising the completions detailed in the West Dunbartonshire Housing Land Audit (HLA), results in a shortfall in private housing supply.

Persimmon Homes are of the view that the 50 private and 80 social rented homes that are envisaged will be delivered annually between 2012 and 2024 will fall short of the annual completions required in West Dunbartonshire There will therefore be a shortfall in housing delivery within West Dunbartonshire.

In order to address the forecast shortfall in housing delivery further sites should be allocated for housing. At present the majority of the sites within the HLA are brownfield and generally as a result more expensive to develop. Additional greenfield sites should be allocated to stimulate house building within West Dunbartonshire and address the forecast housing shortfall.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15)** state that, in meeting the Housing Land Requirement set out in Table 1, Schedule 2 of the Proposed Local Development Plan 2



shows only a supply of 1,386 units compared to a supply of 1,701 units stated in Table 1, leaving a surplus of only 179, as opposed to 494 in Table 1. They also consider that the deliverability of these sites must be questioned. and that the likely LDP 2 adoption will take place part way through the SDP period, further adjustment of targets is required to take account of completions to date. The relevant Tables in the Proposed LDP2 relating to housing land supply requirements therefore require updating.

The Plan identifies a number of additional small to medium sites, identified within Schedules 2 and 3 of the Plan, described as sites adding to the range and choice of housing sites on offer in the 2017 effective land supply. The range and choice of housing however does not extend to green field release sites and still fails to meet the requirements of SPP 2014 in that respect.

Taylor Wimpey are of the view the new allocations within the Plan cannot be regarded as effective sites and are all brownfield sites (Carmen Waterworks is a brownfield site in the Greenbelt). Examination of the Housing Land Audit 2017 shows that there are a number of sites included as effective sites, which are regarded as questionable in relation both to their deliverability and the timing of any delivery. The particular points raised by Taylor Wimpey in relation to these sites are discussed in Issues 24, 25, 26, 27 and 29 in terms of their effectiveness and programming. In addition, the housing land supply does not provide an adequate degree of choice and range in sites, given that there are no greenfield release sites.

Taylor Wimpey are therefore of the view that a wider review of the quality of the housing supply needs to be undertaken in addition to a review required to make up the shortfall post 2024 that Homes for Scotland has highlighted.

Taylor Wimpey state that they have engaged with Homes for Scotland (HfS) and understand that their recent discussions with the Council over the post 2024 housing land supply in Schedules 2 and 3 have indicated that these could be amended. More specifically they understand that discussions between HfS and the Council have identified a nominal all tenure shortfall of 205 units in the post 2024 period rather than the surplus of 436 units identified in Table 2 to Proposed LDP2.

The points of representation made by Taylor Wimpey are with a view of Duntiglennan Fields being allocated in preference to other sites and/or to meet the shortfall in the housing land requirement of the Plan.

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** state, by referring to all legislation and guidance, the LDP must be consistent with Clydeplan and the LDP should meet the Housing Land Requirement of Clydeplan. Given that the adoption of the Plan is taking place part way through the SDP period, a further adjustment to these targets is required to take account of completions to date. Given that the planned adoption of the Proposed LDP is January 2020, a further adjustment needs to be made to ensure it plans for 10 years following the date of adoption (i.e. to 2030), as required by the SPP (para. 120), because Clydeplan targets only run until the end of March 2029.

The approach in the proposed LDP (Table 1, p.76) is incorrect as it does not take into account completions to date. Instead it just applies the 2012-24 housing land requirement to the remaining 7 years of the period on a pro-rated basis. Such an approach would result in unmet housing need and demand between 2012 and 2017 not being planned for and going unmet. It is not compatible with the legal and policy framework set out in their

representation.

Homes for Scotland state they dispute the programmed completions of some sites and that there is an all-tenure shortfall of 205 dwellings. The potential for programme slippage is also important given the reliance on brownfield sites and 2017/18 completions (124 units) amounting to 50% of what was programmed (249 units). Homes for Scotland consider the supply figure of 3,489 should be considered a best-case scenario. Additional sites should therefore be allocated to refresh the housing land supply which is essentially unchanged over the last 8 years and has failed to deliver the new housing West Dunbartonshire needs. Even if a relatively modest 20% slippage occurred, the shortfall would increase to 905 against the housing land requirement, resulting in the HST being missed.

#### Policy H1: Housing Land Supply

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** state that the current wording of Policy H1 does not sufficiently reflect the urgency with which a shortfall in effective supply needs to be rectified. A shortfall in effective supply reflects, by definition, a lack of deliverable housing sites, but also normally arises after a deficit in housing completions. It therefore is usually more than just a warning sign that need may go unmet in the future, but clear evidence that housing delivery has been inadequate to meet identified need and demand.

These changes would ensure the policy better reflects the urgency of the situation. Also given that if such a situation arose policies for the supply of housing would be considered out of date in accordance with the SPP (para. 125), it would be superfluous to include restrictive policies such as those struck through in the suggested modification below, as they would be out of date at the time of their application. Infrastructure would be a material consideration and sustainability is covered in depth in the SPP.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### General

**Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/15)** remove the capacity of Site H2 (33) from contributing to the housing land supply of the Plan.

##### Housing Land Supply

**Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15)** state that the Council should allocate additional greenfield sites to address the shortfall in the Housing Land Supply within the Plan.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15)** state that the housing land supply needs to be reviewed in terms of deliverability and programming, as well as in relation to range of choice of sites. Duntiglennen Fields should be allocated to provide both additionality in terms of housing land supply and replace a site of equal capacity at Strauss Avenue which is considered non-effective due to site constraints.

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** state that the plan should allocate additional sites to meet the shortfall and to refresh the housing land supply.

## Policy H1: Housing Land Supply

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** state that Policy H1 should be amended as follows (addition, deletion):

The Council will provide a minimum of five years ~~A five year~~ effective **housing land** supply of ~~housing land will be maintained at all times for both the Housing Sub-Market Areas and for the Local Authority Area (all-tenure and private) to ensure that the Housing Supply Target is met in full over the development plan period as set out in Policy 8 of the SDP.~~ **throughout the lifetime of the Plan to enable delivery of the strategic housing requirement.** This will be monitored and updated annually **using housing completions to date and the effective housing land supply set out in the Housing Land Audit.** ~~through the Housing Land Audit. The Council will prioritise the early delivery of sites within the established land supply,~~ If the audit identifies a shortfall in the five year effective land supply. ~~In this instance, the Council will~~ **take prompt action to rectify this by supporting** housing proposals which are capable of delivering completions in the next five years **and compatible with national policy.**

- ~~• Can address infrastructure constraints;~~
- ~~• Are in a sustainable location; and~~
- ~~• Do not undermine the strategic focus on urban regeneration and brownfield redevelopment.~~

### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council's response to the representations received to this issue are broken down into the following subheadings: General; Housing Land Supply; and Policy H1: Housing Land Supply.

#### General

Although the representation from **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/15)** is understood, the Council does not agree that housing within Local Development Plan 2 only serves developers. There is an identified need and demand for both private and social rented housing within West Dunbartonshire, which the Plan requires to address, and this need and demand has been identified within all communities of West Dunbartonshire. The support from **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/15)** in this regard is welcomed.

The issues the Community Council and the Trust raise in relation to integration of housing development within existing communities is a matter which the Creating Places policies of the Plan will help to address. The Council would also point out the infrastructure to support the capacity of these new sites over the plan period is also in place and that infrastructure providers, key agencies and the Council's own service areas have not raised any infrastructure issues with the allocated sites in the Plan.

In response to comments from **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/15)** in relation to density and typology of new housing development, it is considered that this is also a matter which the Creating Places policies of the Plan will help to address and that this is more appropriately considered through development management.

The representations from **Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15)**; **Avant Homes (Scotland) Limited (PLDP/642/15)**; and **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** are duly noted with regard to the Council's decision to not include an affordable housing requirement.

With regard to request to remove Site H2(33) from the housing land supply by **Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/15)**, the Council would point out that the indicative capacity of this site has not been included in the housing supply target figures as it is considered to be a long term release site rather than an effective housing site at this current time. However, the site is included in the established housing land supply and may become a future release should the site be able to demonstrate that it is, or will become, effective. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

The comments from **SNH (PLDP/640/15)** are addressed within Issues 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32 and 33.

The comments of **SPT (PLDP/675/15)** on the sustainable locations of sites is noted.

The comments and support from **SEPA (PLDP/676/15)** in relation to the approach for housing land and the allocation of sites are noted.

### **Housing Land Supply**

The response to the Housing Land Supply is further broken down as follows: Allocation of Housing Land: Brownfield vs Greenfield; Range and Choice of Housing Land; Completions and the use of NB2 data; Housing Land Requirement; Strategy Housing Investment Plan Sites; Programming; and overall conclusion.

### **Allocation of Housing Land: Brownfield vs Greenfield**

Firstly, it is important to set out the Scottish Government guidance on the allocation of land within a Local Development Plan, as the representations from **Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15)**, **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15)** and **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** all seek to challenge the Council's strategy of allocating housing land.

Paragraph 39 of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (CDxx) states that "*planning should direct the right development to the right place*". To do this, paragraph 40 of SPP states that development plans require to promote a sustainable pattern of development appropriate to the area and sets out a series of principles which should be used to guide decisions. Of particular note is the third bullet point of the paragraph, which states that Local Development Plan should consider "*the re-use or re-development of brownfield land before new development takes place on greenfield sites*".

The arguments provided by of Persimmon, Taylor Wimpey and Homes for Scotland all seek the allocation of additional greenfield land and are of the view that the brownfield sites within the Plan are either not effective, not deliverable or are likely not to achieve the programming, as agreed in the 2017 Housing Land Audit. These specific parts of the representations by the three respondents are all considered by the Council to be contrary to the provisions of paragraph 40 of SPP, as the Council is '*re-using and/or redeveloping brownfield land before any development takes place on greenfield land*'. The Council is

therefore strongly of the view that its preference for, and allocation of, brownfield land is robust in policy terms and that the sites are effective and can be delivered within the Plan period. That being said the Council also believes in a balanced approach and has allocated two greenfield release sites, which are discussed below, to provide a range and choice of land for housing development within West Dunbartonshire.

Within Issue 2, in response to a representation from Homes for Scotland which stated that brownfield land does not always represent the most sustainable, appropriate or viable option for development, the Council responded by saying *“instead of stating that brownfield sites and regeneration sites are resulting in under-delivery of new housing, it would be better to investigate, with the respondent, what action can be taken to make brownfield sites more attractive to house builders [and] that releasing additional land within the Greenbelt to increase the housing land supply, as the respondent is seeking, may not necessarily result in an increase in house building within West Dunbartonshire nor will it represent a balanced Spatial Strategy.”*

This view was also expressed in a recent Planning Appeal decision (PPA-280-2026) (Council Supporting Information xx) to a site in Kilmacoll, Inverclyde. In paragraph 24 of that decision the Reporter stated that:

*“The Appellant says that the emphasis on brownfield sites and regeneration is resulting in under-delivery of new housing. If this is correct, my view is that the first response should be to see whether action can be taken to make the brownfield sites, including the community growth area, more attractive to house builders. Allowing housing development on greenfield sites that have not been identified in the development plan for new housing would make it more difficult to attract development to brownfield and regeneration sites. It would also be contrary to the vision of the compact city region..”*

Also, it is important to note the Reporter's view in paragraph 77 where he stated that:

*“..... I find that failure to achieve building rates envisaged .... may, at least in part, be the result of economic factors and not solely because the total amount of land is insufficient or subject to constraints of a non-economic kind. It follows that increasing the housing land supply may not necessarily result in an increase in house building.”*

Within the recent Examination Report into the Proposed Inverclyde Local Development Plan (April 2019) (Council Supporting Information xx), the Reporter stated that *“I recognise that changes in funding availability and market demand may result in differences between the timing and tenure of house completions, compared with that which is envisaged in Clydeplan. However, development plans have little influence over these factors.....”* (Paragraph 47, page 72)

It is inherent within Homes for Scotland's representation, especially within paragraph 36, that they believe that there will be slippage with the development of brownfield land within the Plan period. Although, not specifically stated it is strongly suggested in their representation that any under-delivery of housing land will have to be added to subsequent Local Development Plan housing land requirements and addressed by the allocation of further land.

The Council is of the view, should this be the intention of this paragraph, that continually adding under-delivered housing completions to the housing supply target and requirement of the plan is considered in itself to be an unsustainable practice, as there is no evidence



provided to demonstrate that both the housebuilders and construction industry would be able to deliver these increases in the first instance. It should also be noted that the capacity of these sites are not lost and are still within the housing land audits and housing land supply of the plan. Therefore adding units already allocated within the housing land supply of the plan to the new Local Development Plan's housing supply target is considered to be duplication of housing figures.

Taking the above into account, the Council is of the view that under-delivery of housing on brownfield sites, or the notion that brownfield sites are not always attractive to developers, is not down to the land being non-effective in itself, but is due to a range of other economic factors which are outwith the scope of the Plan to deal with, or not the responsibility of the Council.

The Council considers the implications of this approach could potentially result in future iterations of development plans containing inflated housing supply targets and requirements that cannot be achieved by the house builders and/or the construction industry, and which become inherently undeliverable. The Reporter in the above case was also of the view that by increasing the housing land supply will not necessarily translate into an increase in house building. Moreover, the Reporter considering representations to the Inverclyde Proposed Development Plan (Examination Report April 2019) stated that:

*"The role of the local development plan is not to demonstrate that a target will be met. Rather it is to provide enough land that is capable of becoming effective and is sufficient to enable the target to be met."* (Paragraph 40, Page 71)

The Council would also note that, although a number of greenfield sites were suggested for inclusion at the Call for Sites stage, only one of them was from a Homes for Scotland member. Many of these sites were not taken forward into the Main Issues Report (CDxx) and/or the Proposed Plan as they were either located within the Greenbelt and would have significant adverse environmental impacts. The only site continually suggested by any of the major housebuilders throughout the Local Development Plan process has been Duntiglen Fields (See Issue 27), which would appear to suggest the demand for greenfield sites may not as pressing as the respondents claim. Therefore, allocating additional greenfield sites, as requested by Persimmon Homes and Homes for Scotland, would not necessarily result in them being developed, or provide any greater certainty or speed of delivery in the effective land supply.

In conclusion to this section of the Schedule 4, the Council is of the opinion that the strategy for the allocation of housing land within the Plan is fully in conformity with the requirements of SPP and Clydeplan, and that the sites allocated for residential use are considered to be effective and deliverable within the plan period and will meet the housing land requirement in full. The Council therefore requests that the Reporter disregards the representations from **Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15)**, **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15)** and **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** as these do not accord with the provisions of SPP or meet with the vision of Clydeplan.

#### **Range and Choice of Housing Land**

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15)**, within paragraph 3.10 of their representation, state that the additional housing sites allocated within the Plan do not extend to greenfield sites. Local Development Plan 2 does however allocate two new greenfield release sites and therefore accords with SPP.

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)**, within paragraph 36 of their representation, state that additional sites should be brought forward as the housing land supply is essentially unchanged over the last 8 years and has failed to deliver the new housing West Dunbartonshire requires. The Council disputes that just because the housing land supply is unchanged that it is the sole reason why it has failed to deliver the housing completions. The Council is of the view that this is down to range of other factors outwith the control of the Council and not just down to housing land supply, which has been agreed with Home for Scotland as effective every year through the Housing Land Audit process.

The Council therefore considers it important to state that the Local Development Plan's role is to ensure that there is sufficient housing land allocated to meet the housing land requirements of the Plan. This point was also the view of the Reporter examining the Proposed Inverclyde Local Development Plan (April 2019):

*"The role of the local development plan is to ensure that sufficient sites that are either already effective, or are capable of becoming effective during the plan period, are allocated, and that these will be sufficient to enable the housing land requirements to be met."* (Examination Report: Paragraph 53, Page 73).

Furthermore, the Council would point out that a full and comprehensive review of the effectiveness of housing sites contained within the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) (CDxx) was undertaken as part of Local Development Plan 2's preparation and the sites that were proposed to be added, re-allocated or de-allocated are detailed within the Main Issues Report. As a result of that exercise, Local Development Plan 2 has allocated 8 new housing sites to the housing land supply, of which two are considered to be 'shovel-ready' greenfield sites. In this regard, the Council therefore challenges the point made by Homes for Scotland that the housing land supply is essentially unchanged.

The Council also disputes Homes for Scotland's assertion that the reliance on brownfield sites is not delivering new homes for West Dunbartonshire. The Council would point out, by directing the Reporter to the Housing Land Audit (2017) (cdxx) and Draft Housing Land Audit (2018) (cdxx), that there has been progress on the housing land requirement of both the Proposed Plan (2016) and the sites carried forward into Local Development Plan 2. For instance, development has now commenced on a number of significant brownfield sites allocated within the Plan; namely at Dumbarton Waterfront/Castle Street (195 units) and the Former Bradfield Primary School, Clydebank (88 units, Miller Homes).

Planning consent was also granted for 146 affordable housing units on Queens Quay in March 2018 (from a total site capacity of at least 1045 units); and the former RHI site within Clydebank (120 units) will be subject to full planning application which will be lodged in the Summer 2019 by a Homes for Scotland member. Further progress is being made on other brownfield sites, such as the 'Shed 7' site, Castle Road, Dumbarton (233 units); Roseberry House, Clydebank (approx. 70 units) where the sale of the site is in the process of being concluded; and the former Council offices at Garshake, Dumbarton, which has had 8 notes of interest from Homes for Scotland members (approx. 100 units).

Similarly, taking the above into account, the view of Taylor Wimpey that the new proposed sites can 'be challenged' in terms of their effectiveness, as can some of the long-standing sites, is disputed by the Council, as the sites within the plan are considered to be effective and/or have extant planning permission. Many of the sites in question are also coming forward for development as the above paragraphs set out. Issues 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29,



30, 32, 33 and 34 deal with representations to the effectiveness of housing sites called into question by Taylor Wimpey and, as stated in the response given by the Council to these issues, are effective and capable of being delivered within the plan period.

The Council contends that, overall, Taylor Wimpey's views on the effectiveness of the housing sites within the Plan should be disregarded as they do not provide any compelling or substantive evidence to demonstrate why these sites are considered to be ineffective.

In conclusion, the Council contends that the Plan allocates, as required by SPP, a range and choice of effective housing land within West Dunbartonshire that will meet the housing land requirement in full.

### **Completions and the Use of NB2 data**

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** rely on the use of Scottish Government Private Housing Completion Certificate Data sets (more commonly known as NB2s), to try and demonstrate that completions are on the rise in West Dunbartonshire and that more housing land should be released. This is a common approach Homes for Scotland and their members have been recently using throughout Local Development Plan examinations within Scotland.

It is important to note that the use of NB2 data to demonstrate approval rates of completion certificates is not advocated in any Scottish Government Guidance at this present time, namely SPP and Planning Advice Note: 2/2020 – Affordable Housing and Housing Land Audits (CDxx). Paragraph 123 of SPP states that:

*“Planning authorities should actively manage the housing land supply. They should work with housing and infrastructure providers to prepare an annual housing land audit as a tool to critically review and monitor the availability of effective housing land, the progress of sites through the planning process, and housing completions...”*

Moreover, paragraph 41 of Pan 2/2020 states:

*“Planning authorities should therefore carry out regular monitoring of housing completions and the progress of sites through the planning process. This can be achieved through the preparation of a housing land audit, carried out annually by the planning authority in conjunction with housing and infrastructure providers”*

To reiterate the point made above, nowhere in the approved guidance by the Scottish Government does it state that completion certificate data through the Building Standards process should be used. The optimum tool for collecting data on the effectiveness of housing land and how many completions have been achieved is through a housing land audit, which is the preferred and only method advocated by the Scottish Government.

The Council monitors housing land through a site inspection, which verifies both completions and occupancies. This approach is commonly used throughout the 8 Authorities within the Clydeplan area and is considered to be a robust method of monitoring completions through the Housing Land Audit process. The Housing Land Audit process is then agreed with Homes for Scotland each year in terms of completions and programming for future years. This approach was accepted by the Reporter within a recent Appeal Decision (PPA-260-2074 - Land north west of Leverndale Hospital, Crookston Road, Glasgow) (Council Supporting Information xx), where it was:

*“accepted by both parties that Homes for Scotland provide comments on the programming and capacities of sites within the future supply set out in the HLA and that these figures represent the remaining capacity of known housing sites..... I am not therefore persuaded that the audit should be set aside in preference to the NB2 data.” (paragraph 22, page 4)*

Furthermore it should be noted by the Reporter that NB2 data is not scrutinised and verified to the same extent as other Scottish Government Data such as the Scottish Vacant and Derelict Land Survey (SVDLS) data, for instance, and is also not subject to any robust guidance on the its collection to ensure that it is standardised across Scotland, unlike the SVDLS. It is also noted that the Scottish Government do not separately verify the data but are entirely reliant on the data submitted from Local Authorities, which again, is not the same approach as they take to the SVDLS. NB2 data returns are therefore entirely reliant on developers/builders applying for completion certificates and there are occasions when this may not happen.

It should also be noted that the NB2 data that Homes for Scotland are using includes all private sector completions where by, as set out in PAN 2/2020, Housing Land Audits only look at completions of 4 or more units. Therefore, the comparison made by Homes for Scotland between the completions in Housing Land Audits and NB2s is not a like for like comparison. A fair comparison would have been if Homes for Scotland had removed all completions for housing sites of 4 or less houses from the data.

The Council is of the view that the evidence provided in the Council's agreed Housing Land Audit (2017) should be considered to be the most reliable means of understanding completions within West Dunbartonshire.

The completions identified within the Audits are backed up by data from Council Tax records, which are also based on occupancy of the house. Over the last 5 years (2013-2018), the table below shows that Council Tax data is more consistent with the completions set out in the Audits than those in NB 2 returns, allowing for the inclusion of sites under 4 units within the Council tax data. It is considered that this supports the robustness of the Housing Land Audit data.

	Housing Completions		
	Council Tax Data	Housing Land Audit	Discrepancy
2013/14	226	202	24
2014/15	291	310	-19
2015/16	257	223	34
2016/17	131	131	0
2017/18	124	122	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>988</b>	<b>41</b>

The Council is therefore of the view, since there is no requirement in Scottish Government Guidance, and as the reliability of the NB2 dataset is in any case questionable, that the Reporter should disregard those parts of the representation from **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** which use NB2 data to demonstrate that there is an increase in completions which differs from those detailed in the Housing Land Audit 2017.

## **Housing Land Requirement**

**Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15)** and **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** state that there is a shortfall of housing land within the plan period. It is important to note that there is no consistency between the two respondents on what the actual shortfall is as they all come to differing figures. Persimmon Homes state that there is a shortfall of 57 units and Homes for Scotland are of the view that there is a shortfall 205 dwellings. The Council would contend that if they were using the same evidence base then the shortfall would be the same in both representations.

Although, **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15)** do not specifically challenge the housing land supply and housing land requirement figures, their representation supports the approach used by Homes for Scotland on this matter and adopt Homes for Scotland's approach as their own. In response to their contention that Schedule 2 shows a lower housing supply than indicated in Table 1, the Council would confirm that this is a lower figure, as Schedule 2 excludes sites which have commenced, while they are included in the Housing Land Audit figures as used in Table 1. This is directly explained in the Notes on Schedule 2 and Notes on Schedule 3. The supply figures in Table 1 are therefore correct and valid.

The Table below summarises the information provided by both Persimmon Homes and Homes for Scotland/Taylor Wimpey based on the all tenure figures for 2017-2024 against the Council's information.

	All Tenure	WDC	Persimmon	Homes for Scotland/ Taylor Wimpey
A	Housing Supply Target (2012-24) as set out in Clydeplan	2,760	2,760	2,760
B	Housing Land Requirement (2012-24) as set out in Clydeplan	3,170	3,170	3,170
C	Completions 2012-2017 (as set out in the HLA 2017)	1,060	1,060	1,060
D	Revised HST 2017-24 (A-C)	1,700		1,700
E	Revised HLR 2017-24 (A-C * 15%)	1,955	2,110 (b – c)	2110 (b – c)
F	Housing Land Audit 2017-2024	2,516	1,701	2516
G	SURPLUS 2017-2024 (F –E)	561	-409	405

All three respondents argue that the housing land requirement should be 2,110 units between 2017-2024. However, the methodology that they all have used to arrive at this number is incorrect and questionable. Paragraph 116 of SPP states that the housing supply target *“should be increased by a margin of 10 – 20% to establish the housing land requirement, in order to ensure that a generous supply of land for housing is provided.”*

The Council would argue that Clydeplan and the LDP have correctly applied a generosity allowance of 15% to the averaged housing supply target to produce a Housing Land Requirement for the LDP period (2017-24) of 3,170.

All three respondents instead use a methodology of deducting completions from the Clydeplan figures for 2012-2017 to arrive at a residual housing target. Following this method, for the period of the plan between 2017 – 2024, the housing supply target of Clydeplan between the years 2012 and 2024 should be used, minus the number of completions between 2012 and 2017 of 1,060 units, to establish what the residual housing supply target is, which in this case is 1,700 units for all tenures. The generosity allowance set out within Clydeplan is 15%; therefore, the housing land requirement for 2017-2024 is  $1,700 + 15\%$  which equals 1,955 units.

This approach was considered to be correct in a recent Appeal Decision (PPA-260-2074 - Land north west of Leverndale Hospital, Crookston Road, Glasgow) as the Reporter stated that:

*“any methodology applied to calculate the shortfall or surplus in the five year effective supply should use the housing supply target as its starting point, rather than the housing land requirement....”*(Paragraph 6, Page 2)

As a result, it could be argued that the seven year average that the Council had used to calculate the housing supply target and then the housing land requirement, is not in strict conformity with the approach set out in SPP, as it did not take account of intervening completions. Taking into account these completions, the housing land requirement for 2017-2024 should have been  $1,700 + 15\% = 1,955$  instead of the original figure of 1,849. This would result in a surplus of 561 units and not 667 units for 2017-2024. The Council therefore suggests that an amendment to Table 1 on page 76 may be required.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the table, the Council would have no objection to it being changed and would suggest the table is amended as follows (changes are in bold):

Table 1: Housing Land Requirement 2012-2024			
	Private	Social Rented	All Tenure
A Housing Supply Target (2012-2024)	1,800	960	2,760
B Housing Land Requirement (2012-2024)	2,070	1,100	3,170
<b>C Completions from 2012-2017</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>1,060</b>
<b>D Housing Supply Target 2017 – 2024 (A-C)</b>	<b>1,101</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>1,700</b>
<b>E Housing Land Requirement 2017 – 2024 (D x 15%)</b>	<b>1,266</b>	<b>689</b>	<b>1,955</b>

<b>F Housing Land Audit 2017-2024</b>	<b>1,701</b>	<b>815</b>	<b>2516</b>
<b>G SURPLUS 2017-2024 (F-E)</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>561</b>

However, when arriving at the housing land requirement for 2017-2024, Persimmon Homes and Homes for Scotland have subtracted the completions for 2012-2017 from the Housing Land Requirement of Clydeplan, rather than the Housing Supply Target, to arrive at the figure of 2,110 for 2017-2024. This is contrary to the approach outlined in paragraph 116 of SPP and is incorrect. The housing supply target for the plan period of 1,700 and the housing land requirement of 1,955 units, as set out in the revised Table 1 above, are the correct figures on which to base the housing land requirement for the Plan.

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** state that the plan period will require to be extended to fully cover the 10 years from adoption of the plan, which is detailed in the Development Plan Scheme (September 2018), as being in January 2020. Therefore, the housing land supply and housing land requirement of the plan should be extended by a year to fully comply with SPP.

The Council agree that the housing supply target and the housing land requirement of the Plan requires to fully accord with paragraph 119 of SPP, which states that Local Development Plan's *"should allocate a range of sites which are effective or expected to become effective in the plan period to meet the housing land requirement of the strategic development plan up to year 10 from the expected date of adoption"*.

Therefore the housing supply target for the Plan from 2012-2029 will need to be increased by 230 units (which is the all tenure housing supply target of 3,910 / 17 years), resulting in a new housing land supply target for 2012-2030 of 4,140 units. The housing land requirement will therefore increase by 264 units to 4,754 units for the same period.

To make the table accurate, land from the established supply programmed for 2029-2030 has been included in the calculations. This is a logical step as it is important to include an extra year of programming within the proposed new table to ensure that the figures are reflecting what is programmed for delivery on the ground between 2024-2030. However, the Council would argue that programming over this longer timescale from a 2017 base-date will not be fully reflective of the likely housing output for those later years, as there is a natural decay in output as sites are built out, and there will inevitably be additions to the land supply before then, mostly through windfall sites and potential further development plan allocations.

It is also important to note that, due to the reliance on funding timescales, the affordable housing sites are not programmed this far in advance and the Council's Strategic Housing Investment Plan (SHIP) only looks at a five year horizon. Therefore, there are no programmed social rented sites for 2029 to 2030 at this present time. Consequently, the Council has taken an average of the social rented sites completed between 2012 and 2017 and applied this figure for 2029-2030. It should be noted this figure is below the current rate of social rented house building the Council has committed to in the current (2019) SHIP programming, and is therefore a conservative figure.

Taking all of the above into account, the Council would have no objection to an amendment being made to Table 2 of the Plan to extend the housing land supply and housing land requirement to 2029/30. Should the Reporter wish to amend Table 2 on Page 77, the Council would have no objection to the table being changed and would suggest that it is amended as follows:

Table 2: Housing Land Requirement 2024 -2030			
	Private	Social Rented	All Tenure
A Housing Supply Target (2024-2030)	900	480	1380
B Housing Land Requirement (2024-2030) (A x 15%)	1,035	552	1587
C Surplus from 2017-2024	+435	+126	+561
D Additions from Established Supply (2024-2029)	765	371	1,136
E Additions for Programmed sites (2029-2030)	72	72	144
F Total Supply (C+D+E)	1272	569	1841
G Surplus 2024 – 2029 (F-B)	237	17	254

Even taking on an additional year to 2030, the table below shows that the Housing Land Requirement for the Plan between 2017-2030 can be met in full and therefore complies with SPP and Clydeplan in this regard. The Council therefore does not agree with Homes for Scotland that there is a shortfall of 205 houses and, in fact, has demonstrated there is a surplus of units over the Plan period. The arguments about programming and disputed sites that Taylor Wimpey and Homes for Scotland have raised are discussed in the section on programming below.

Housing Land Requirement 2017-2030			
	Private	Social Rented	All Tenure
A Housing Supply Target (2017-2030)	2001	1079	3080
B Housing Land Requirement (2017-2030) (A x 15%)	2301	1241	3542
C Housing Land Audit (2017-2024)	1701	815	2516
D Additions from Established Supply (2024-2029)	765	371	1,136
E Additions for Programmed sites (2029-2030)	72	72	144
F Total Supply (C+D+E)	2538	1258	3796
G Surplus 2017 -2030 (F-B)	237	17	254

The Council would also point out that the private figure of 72 units programmed for 2029-2030 within the Housing Land Audit 2017 is not reflective of the average completions that have been experienced over the last five years and, therefore, should also be considered as being conservative. For example, the five year average of private housing completions between 2012 and 2017 is 140 units per annum (699/5 years). If this figure were to be used there would be a surplus of 377 private sector units and an all tenure surplus of 394 units for 2017-2030.

The Council has also completed a Draft Housing Land Audit for 2018, which although it has not been the subject of consultation and agreement with Homes for Scotland (who have agreed with the Council that 2018 should be left as a Draft with a commitment to agreeing the 2019 Audit) nonetheless provides a more up-to-date position on the housing land supply as a reference point. The draft Audit recorded 122 completions for 2017/18 and programmes a further 2403 units to 2024, giving a total of 2525 units for 2017-24, in comparison with 2516 as per the 2017 Audit and Local Development Plan 2. It is considered that this reinforces the robustness of the programming in the agreed 2017



Audit, and therefore the Local Development Plan housing figures.

With regard to the figures used by **Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15)**, the Council would point out that there are a number of very significant errors in their methodology. Persimmon use the all-tenure housing land requirement figure (3170) but then subtract only private-tenure projected completions, as set out in the 2017 Housing Land Audit, to meet this requirement instead of using the all-tenure sector programming of 2,516 for 2017-24, as agreed with Homes for Scotland. This produces a notional shortfall of 409 units to 2024. However, the Council would argue that this is not a logical or sustainable approach and is at odds with that used by from Homes for Scotland.

Consequently, there are a multitude of errors in the methodology used by Persimmon. Instead of using Schedule 10 of Clydeplan, which sets out the Private Housing Land Requirement by Local Authority Area, Persimmon use the all tenure housing land requirement figure and then subtract the all tenure completions, as set out in the 2017 Housing Land Audit, instead of using the private sector completion figure. Persimmon also continue with the revised housing land requirement figure of 2,110, which, as stated above, is not in conformity with the approach set out in SPP and is completely inaccurate.

Furthermore, Persimmon attempt to create a new housing completion rate for West Dunbartonshire, which is at odds with the annual rates for private sector housing completions as set out in Clydeplan, by using the incorrect revised housing land figure for 2017-24 and then dividing that by 6 years. The Council contend that the approach Persimmon use in terms of years completed in the Plan is not on a like for like basis i.e. the figure should be for a 7 year period between 2017 and 2024.

The table below compares the approach taken by the Council in terms of the private sector component of the housing supply target and housing land requirement, against Persimmon's methodology, which doesn't follow the approach set out in SPP (as detailed above) nor uses the correct figures as set out in Clydeplan and the 2017 Housing Land Audit.

	Private sector housing (2017 – 2024)	WDC	Persimmon
A	Housing Land Supply (2012-2024) as set out in Clydeplan	1,800	
B	Housing Land Requirement (2012-2024) as set out in Clydeplan	2,070	3170 (quoted Clydeplan all tenure figure)
C	Completions (as per HLA 2017)	699	1060 (quoted all tenure completion figure)
	Housing Land Supply (2017-24)	1,101 (a-c)	
D	Housing Land Requirement (2017 -24)	1,266 (a-c x 15%)	2110 (b-c)
E	Annual Completion rate as set out in Clydeplan: Housing Supply Target	150 (a / 12) (based on Housing land supply)	352 (d/5)



	Housing Land Requirement Annual Completion Rate	172 (150 x15%)	
F	Plan Years remaining	7 (based on the base date of the HLA)	6
G	5 year effective housing land requirement	863 (172 x 5)	1758 (E x 5)
H	Effective Private Housing Land Supply as set on in 2017 HLA	1701	1701
I	Surplus/Shortfall	+762 (h-g)	-57 (h-g)

The information provided in the table above demonstrates the significant errors Persimmon have made in order to ensure that there is a shortfall in private sector housing land within 2017-24 in West Dunbartonshire. As the Council has demonstrated, by using the correct figures and approach, there is a substantial surplus of effective private housing land for the period of 2017-2024 that will meet the private sector housing land requirement in full within this time period.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15)** challenge the proposed new sites within the Plan and their capacities. They also challenge the programming within 2017 Housing Land Audit for the new sites added in Schedule 2. As indicated below, in the section on programming, the Council does not agree with Taylor Wimpey and considers that the sites in the Plan are capable of being built within the plan period.

The Council also does not agree with Taylor Wimpey with regard to the assertion they make in paragraph 3.46 of their representation, where they state that they:

*“understand that their recent discussions with the Council [and Homes for Scotland] over the post 2024 housing land supply in Schedules 2 and 3 have indicated that these could be amended. More specifically we understand that discussions between HfS and the Council have identified a nominal all tenure shortfall of 205 units in the post 2024 period rather than the surplus of 436 units identified in Table 2 to Proposed LDP2.”*

This statement is completely inaccurate and the Council has never stated to Homes for Scotland that Schedules 2 and 3 ‘could be amended’. Schedules 2 and 3, in the Council’s view, detail the housing sites which are capable of being effective and delivered throughout the Plan Period.

The Council would also contend, as previously stated, that the information used by Taylor Wimpey to challenge the housing sites in the Plan is basic and without substantiation.

#### Strategy Housing Investment Plan Sites

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** also seek clarity on why the SHIP sites referred to as priority in the 2017/18 SHIP have been programmed beyond 2024. The Council would accept that the programming for several sites does not match exactly with the SHIP programming; however, it is based on a pragmatic and conservative expectation of delivery on these sites over the Plan period. The delivery and timing of housing sites

within the SHIP is dependent on the continued levels of funding from the Scottish Government to meet its ambitious targets. However it is considered that all affordable housing sites included in the Local Development Plan can be delivered within the Plan period and are fully capable of being delivered before 2024, if the necessary funding is available.

### Programming

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)** dispute the programming of several specific sites in Local Development Plan 2, together with those sites expected to deliver post-2024, and more generally all brownfield sites in the housing land supply. Taken together, they use this to suggest there is a shortfall in the housing land supply for the plan period.

Specifically, they state that they had disputed the inclusion of the sites at Dalquhurn (H2 (35) and H2 (61)) and Littlemill Distillery (H2(62)) in the 2017 Housing Land Audit. However, the Council would strongly disagree that this was the case, and would refer to the agreed and published version of the 2017 Housing Land Audit which clearly records that no sites had been disputed by Homes for Scotland. Notwithstanding this point, the Council considers that both sites are effective due to clear evidence of developer interest: at Dalquhurn a planning application for residential development is currently being considered (application ref:DC18/233) and at Littlemill Distillery there is active interest from a named housing association, as reflected in the 2018/19 SHIP, which programmes completion on the site within 2020/21.

In response to Homes for Scotland's contention that the programming for Queens Quay post 2024 is *"over-inflated and inconsistent with the figures in the agreed 2017 HLA"*, the Council would acknowledge that post 2024 programming was not part of the 2017 Housing Land Audit, but considers that the programming for 2024-29, made for the purposes of the Local Development Plan 2, is entirely appropriate and robust.

The 'extrapolated programming' provided by Homes for Scotland, in Appendices 1 and 2 to their representation, bases post-2024 programming on the same annual completions as for the 2018-2024 period in the HLA. This produces slightly lower figures than the Council's calculation, which included a modest increase in expected annual completions for site WD0463C: Queens Quay-Plots 8-12 from 2027, from 32 units p.a. to 52 units, based on the expected completion of other parts of the wider Queens Quay site; the likelihood of two or more housebuilders operating at the site simultaneously; and an anticipated pick-up in the national housing market in the longer term. This is considered to be a reasonable assumption for this major regeneration site in the longer term, which makes only a small difference to the overall output from Queens Quay in this period, and to the housing land supply position.

The Council further considers that the respondent's claim that all sites programmed to commence post 2024 are challenging to deliver and therefore likely to slip to post 2030 delivery, is made with no evidence to support it and is without any basis. The post 2024 sites are free from significant constraints, and the programming for them is considered to be appropriate, conservative, and achievable. Similarly, as detailed within the sections on the 'Range and Choice of Housing Land', the Council would strongly disagree that the inclusion of, and programming for, brownfield sites is unrealistic or unachievable.

Prioritising brownfield sites is entirely consistent with the aims of SPP, and the delivery of brownfield sites in West Dunbartonshire has remained strong in recent years, with many

key regeneration sites now underway or about to commence, and individual completion rates on brownfield sites usually matching or exceeding those of greenfield sites. The Council therefore does not agree that there is a shortfall in the housing land supply, or that there will be further slippage of many sites in Local Development Plan 2.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15)** call into question the effectiveness and deliverability of Sites H2 (35 – 42) as well as the programming and deliverability of other sites within the Housing Land Audit (2017). The representations to Sites H2 (36; 37; 38; and 40 are addressed within Issues 24, 25 and 26. The responses to the representations on the effectiveness of Strauss Avenue, Clydebank; Mains Street, Jamestown; the Glebe, Old Kilpatrick are detailed within Issues 27 - 29 respectively. In summary, the Council's responses within these Issues disputed the representations from Taylor Wimpey and considered the sites to be effective and deliverable within the Plan period.

In addition, they query the programming of the former Thor Ceramics site (H2 (14)) on the basis that a 2017 planning application remains currently undetermined. In response, the Council would point out that the 2017 Housing Land Audit was agreed by Homes for Scotland, and considers that the programming is entirely reasonable based on the sustained interest in the site and recent planning application. No modification is therefore required.

In response to the representation by **Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/15)** specifically in relation to the WD0482 Shed 7, Castle Road, Dumbarton site, the Council notes that this is included as an effective site in the agreed 2017 Housing Land Audit, and contributes to meeting the Housing Supply Target. It is not identified as a Housing Opportunity Site in Local Development Plan 2 because development of the site had already commenced at the point of preparing the Plan. The 2017 Housing Land Audit programmes the site for 175 completions by 2024, and given the observed progress on the site as of April 2019, the Council considers this appears to be realistic.

#### Conclusion on Housing Land

In conclusion to this Issue overall, the Council has demonstrated that there is not a shortfall of housing land within the plan period, as advocated by **Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/15)**, **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/15)** and **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)**. The Council has also demonstrated that the methodology and figures that the representations have used are inaccurate and methodologically questionable and not in conformity with SPP.

#### Policy H1: Housing Land Supply

With regard to the representation from **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/15)**, the Council is of the view that the Policy as it currently stands will ensure that if a shortfall in the five year effective land supply were to occur that further housing sites could be brought forward to meet the shortfall in a sustainable manner. The suggested modifications by Homes for Scotland would substantially weaken the Policy and would not be in conformity with SPP's requirement of directing the right development to the right place.

It should be noted that the Policy has been updated and that its currently wording reflects the majority of the Reporter's recommended changes to the similar policy within the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) as set out on Page 145 of the Examination Report (CD xx) for that Plan.

No modifications to the Policy are therefore required in this regard.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 16	Revitalising our Economy and Achieving Zero Waste	
Development plan reference:	Revitalising our Economy (Pages 80 – 83) and Achieving Zero Waste (Page 117)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/16) Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/16) SNH (PLDP/640/16) Clydeport Operations Ltd (PLDP/645) (Support) Peel Environmental Ltd (PLDP/647) (Support) Mr Hugh Kinlock (PLDP/671) SEPA (PLDP/676/16) (Support) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/16) Glasgow Airport (PLDP/788)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the development policies of the Plan which set out the Councils requirements for development proposals associated with Economic Growth; Business and Industrial development; Sustainable Waste Management; and the sites within the Plan that are allocated for these specific types of development.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
The representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped into the following sub-headings: General; Policy E1: Economic Growth and Business and Industrial Opportunity Sites and Table 10: Waste Management Sites; Golden Jubilee Introductory Text; Policy E6: Tourism Development; Policy E7: Glasgow Airport and Aircraft Noise; and Schedule 4: Business and Industrial Opportunities.		
<u>General</u>		
<p><b>Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/16)</b> suggest that the supply of potentially marketable and serviceable land, as set out in the Ryden Industrial and Business Land Review 2018 (CD/XX), has been skewed by take up of one-off uses in 2011, 2013 and 2017. On this basis, it is suggested that further reviews of supply may mean it is appropriate to release commercial land for other uses, such as housing, within the lifetime of the plan.</p>		
<p><b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/16)</b> see no mention of the role or contribution that the social economy or social enterprise can make. Serious consideration should be given to the potential of both of these to help achieve a sustainable local economy and inclusive economic growth.</p>		
<p><b>SEPA (PLDP/676/16)</b> are satisfied that the strategies and policies associated with the delivery of the Council's Economic Development Strategy are appropriate and where relevant include the safeguards required to protect our interests. SEPA also state that they have no additional comments to offer on the sites included within Schedule 4 as they have</p>		

already commented on the environmental impacts/assessments associated with these allocations.

#### Policy E1: Economic Growth and Business and Industrial Opportunity Sites and Table 10: Waste Management Sites.

**Clydeport Operations Ltd (PLDP/645)** are supportive of Policy E1 and the safeguarding of Rothesay Dock, Clydebank (Site ref: E1 (8)) for business and industrial opportunities.

**Peel Environmental Ltd (PLDP/647)** are supportive of Policy E1 and the safeguarding of Rothesay Dock, Clydebank (Site ref: E1 (9)) for business and industrial opportunities and Rothesay Dock, Clydebank (Site Ref ZW1(3)) for waste management.

**Mr Hugh Kinlock (PLDP/671)** indicates that there is no evidence to demonstrate that the sawmill will expand into the reserved area and the site E1 (11) will create more economic value if it is developed for housing alongside H2(29) or H2(30).

**The Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/16)** make representations to various business and industrial sites within the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate and at Lomondgate, which are considered within Issue 10 and 11. However, the representations to the various sites at Vale of Leven Estate are considered within the context of this Issue. In relation to Site E1(1), **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/16)** question the need to expand and provide further development land in this area when at present there are numerous vacant units and this has been a long standing problem. The Trust would support consolidating all efforts to filling the existing vacant units before providing more land for business and industrial.

Site E1(2), the **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/16)** strongly object to the change of use to an Industrial & Business Opportunity. This area has historically always been open green space (at least 75 years) and is an area considered to have significant biodiversity, flora & fauna. Given this area is within the HSE notification zone the Trust do not believe that any development is appropriate.

#### Golden Jubilee Introductory Text

**SNH (PLDP/640/12)** request amendments to paragraph 3 of the introductory text on Page 81 of the Plan to be consistent with text used elsewhere in the Plan and to provide clarity regarding consideration of all potential threats to the SPA.

#### Policy E6: Tourism Development

**SNH (PLDP/640/16)** request an amendment to the policy to ensure the protection of Natura 2000 sites and to accord with the wording in paragraph 207 of SPP.

#### Policy E7: Glasgow Airport and Aircraft Noise

**Glasgow Airport (PLDP/788)** in relation to Government Guidance suggest the Council retain the 57 LAeq contour threshold for controlling noise sensitive developments in proximity to the airport and that any development within this contour is accompanied by an initial noise risk assessment and the preparation of an Acoustic Design Statement as recommended in the Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise for New Residential Development (published by the Association of Noise Consultants, Institute of



Acoustics and Chartered Institute of Environmental Health). Although not explicitly mentioned in Glasgow Airports representation, they advise that aircraft noise maps on Page 83 of the Plan should be consistent with their latest LAeq Noise Contours (2017) as published in Glasgow Airport's Noise Action Plan 2018-2023.

#### Schedule 4: Business and Industrial Opportunities

**SNH (PLDP/640/16)** state that Clydebank Industrial Estate E1(6) should be required to undertake an HRA and that the reference in the table to E1(6) should be amended.

**SNH (PLDP/640/16)** request amendments to the Note within Schedule 4 to be consistent with text used elsewhere in the Plan and to provide clarity regarding consideration of all potential threats to the SPA.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/16)** reiterate their comments made at Main Issues Report stage in relation to Sites E1(1), E1(2), E1(3) and E1(4) in terms of flooding / oversupply/ Greenland / Biodiversity

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### General

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/16)** do not proposed a specific modification but it is inherent in their representation that they wish to see the chapter amended to include reference to the role or contribution that the social economy or social enterprise can make to the economy.

##### Policy E1: Economic Growth and Business and Industrial Opportunity Sites

**Mr Hugh Kinlock (PLDP/671)** re-designate Site E1(11) as a housing site and link to H2(29) or H2(30)

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/16)** do not propose a modification but it is inherent in their representation that they do not wish site E1(1), E1(2), E1(3) and E1(4) to be designated for business and industrial uses at this time.

##### Golden Jubilee Introductory Text and Policy E3

**SNH (PLDP/640/16)** to provide clarity regarding consideration of all potential threats to the SPA, SNH recommends that the words "disturbance and pollution" are removed from the text. Similarly they recommend that the word 'appraisal' in the second and fourth sentence of paragraph 3 is changed to 'assessment'. Therefore, the paragraph should be reworded as follows

*"Development within the Hospital Campus or within the Clydebank Riverside Strategic Economic Investment Location must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan,*



*including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development”.*

#### Policy E6: Tourism Development

**SNH (PLDP/640/16)** request that the policy is amended as follows (amendment in bold):

*“The development of new and existing tourist facilities will be supported and encouraged throughout the Council area where **there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of a Natura 2000** site and they avoid adverse impacts on the green network and built heritage and are in accordance with other relevant policies within the Plan.”*

#### Policy E7: Glasgow Airport and Aircraft Noise

**Glasgow Airport (PLDP/788)** request that the Policy is amended to require development within areas affected by aircraft noise are accompanied by an initial noise risk assessment and the preparation of an Acoustic Design Statement as recommended in the Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise for New Residential Development (published by the Association of Noise Consultants, Institute of Acoustics and Chartered Institute of Environmental Health).

It should also be ensured that the Map depicting aircraft noise contours on Page 83 of the Plan is in line with the LAeq Noise Contours (2017) as published in Glasgow Airport’s Noise Action Plan 2018-2023

#### Policy ZW1: Sustainable Waste Management and Table 10 – Waste Management Sites

**Peel Environmental Ltd (PLDP/647/16)** are supportive of Rothesay Dock, Clydebank (Site Ref: ZW1 (3)) being identified for waste management purposes and are committed to bringing forward development on the site.

#### Schedule 4: Business and Industrial Opportunities

**SNH (PLDP/640/16)** state that Clydebank Industrial Estate E1(6) should be required to undertake an HRA and that the reference in the table to E1(6) should be shown with a double \*\*.

**SNH (PLDP/640/16)** state that the notes referencing to both Clydebank Industrial Estate E1(6) (see proposed modification above) and Cable Depot Road Clydebank E1(7) in relation to the SPA should be amended to provide clarity regarding consideration of all potential threats to the SPA. SNH recommends that the words “disturbance and pollution” are removed from the Note. Similarly they recommend that the word ‘appraisal’ in the second and fourth sentence of the Note is changed to ‘assessment’. Therefore, the paragraph should be reworded as follows:

*“Development at Clydebank Industrial Estate and Cable Depot Road must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address*

*disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development”.*

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council's responses to the representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped into the following sub-headings: General; Policy E1: Economic Growth and Business and Industrial Opportunity Sites and Table 10: Waste Management Sites; Golden Jubilee Introductory Text; Policy E6: Tourism Development; Policy E7: Glasgow Airport and Aircraft Noise; and Schedule 4: Business and Industrial Opportunities.

General

In response to comments from **Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/16)**, the Council would point out that the Business and Industrial Review (April 2018) (CD xx) did not suggest any de-allocation of business and industrial land as the Plan only has a marketable supply of 11 years of land left. Nothing in the review would therefore correlate with Persimmon's view that the figures have been skewed. Due to the fact that all the allocated sites within the Plan are required to meet the business and industrial land take up rates, the Council does not agree that this land could be allocated to any other use. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

With regard to the representation from **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/16)**, Scottish Planning Policy (CD xx) does not specifically require business and industrial policies to mention the role or contribution of social economy or social enterprise can make to economic development. However, the Council does acknowledge that these often overlooked areas of economic development can make an important contribution to an area and measures to support the social economy and social enterprises are contained within the Council's Economic Development Strategy 2015-2020 (CD xx). The Council believe that this is the most appropriate document to refer to the social economy and social enterprise. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

The comments of **SEPA (PLDP/676/16)** are noted.

Policy E1: Economic Growth and Business and Industrial Opportunity Sites and Table 10: Waste Management Sites.

The support of **Clydeport Operations Ltd (PLDP/645)** and **Peel Environmental Ltd (PLDP/647/)** are welcomed.

In response to the representation from **Mr Hugh Kinlock (PLDP/671)**, Local Development Plan 2 seeks to maintain a generous and varied supply of land for industry and business development which is both well located and readily available for development in order to help attract new businesses to the area, retain existing businesses and encourage business starts-ups. The Council's Business and Industry Review (April 2018) assessed all current sites allocated for business and industrial and did not propose any de-allocation of this site from the business and industrial land supply. In this context, the Council believes that loss of land identified for industry and business should be resisted. Furthermore, the sawmill owners/operators have not written to the Council requesting this site to be re-designated to another use. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

Although the points made by the **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/16)** are understood, Scottish Planning Policy requires Local Development Plan 2 to allocate sites that meet the diverse needs of different sizes of businesses and to allow new economic development opportunities. The Council's Business and Industry Review (April 2018) undertook a review of this site and it scored fifth highest in the assessment. The review also did not propose any de-allocation of this site from the business and industrial land supply. The site has also been allocated for business and industrial use within the Adopted Local Plan (2010) (CD xx) and the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) (CDxx).

Therefore, irrespective of the number of vacant units within the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate, Local Development Plan 2 is required to maintain a generous and varied supply of land for industry and business development. In this context, the Council is of the view that no modification to the Plan is required and that the site should not be de-allocated.

The representation to site E1(2) by the **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/16)**, the Council indicates that this site has also been allocated for business and industrial use within the Adopted Local Plan (2010) and the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016). It also scored highly within the assessment of business and industrial sites as detailed in the Council's Business and Industry Review (April 2018). The review also did not propose de-allocation of this site from the business and industrial land supply. In this context, the loss of land identified for industry and business should be resisted.

The Environmental Report (CD xx) did not find that there would be significant environmental impacts on biodiversity and fauna but did find that there could be significant adverse environmental impacts on health due to the HSE consultation zone. Mitigation measures have been put in place, which should result in significant positive environmental impacts which will be achieved through Policy ENV 10 of the Plan.

No modification to the Plan is required in this regard.

#### Golden Jubilee Introductory Text

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to Paragraph 3 on Page 81 being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/16)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the paragraph.

#### Policy E6: Tourism Development

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the policy being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/16)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

#### Policy E7: Glasgow Airport and Aircraft Noise

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the policy being made, as requested by **Glasgow Airport (PLDP/788)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy and would suggest that the policy is amended as follows (amendment is in bold):

*"Policy E7*

*Glasgow Airport and Aircraft Noise*

*Development that would adversely impact on the operations of Glasgow Airport or would be adversely affected by aircraft noise will not be permitted. **Development which is proposed within an area affected by aircraft noise is required to be accompanied by an initial noise risk assessment and the preparation of an Acoustic Design Statement as recommended in the Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise for New Residential Development (published by the Association of Noise Consultants, Institute of Acoustics and Chartered Institute of Environmental Health).***

In response to the issues regarding conformity with the LAeq Noise Contours (2017), as published in Glasgow Airport's Noise Action Plan 2018-2023, the Council would point out that these were not available or published when Local Development Plan 2 was being finalised. As such, there are discrepancies between the noise contour map contained on Page 83 of the Plan and the data supplied by Glasgow Airport. As this is a technical matter, the Council will ensure that the map is updated to reflect the data supplied by Glasgow Airport in this regard and consider that this modification would be non-notifiable in any event. However, the Council would have no objection to the Reporter recommending that this modification should be made within the examination report, should the Reporter view the change as material.

#### Schedule 4: Business and Industrial Opportunities

In response to the representations from **SNH: (PLDP/640/29)** and **(PLDP/640/30)**, the Council would have no objection to the proposed modifications, should the Reporter wish to amend the Schedule.

In relation to the representations from the Vale of Leven Trust: **(PLDP/677/16)** with regard to Sites E1(1), E1(2), E1(3) and E1(4), the Environmental Report did not anticipate any significant environmental impacts that would preclude development of the sites. Therefore, the Council is of the view that no modifications to the Plan are required in this regard and the sites should continue to be allocated for business and industrial uses.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 17	Supporting Town Centres	
Development plan reference:	Supporting Town Centres (Pages 84-87)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group (PLDP/165) Legal and General UK Property Fund (PLDP/660/17) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/17)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the Supporting Town Centres section of the Plan, which sets out a Retail Strategy based on a Network of Centres, and a series of town centre and retail policies.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b>Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group (PLDP/165)</b> support and welcome the inclusion of the site within the 'Supporting Town Centres' section of the Proposed Plan on page 84; and as a 'Destination Commercial Centre' within Table 4: Network of Centres on page 85, and support the inclusion of this existing retail centre within the Vale of Leven Proposals Map and its designation as a Commercial Centre on the Proposals Map. They also suggest that Local Development Plan 2 should make specific reference to the planning permission (ref: DC16/280), which was granted on 12th April 2018 for the redevelopment of the existing centre. This minor amendment would acknowledge the proposals to refurbish the existing Antartex Retail Centre and ensure consistency of approach with the other retail proposals in the Proposed Plan. This would reflect the important role that the Antartex Retail Centre plays in the local retail hierarchy.</p> <p><b>Legal and General UK Property Fund (PLDP/660/17)</b> state that the Phase 1 of St James Retail Park continues to yield opportunities for investment and development, and that, as well as consolidating existing retail floorspace, there are opportunities to introduce smaller scale retail development (including Class 1 or Class 3), or indeed leisure development, that could be supported in the commercial centre including where the retailer may have dual representation in the town or where its trading or locational format allows. Any proposals would require to be the subject of applications for planning permission and an assessment against the policies of the local development plan including in respect of the sequential test.</p> <p>The representation also refers to the Delivering Our Places: Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront section of Local Development Plan 2, in that they contend that the Plan is ambiguous as to whether the Retail Park is identified within the town centre or not. This issue is fully considered within Issue 6: Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront section.</p> <p><b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/17)</b> state that they support a range and choice of uses in Alexandria Town Centre with increased retail provision; but would like to limit particular clusters of uses such as, hairdressers, bookmakers and hot food takeaways.</p>		

<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>
<p><b>Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group (PLDP/165)</b> seek that Table 4: Network of Centres on page 85 of the Proposed Local Development Plan is amended to include specific reference to the granting of planning permission for the redevelopment and refurbishment of Antartex Village on 12th April 2018 (Planning Permission Reference: DC16/280).</p> <p><b>Legal and General UK Property Fund (PLDP/660/17)</b> seek a change to Policy SC1 and the associated Table 4: Network of Centres in West Dunbartonshire to allow smaller scale units to operate within St James Retail Park, even if already represented with the town. Any proposals would require to be the subject of applications for planning permission and an assessment against the policies of the local development plan including in respect of the sequential test.</p> <p><b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/17)</b> would like a modification to the Plan to allow fewer clusters of uses such as hairdressers, bookmakers and hot food takeaways in Alexandria Town Centre, while maintaining a range and choice of uses and increased retail provision.</p>
<b>Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:</b>
<p>With reference to <b>Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group (PLDP/165)</b>, while the Council acknowledges the recent planning consent, it considers that Policy SC1: Sequential Approach and Table 4: Network of Centres in West Dunbartonshire provide strong and sufficient support for the continued role and development of the Antartex Retail Village, and that adding a specific reference to the planning consent within Table 4 is neither necessary in order to strengthen the policy, nor consistent with the purpose and content of Table 4, which does not reference planning consents for other retail centres. As such, no modification is considered necessary.</p> <p>With regard to the representation by <b>Legal and General UK Property Fund (PLDP/660/17)</b> the Council considers that amending Policy SC1 and Table 4 to permit smaller scale retail units at the St James Retail Park would have the effect of allowing the Retail Park to accommodate stores that would normally be found within Dumbarton Town Centre. At present, as it offers large-format, predominantly bulky goods retail, the Retail Park largely provides a complementary role to the town centre. This role is protected through the restrictions in terms of minimum unit sizes and requires an assessment against the impact that development within this area could have on the town centre, set out in Policy SC1 and Table 4:Network of Centres.</p> <p>Without these restrictions it is considered that the Retail Park would be able to trade in direct competition with, and potentially attract existing retailers and future investment away from, Dumbarton Town Centre. The Council also does not agree with the representation that retailers would be able to maintain a dual presence within the town, noting the relatively small geographic area and available retail catchment. Instead, this is likely to materially harm the town centre and would run counter to the overall strategy of Local Development Plan 2 and to SPP (CD xx) in its support for, and protection of, town centres. The Council considers that the Retail and Town Centre policies provide an appropriate balance of support for the continuing successful operation and development of the St James Retail Park and Commercial Centre, while continuing to support the vitality and viability of Dumbarton Town Centre. As such no modification is required.</p>



<p>In response to the representation from <b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/17)</b>, the Council considers that the Retail Strategy and retail policies within the Supporting Town Centres section of the Plan already support a vibrant mix of uses within town centres, which can support retail uses and complement shopping visits.</p> <p>Given that Alexandria Town Centre is smaller and serves a different retail function compared to the two larger town centres of Dumbarton and Clydebank, the current policy framework set out in Table 4: Network of Centres in West Dunbartonshire, and in Policy SC3: Other Town Centre Areas, is considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>Policy SC3: Other Town Centre Areas allows significant flexibility of town centre uses whilst seeking to maintain an appropriate balance of these uses. The policy also contains a provision to avoid an over-proliferation of uses, which would have a detrimental impact on the overall character and amenity of the area. The Council considers that this policy balance is appropriate for Alexandria Town Centre. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.</p>
<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>



Issue 18	Built Environment	
Development plan reference:	Paragraph 1, Policy BE 1 and Policy BE 2, Page 89.	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Avant Homes Scotland (PLDP/642/18) Scottish Government (PLDP/659/18)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the development policies of the Plan which set out the Councils requirements for the built environment within West Dunbartonshire.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b>Avant Homes Scotland (PLDP/642/18)</b> state that Policy BE 2 should make provisions for situations where it is not possible to maintain and enhance a listed building. The Policy should also take into account where the condition of listed building creates a 'significant conservation deficit' and therefore halts sustainable development. Therefore an amendment to the policy is sought to take account of rare occasions where demolition is required in order to ensure the positive future of an area. They are also of the view that the policy should be amended to consider enabling development and encourage the Council to take into account situations where the full completion of the new-build element of any enabling development is required to successfully restore a listed building.</p> <p><b>Scottish Government (PLDP/659/18)</b> request an amendment to Policy BE 1 to align with paragraph 145 of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and because the planning authority only have a remit over unscheduled archaeology and the setting of scheduled monuments as this is a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications.</p> <p><b>Scottish Government (PLDP659/18)</b> request an amendment to the first sentence on paragraph 1 on page 89 as Planning Authorities have no remit over direct impacts on scheduled monuments as HES are the consenting authority for Scheduled Monument Consent.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<p><b>Avant Homes Scotland (PLDP/642/18)</b> recommend that Policy BE 2 is amended to include provision for the demolition of listed buildings where they are a constraint to development and there is no viable prospect of their restoration. It is also urged that this same policy accounts for the occasions where enabling development is needed in its entirety before works begin on listed buildings.</p> <p><b>Scottish Government (PLDP/659/18)</b> request that the first sentence of Policy BE 1 is amended to read:</p> <p><i>'Where Development adversely affects the integrity of the setting of a Scheduled</i></p>		

*Monument, permission would only be granted where there are exceptional circumstances’.*

**Scottish Government (PLDP659/18)** request that the first sentence of paragraph 1 on page 89 is deleted and replaced with the following:

*‘Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) is required from Historic Environment Scotland (HES) for any works that would directly affect a Scheduled Monument.’*

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

In relation to the representation from **Avant Homes Scotland (PLDP/642/18)**, the Council does not agree with the suggested amendments to Policy BE 2. Paragraph 139 of SPP (CD xx) is clear that Local Development Plans *‘should provide a framework for protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing all elements of the historic environment’*.

Moreover, Paragraph 141 states that changes to listed buildings *‘should be managed to protect its special interest while enabling it to remain in active use’* ..... [and] *‘special regard must be given to the importance of preserving and enhancing the building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest’*. Nowhere in SPP does it encourage, as the respondent seeks, provisions for the demolition of listed buildings where a conservation deficit is the only obstacle to its redevelopment. The amendment to the policy that is being proposed would be against the provisions of SPP and Historic Environment Scotland Policy. The proposed amendment would substantially weaken the policy and would set a dangerous precedent of allowing the potential demolition of listed buildings where the only obstacle is the cost of restoring it.

The Council also does not agree that the enabling development section of the policy should be amended to allow the completion of the new build element in its entirety before works to the listed building are started. The exact nature of how the conditions of a planning application and/or legal agreement are agreed in relation to what proportion of the enabling development is allowed to be completed before works to the listed building start, are on a case by case basis and should not be specified in policy. No modifications to the policy are therefore required in this regard.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to Policy BE 1 being made, as requested by **Scottish Government (PLDP/659/18)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

With regard to the **Scottish Government (PLDP659/18)**, the Council would point out that the respondent has made an error in terms of referencing the correct paragraph the representation relates to. It should be the first sentence on paragraph 2 that the respondent is referring to as that relates to Scheduled Monument Consent. The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the paragraph 2 on page 89 being made, as requested by **Scottish Government**, should the Reporter wish to amend the paragraph.

**Reporter’s conclusions:**

**Reporter’s recommendations:**

Issue 19	Green Infrastructure	
Development plan reference:	Green Infrastructure Chapter (Pages 92 – 95); Policy GI 1; Policy GI 2, Policy GI 3 and Policy GI 4.	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
SportScotland (PLDP/26/19) (Support) Persimmon Homes (PLDP/173/19) Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/19) Silverton and Overton Community Council (PLDP/182/19) Avant Homes Scotland (PLDP/642/19) Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/19) RSPB (PLDP/649/19) (Support) Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/19) Clydebelt (PLDP/673/19) SEPA (PLDP/676/19) (Support) Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/19)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the development policies of the plan in relation to Green Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>The Council has grouped the representations received under the Chapter/ Policy heading to which they relate to.</p> <p><b><u>Green Infrastructure Chapter</u></b></p> <p><b>SEPA (PLDP/676/19)</b> are fully supportive of the integration of green infrastructure into all developments and the outcome of increased healthy lifestyle options is seen as a key benefit of this approach.</p> <p><b><u>Policy GI 1: Safeguarding Open Space and Outdoor Sports Facilities.</u></b></p> <p><b>SportScotland (PLDP/26/19)</b> states the wording of Policy GI 1 reflects the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy and we would support this in its current form for the protection it provides to these spaces.</p> <p><b>Clydebelt (PLDP/673/19)</b> state that they support Policy GI 1 but are of the view that the Policy is not being adhered to. They provide examples of the proposed allocation of Strauss Avenue and the Glebe, as well as, Roseberry Place of examples where safeguarded open space is being built upon contrary to the Policy. Also make comments on previous Government directives on business and industry open space provision and Queens Quay, in terms of what has been provided. Also makes comments on meetings and charrettes and is of the view that charrettes overrule years of consultation with local residents. As a response, they wish to know where all the plans and suggestions have went.</p>		

## **Policy GI 2: Open Space Standards**

**Persimmon Homes (PLDP/173/19)** state that where the Council's Open Space Audit identifies that there is an inadequate supply of green infrastructure/open space and the site is surrounded by protected open space there should be provision to make qualitative improvements to the adjacent open space to the benefit of new development and wider community rather than creating further open space within the development.

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/19)**, in relation to Policy GI2, state that whilst the importance of greenspace is recognised, they question the need for set standards, particularly given the focus on maximising the use of brownfield land. Strict standards in addition to detailed other guidance on placemaking, would limit the ability of Planning Officers to take into account site specific considerations in assessing whether a given development was acceptable overall. The standards should instead be referred to as indicative, allowing developments to be properly considered at the application stage.

## **Policy GI 3: Allotments**

**Silverton and Overton Community Council (PLDP/182/19)** support Policies GI2, GI3 and GI4. However, in reference to Policy GI 3, the respondent states that the site suggested by them, at the Call for Sites stage and in the Main Issues Report, has not been identified in LDP 2 and the site suggested at Millburn Crescent was not listed in the Review of the Call for Sites. They seek clarification on these points.

## **Policy GI 4: Developer Contributions**

**SportScotland (PLDP/26/19)**, in relation to Policy GI 4, support the range of projects to target developer contributions which includes spaces for sports and recreation participation.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/19)** does not support Policy GI 4 and is of the view that smaller sites of 10 units or less should not be exempted from providing green space and neither should high density urban areas. If the developer contribution policy is to remain the first two exemptions should be removed and there should be a publically available record of where the money has been spent or will be spent. There are no exceptional circumstances where a developer should be exempt from paying these especially not due to development costs – developers should never be subsidised in any way or let away with paying what they are due –they are a businesses after all – if they can't afford to pay or run profitably it is of no concern to the council or to the general public.

**Avant Homes Scotland (PLDP/642/19)** support Policy GI 4 but state that the Policy needs to ensure that potential restoration and enabling developments are not hampered or halted by unnecessary and unjustified developer contributions. The respondent is of the view that such developer contributions have the ability to hinder a development and potentially cause sites to continue to lie vacant and derelict for the long-term. The social, economic and planning benefits need to be weighed up against any potential developer contribution.

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/19)** support Policy GI 4 but seek a change to the Policy to ensure that budgets for green infrastructure are not reduced throughout the

development process.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/19)** support Table 7 of Policy GI 4 as its includes biodiversity improvements as one of the projects which can be delivered through developer contributions.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/19)** is of the view that developers should be obliged to contribute to the delivery of canal related improvements e.g. towpath access upgrades and moorings' provision.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**Persimmon Homes (PLDP/173/19)** do not suggest a specific modification to the plan but it is inherent in their response that they wish Policy GI 2 amended to provide a specific context to allow for adjacent open space to be upgraded and the open space requirements of the policy lessened or not required.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/19)** wishes the first two bullet points of Policy GI 4 to be removed and a requirement for a public required detailing where developer contributions have been or will be spent.

**Avant Homes Scotland (PLDP/642/19)** request that Policy GI 4: Developer Contributions is strengthened to ensure that developments which include development and the restoration of listed buildings are exempt from providing a developer contribution making the project unviable.

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/19)** seeks a provision within the Policy that developer contributions and developers budgets towards these contributions are 'ring fenced' at an early stage to ensure that the budget is not reduced as the development stages progress.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/19)** seeks an amendment to Table 7 to include canal related improvements to the list of projects.

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council has grouped its responses to the representations received under the Policy heading to which they relate to, as detailed below.

### **Green Infrastructure Chapter**

The support of **SEPA (PLDP/676/19)** for the approach within the chapter is welcomed.

### **Policy GI 1: Safeguarding Open Space and Outdoor Sports Facilities.**

The Council welcomes the support of **SportScotland (PLDP/26/19)**

With regard to the representation from **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/19)**, the Policy does allow for development on areas of safeguarded open space where they accord with the criteria of the Policy. This is the case in the sites that the respondent mentions, particularly Issue 27 relating to Strauss Avenue. The other points of the representation are clearly to do with provisions of other documents, which are outwith the context, or do not form part of this Plan. No modifications to the plan are required in this regard.

### **Policy GI 2: Open Space Standards**

With regard to the representation from **Persimmon Homes (PLDP/173/19)**, the Council would point out that the provisions of Policy GI 4 would allow nearby open space to be upgraded rather than requiring its provision on site where the criteria of the Policy are met for the residential development. Where residential development does not meet this criteria or it is not close to an existing area of open space, the Council will require the provision of green infrastructure on site in line with Policy CP 2 of this Plan and the Green Infrastructure Supplementary Guidance when it is adopted. No modification to the Policy is therefore required in this regard

In response to the representation from **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/19)**, the Council is of the view that open space standards are required. Paragraph 225 of SPP (CD xx) states that:

*“Local development plans should seek to enhance existing and promote the creation of new green infrastructure, which may include retrofitting. They should do this through a design-led approach, applying standards which facilitate appropriate provision, addressing deficits or surpluses within the local context. The standards delivered through a design-led approach should result in a proposal that is appropriate to place, including connections to other green infrastructure assets.”*

The Council therefore has complied with SPP in this regard and is strongly of the view that Open Space Standards are required to ensure that each development delivers the amount of open space that is required per household. This provides a successful place, which has considered green infrastructure from the outset and encourages a healthy and active new residential area. Without standards, there is the possibility of new developments not providing the amount of open space that is required, which could lead to the under provision of open space within West Dunbartonshire and would not lead to healthier and successful places. No modification to the Policy is therefore required.

### **Policy GI 3: Allotments**

The support of the **Silverton and Overton Community Council (PLDP/182/19)** is



welcomed. With regard to the queries raised in relation to the aforementioned sites, the Council took the view to review the provision of allotments within West Dunbartonshire and take the allocation of new allotments forward as part of its Food Growing Strategy. This is the reason why LDP 2 has not allocated, or considered the allocation of these sites.

Millburn Crescent was not listed in the Review of the Call for Sites, as the site was not suggested by the respondent at the Call for Sites stage of the plan preparation process and therefore was not included within the Review of the Call for Sites. However, it was considered in relation to the response from the respondent at Main Issues Report stage and will continue to be considered for allocation as an allotment within the approach detailed above.

#### **Policy GI 4: Developer Contributions**

The support of **SportScotland (PLDP/26/19)** for the range of projects targeting developer contributions is welcomed.

The Council does not agree with the view expressed by **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/19)** that developments of 10 units or less or those sites where green infrastructure standards are not appropriate on site i.e. high density areas should not be exempt from providing onsite green infrastructure. There needs to be flexibility within the Policy which recognises that some sites i.e. those within a town centre area or smaller developments, will not be able to provide the standards set out in Policy GI 2, which could be to do with site size or close to an area of open space. The need for flexibility in the Policy and to allow contributions to be made to the upgrading of nearby open spaces is supported by **Persimmon Homes (PLDP/173/19)** in relation to Policy GI 2.

The Council is firmly of the view that this kind of flexibility is needed as not all development can provide green infrastructure on site and to ensure that there is no deficit in open space provision, alternative methods of ensuring that development meets the open space requirements are required.

Also, in most circumstances it makes no sense in asking for on-site open space provision where there is an area of recreational open space close by which would serve the development and at the same time could be enhanced for the benefit of all the community.

Furthermore, it should be noted that this criteria within the Policy does not absolve developments from providing landscaping or other amenity open space required in terms of placemaking. No modification to the Policy is therefore required in this instance.

In relation to the view of **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/19)** that a public record of what developer contributions have been or will be spent on should be made, it should be noted the Planning, Building Standards and Environmental Health service reports to Planning Committee on these matters. The report details the amount of developer contributions collected in that year; what it has been spent on; and what future projects the money will be spent on. The system for collecting developer contributions and how it is monitored will be contained within the Supplementary Guidance on Green Infrastructure. No modification to the Policy is therefore required in this regard

In response to the representation made by **Avant Homes Scotland (PLDP/642/19)**, it should be noted that the Policy allows for developer contributions relating to green



infrastructure to be waived or reduced where a developer demonstrates that the development would have exceptional development costs and/or overriding economic, social or other benefits. Therefore, the Council is of the view that the Policy does not need to be amended to specifically exempt enabling developments as it already provides this flexibility. No modification to the Policy is therefore required in this instance.

The Council would point out that any developer contribution that is received is put into an account which is solely for the use of Developer Contribution projects set out in Table 7 of the Plan. Therefore, the representation made by **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/19)**, seeking to ensure that funds are ring-fenced is already in place. Collection of the funds can be achieved in a variety of ways, but in most cases the developer will pay the required amount, in full, after planning permission is granted and this is then transferred to the Council's developer contribution fund. The Supplementary Guidance on Green Infrastructure will detail how developers can make their payment and how the developer contribution system operates within the Council. No modification to the Policy is therefore required in response to the representation.

The support of **RSPB (PLDP/649/19)** for developer contributions being able to be directed towards appropriate projects associated with biodiversity improvements is noted.

In relation to the representation from **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/19)**, the Council can see merit in extending the scope of the projects to include canal related improvements as the Forth and Clyde Canal is a key asset within West Dunbartonshire and is an important Scheduled Monument. Should the Reporter wish to amend Strategic Green Network Projects on Page 60, the Council would have no objection to the projects being changed and would suggest that the second bullet point under Access Priorities is amended as follows (the proposed amendment is in bold):

- "Forth and Clyde Canal, strategic and local connections to and from the Canal and **Canal Related Improvements, such as, but not limited to, towpath access upgrades; moorings provision and improvements related to recreational uses.**

No amendment to Table 7 on Page 93 is required as Strategic Green Networks Projects are already included within the Table.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>

Issue 20	Environment	
Development plan reference:	Safeguarding our Environment – Pages 96 to 103.	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (PLDP/007) Persimmon Homes (PLDP/173/20) Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/20) Coal Authority (PLDP/179) Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/20) SNH (PLDP/640/20) Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20) RSPB (PLDP/649/20) SEPA (PLDP/676/12) (Support)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the development policies of the Plan in relation to the Natural Environment and the SEA Environmental Report.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
The representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following subheadings: General; Safeguarding our Environment Introductory Text; Natural Environment Designations Map; Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation; Landscape and Policy ENV 2: Landscape Character; Policy ENV 3: Carbon Rich Soils; Policy ENV 4: Forestry, Trees and Woodland; Policy ENV 6: Flooding; Policy ENV 7: Advanced and Temporary Greening of Vacant and Derelict Land; Policy ENV 8: Air, Light and Noise Pollution; Policy ENV 9: Contaminated Land; and Policy ENV 10: Implementation of the SEA Environmental Report.		
<u>General</u>		
<b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/20)</b> support all the Policies in this section and are particularly pleased at the clear emphasis being given in the Proposed Local Development Plan 2 to the value of the natural environment in West Dunbartonshire.		
<b>SNH (PLDP/640/20)</b> request an additional paragraph to be added into the supporting text on Page 96 to reflect the requirements set out in SPP paragraph 207 for Natura 2000 sites.		
<b>SEPA (PLDP/676/20)</b> are supportive of all aspects of this section of the plan and in particular the aims and policies relating to ‘carbon rich soils, forestry/trees/woodland, the water environment, flooding, air pollution, contaminated land and the implementation of the SEA ER’. These detailed strategies and policies will deliver help to ensure that development that has the potential to impact on the natural environment will be subject to appropriate assessment, management, mitigation and monitoring to ensure no detriment occurs.		

## Natural Environment Designations Map

**Persimmon Homes (PLDP/173/20)** state that hatching on page 97 relating to the Kilpatrick Hills and SSSI varies from the hatching in the key. This should be amended to avoid dubiety.

## Safeguarding our Environment Introductory Text

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** request an additional paragraph to be added into the supporting text on Page 96 to reflect the requirements set out in SPP paragraph 207 for Natura 2000 sites.

## Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation

**Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (PLDP/007)** state that there is no mention of geological conservation within Policy ENV 1 and seeks an amendment to the Policy to include a reference to geology.

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** state the policy requires to be amended to reflect the requirements to notify Scottish Ministers for International Designations (Natura 2000 Sites), National Designations (SSSI's) and Protected Species as set out in paragraphs 207 to 214 of SPP.

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)** does not support the provision that 'Development on Natura 2000 sites will be permitted where there are no alternative options'. Such a provision will allow developers to believe that such sites are open for development, when in fact, this is designation should inform where development is not to take place, as the site is designated for nature conservation. The wording here has to be encouraging of developers to stick with allocated sites rather than consider Natura 2000 sites for development. The second bullet point alludes to the fact that the environment can be overlooked if there are enough social and economic benefits. This should not be the case in a planning system which is for sustainable development, where the environmental concerns should be given equal consideration to those social and economic ones.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/20)** welcome this policy.

## Landscape and Policy ENV 2: Landscape Character

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** support the description of 'Landscape' within the opening text. However, we consider the reference to 'compromise' of the landscape character and the need for action 'as far as possible' to be ambiguous. To add greater certainty the respondent recommends that the second last sentence be amended.

In relation to Policy ENV 2, the respondent also considers that the wording of the policy to be ambiguous due to inclusion of the qualification 'where appropriate', suggesting that the policy only needs to be applied in some circumstances and not detailing what these are. This does not seem to follow paragraph 202 of SPP which states unequivocally that: 'The siting and design of development should take account of local landscape character'. The respondent recommends that the policy should not only refer to consideration of landscape character but also highlight that this should inform siting and design of the development, assisting the design process. In the interests of certainty and to accord with paragraph 202 of SPP, the policy should therefore be amended.

### Policy ENV 3: Carbon Rich Soils

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** recommend that the provision of a link to SNH's Carbon and Peatland Map referred to in the supporting text prior to Policy ENV 3 and request that Policy ENV 3 is amended to provide further protection.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/20)** welcome this policy and the support given for peatland restoration.

### Policy ENV 4: Forestry, Trees and Woodland

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)** state that they support the wording preceding the policy and suggest that this should also be incorporated into the policy. Indicate that in relation to the interpretation note on the Ancient Woodland Inventory, it is completely inappropriate to say that fragmentation and/or loss of these types of woodland may be permitted.

The respondent also welcomes the recognition that trees form an important feature of urban areas, and that they should be retained trees that have a significant visual, landscape and historic impact. This should also be included in the actual policy wording.

### Policy ENV 6: Flooding

**Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/20)** states that the Policy should also recognise that in exceptional circumstances, there may be a need for development activities (temporary or permanent) within such areas. This could include the need to undertake remediation activities to deliver environmental betterment or an unavoidable need to undertake land raising (and to provide associated compensatory storage) to protect development from flood risks. The Policy should be modified to reflect these exceptional circumstances.

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/20)** refer to their previous comments in relation to Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront Policy 3 in relation to flood risks.

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** highlight the importance that consideration be given to climate change. In particular, for coastal development and in the use of well-designed natural flood management wherever possible. The respondent recommends the provision of a link in the supporting text to the SNH commissioned Report: Impacts of sea-level rise and storm surges due to climate change in the Firth of Clyde': <https://www.nature.scot/snh-commissioned-report-891-impacts-sea-level-rise-and-storm-surges-due-climate-change-firth-clyde>

### Policy ENV 7: Advanced and Temporary Greening of Vacant and Derelict Land

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/20)** support this Policy as this might provide opportunities for temporary community gardens, which would help the problem of demand for allotments, albeit on a short-term basis.

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** state that the Policy required to be amended to provide for the presence and protection of species.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/20)** broadly support this policy, however it should be noted that sometimes brownfield sites that are naturally colonising by wildlife have significant value

and that care should be taken to ensure that any 'greening' does not adversely affect this. As a result, an amendment to the policy should be made.

#### Policy ENV 8: Air, Light and Noise Pollution

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)** generally support this policy but seek a change to the policy in relation to native trees and canopy cover as these can help absorb pollution and act as a noise barrier.

#### Policy ENV 9: Contaminated Land

**The Coal Authority (PLDP/179)** are of the view that the Policy needs to be amended to have the issues of ground stability covered within it as it is especially as the ground conditions associated with past coal mining activity are not necessarily located within the same areas as surface coal resource.

#### Policy ENV 10: Implementation of the SEA Environmental Report

**RSPB (PLDP/646/20)** welcome this policy.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### Safeguarding our Environment Introductory Text

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** request that an additional paragraph be added to the supporting text for Safeguarding Our Environment (Policy ENV1), between paragraph 2 and the final paragraph to reflect the requirements of SPP and suggest the following wording:

*"For Natura 2000 sites, development likely to have a significant effect will be subject to an appropriate assessment of the implications for the conservation objectives".*

##### Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation

**Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (PLDP/007)** seek a modification to the last sentence within Paragraph 3 of the Policy as follows (amendment in bold/ deletions in and):

"In all instances, the Council will require development proposals to have regard to safeguarding features of nature conservation value including woodlands, hedgerows, lochs, ponds, watercourses, wetlands, ~~and~~ wildlife corridors **and geological features.**"

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** seek the following amendments to the Policy (amendments in bold):

*"Development that adversely effects the integrity of sites designated for nature conservation or harms protected species will not be permitted except:*

*a) for Natura 2000 sites:*

- Where there are no alternative solutions*
- There are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social and economic nature; and*
- compensatory measures are provided to ensure that the overall coherence of the*

*Natura network is protected.*

***In this event, Scottish Ministers will be notified***

*b) for protected species:*

*where it accords with relevant legislation and all of the relevant licensing tests are passed*

*c) for SSSI's:*

- where the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the area will not be compromised; or*
- any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by social, environmental or economic benefits of national importance”.*

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)** request that the wording of the Policy is changed as follows:

- to say that development on Natura 2000 sites is not permitted, and encourage developers to seek development on allocated sites;
- Delete the wording in relation to environmental concerns being overlooked if there are enough social and economic benefits; and
- Change the wording 'have regard' to in 'development proposals to have regard to safeguarding features of nature conservation value' to 'enhance and protect as appropriate.'

#### Landscape and Policy ENV 2: Landscape Character

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** requests that the second last sentence of the opening text on Page 98 of the Plan be amended to:

*“It is important that the siting and design of new development relates directly to the key landscape characteristics to maintain or enhance the distinctive landscape character”.*

The respondent also seeks that the first sentence of Policy ENV 2 is amended to:

*‘Development proposals should be sited and designed to relate to the local landscape character of the area and ensure that the integrity of this landscape character is maintained or enhanced’.*

#### Policy ENV 3: Carbon Rich Soils

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** recommend a new paragraph be inserted after paragraph one and paragraph 3 as follows:

*“Where peat and other carbon rich soils are present, applicants should submit a peat management plan and/or enhancement plan to demonstrate how impacts on peat or peatland habitat have been avoided or minimised”.*

#### Policy ENV 4: Forestry, Trees and Woodland

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)** wish to see the following modifications to the Plan:

- In the first paragraph in the policy section add the sentence ‘Developers are encouraged to specifically consider native trees and woodland planting as part of their landscape plan.’
- The wording in the second paragraph should be changed to ‘*Developments that involve the loss or fragmentation of... will not be permitted.*’ In addition the following wording can be used: *Ancient woodland loss is irreplaceable, therefore, no replacement planting can ever make up for this loss. There are circumstances where woodland loss does happen, and in such cases we would expect to see appropriate replacement.* A requirement for replacement planting to be with native tree species should also be added.
- In relation to the second bullet point of the second paragraph the word ‘elsewhere’ should be replaced with ‘*on areas identified by the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Forestry and Woodland Strategy.*’
- Add a provision to the policy to say: ‘*Development likely to negatively impact on ancient woodland should be located away from these sites*’ and that ‘*The Council will aim for an increase in canopy cover across urban areas in West Dunbartonshire.*’

#### Policy ENV 6: Flooding

**Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/20)** request that the following wording is inserted into the first sentence of Policy ENV 6:

*“Except in circumstances which are demonstrated to be exceptional and unavoidable,...”*

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** request that link is inserted into the supporting text for the Policy to draw attention to the SNH commissioned Report: Impacts of sea-level rise and storm surges due to climate change in the Firth of Clyde’: <https://www.nature.scot/snh-commissioned-report-891-impacts-sea-level-rise-and-storm-surges-due-climate-change-firth-clyde>

#### Policy ENV 7: Advanced and Temporary Greening of Vacant and Derelict Land

**SNH (PLDP/640/20)** request that the final sentence of the policy is amended as follows:

*“Any temporary greening of a site should be preceded by a survey to establish any protected species licensing requirements and should not prevent the future development of the site concerned.”*

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/649/20)** recommend that the following wording is added onto the last sentence of the Policy:

*“and should also take account of any existing wildlife value of the site”*



#### Policy ENV 8: Air, Light and Noise Pollution

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)** seek an amendment to the policy to mention native trees and that increasing the canopy cover, as appropriate, to help absorb pollution and act as a noise barrier where this is needed.

#### Policy ENV 9: Contaminated Land

**The Coal Authority (PLDP/179)** request that the following text is either combined into Policy ENV 9 or becomes a new policy. Both examples are set out below (amendments to Policy ENV 9 are in bold and deletions as ~~abc~~):

##### ***“Policy ENV 9: Contaminated Land and Unstable Land***

*Developers will be required to establish the nature of any contamination **and land instability** on any potential development site. Where contamination **or land instability** is present and risks ~~to key receptors~~ are identified, then remediation will be required to ensure the site can be made suitable **and stable** for its future use.”*

Or

##### ***“Policy ENV xx: Unstable Land***

*In areas of past coal mining activity, developers will be required to establish the nature of any land instability on any potential development site. Where land instability is present and the risks posed are identified, then remediation works will be required to ensure the site can be made safe and stable for its future use.”*

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Councils responses to the representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped under the following subheadings: General; Safeguarding our Environment Introductory Text; Natural Environment Designations Map; Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation; Landscape and Policy ENV 2: Landscape Character; Policy ENV 3: Carbon Rich Soils; Policy ENV 4: Forestry, Trees and Woodland; Policy ENV 6: Flooding; Policy ENV 7: Advanced and Temporary Greening of Vacant and Derelict Land; Policy ENV 8: Air, Light and Noise Pollution; Policy ENV 9: Contaminated Land; and Policy ENV 10: Implementation of the SEA Environmental Report.

#### General

The support from **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/20)** for the Policy is welcomed.

The support from **SEPA (PLDP/676/20)** for this section of the Plan and the Policies within it is welcomed.

#### Natural Environment Designations Map

With regard to the representation made by **Persimmon Homes (PLDP/173/20)**, the Council agree that there is an error in the key in terms of the hatching used for the

Kilpatrick Hills and SSSI's. This is a drafting error and the Council consider that this is a non-notifiable modification that can be rectified before LDP 2 is adopted. However, should the Reporter wish to make the modification as the respondent requests the Council would have no objection to this being done so at this stage.

#### Safeguarding our Environment Introductory Text

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/20)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the text to insert an additional paragraph.

#### Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the policy being made, as requested by **Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (PLDP/007)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the policy being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/20)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

With regard to the representation by **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)**, the Council does not agree with the respondent that the Policy requires to be amended as they seek. The Policy is fully in accordance with the requirements of SPP (CD xx). Apart from the minor modifications to the Policy sought by SNH, they have not objected to the Policy and are content with its provisions. No modifications to the Policy are therefore considered necessary.

The support from **RSPB (PLDP/649/20)** for the Policy is welcomed.

#### Landscape and Policy ENV 2: Landscape Character

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the text and the policy being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/20)**, should the Reporter wish to amend both the text and policy.

#### Policy ENV 3: Carbon Rich Soils

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the text being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/20)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the text.

The support from **RSPB (PLDP/649/20)** for the Policy is welcomed.

#### Policy ENV 4: Forestry, Trees and Woodland

The Council does not agree with the representation from **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)** as the Policy wording is fully in line with SPP and the Scottish Government's policy on woodland removal. Moreover, Forestry Commission Scotland were involved in the wording of the Policy and have not objected to the Policy or its provisions and neither have SNH. No modification to the Plan is required in this instance.

#### Policy ENV 6: Flooding

With regard to the representation from **Malin Group Ltd (PLDP/177/20)**, the Council would have no objection to the proposed modification being made to the Policy should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

In response to **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/20)**, it is clear that their representation relates to Issue 6 on Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront and the Council's response to this particular representation is considered within that Issue.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to paragraph 3 being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/20)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the paragraph and would suggest the following wording being inserted after second last sentence of paragraph 3 on page 101 as follows (amendment in bold):

*"It is important to note that climate change is also increasing and frequency of flooding and that new development should, in particular, take account of rising levels within the River Clyde which information on can be found within SNH's commissioned Report: Impacts of sea-level rise and storm surges due to climate change in the Firth of Clyde: <https://www.nature.scot/snh-commissioned-report-891-impacts-sea-level-rise-and-storm-surges-due-climate-change-firth-clyde>."*

#### Policy ENV 7: Advanced and Temporary Greening of Vacant and Derelict Land

The support from **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/20)** for the Policy is welcomed.

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to the policy being made, as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/20)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

With regard to the representation from **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)**, the Council would have no objection to the proposed modification. Should the Reporter be of the view that an amendment to the policy is necessary, the Council would have no objection to the proposed wording being inserted into the policy as the respondent suggests.

#### Policy ENV 8: Air, Light and Noise Pollution

The Council does not agree with the representation by **Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/20)** as the policy already states that incorporating green infrastructure with a development can help to mitigate against adverse impacts. The Council is of the view that it is not necessary to specify types of green infrastructure within the policy as the respondent suggests as this would just add to confusion and duplication. No modification to the policy is therefore required.

#### Policy ENV 9: Contaminated Land

In relation to the representation from the **Coal Authority (PLDP/179)**, SPP does not require Local Development Plan 2 to include a policy or refer to development on unstable land. The Council is of the view that issues with ground stability are better addressed at the development management stage, in consultation with the Coal Authority and through detailed site investigations. By including reference to unstable land within this policy, the

Council is firmly of the view that this would add another layer of complexity to the assessment of a planning application and would result in the Council and not the developer being responsible for ensuring that the site is suitable for development. Therefore, the Council are of the view that no changes to the Policy are required with regard to this issue.

Policy ENV 10: Implementation of the SEA Environmental Report.

The support from **RSPB (PLDP/649/20)** for the Policy is welcomed.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 21	Connectivity	
Development plan reference:	Connectivity (Pages 106 – 107)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
SportScotland (PLDP/026/21) Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/21) Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/21) Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21) Network Rail (PLDP/662/21) Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/21) SPT (PLDP/675/21) (Support) SEPA (PLDP/676/21) (Support)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the development policies of the Plan which set out the Councils requirements for Transport, Core Paths and Natural Routes and Broadband and Communications Infrastructure.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
The representations received to this chapter have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General; Policy CON 1: Transportation Requirements for New Development; Outdoor Access and Policy CON 3: Core Paths and Natural Routes; Policy CON4: Installation of Superfast Broadband for New Development; and Policy CON5: Communications Infrastructure.		
<u>General</u>		
<b>Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21)</b> states that a consideration of freight should be included in the plan to reflect the requirements of Paragraph 282 of Scottish Planning Policy (CD xx).		
<b>Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21)</b> state that the development plan should identify at least one exemplar walking and cycling friendly settlement to demonstrate how active travel networks can be significantly improved in line with meeting their vision for increased cycling and to accord with paragraph 5.14 of National Planning Framework 3 (CD xx).		
<b>SEPA (PLDP/676/21)</b> are supportive of the general aims of the strategy and policies contained within this section, particularly those measures which can reduce vehicular usage with its links to detrimental air quality, climate change and human health. SEPA acknowledge the aims of the 'outdoor access' strategy and encourage the creation of core paths/walkways along watercourses, which builds on the provision of blue-green networks and infrastructure, as detailed in Policy CON 3.		
<u>Policy CON 1: Transportation Requirements for New Development</u>		
<b>Network Rail (PLDP/662/21)</b> state that the Policy covers developments contributions for		

the provision of transport infrastructure but wish to see more detail given on how this will be implemented. We also request that the LDP2 provides a specific reference to a requirement for developer contributions to be grouped and pooled across sites as an Infrastructure Levy for qualitative improvements towards rail infrastructure and/or station capacity facilities and level crossings where required as a direct consequence or generated requirement from a proposed development.

**SPT (PLDP/675/21)** support the Policy and welcome the recognition of the potential requirement for developers to contribute to transport services as well as infrastructure.

#### Outdoor Access and Policy CON 3: Core Paths and Natural Routes

**SportScotland (PLDP/026/21)** state that whilst some reference is made to the importance of routes for recreational purposes, the focus is largely on the Core Path Network and formal footpaths. SPP is clear on the need to protect all important access rights, including off-path (e.g. on/in water, specific climbing crags etc) and access rights extend to a range of recreational purposes, not just walking and cycling. Local Authorities have a statutory duty as set out in the Land Reform (Scotland) Act to uphold access rights, and it is important that this is reflected in development plan policy. As a result, SportScotland seeks modifications to both the text and Policy CON 3.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/21)** states that the Policy CON 3 does not mention bridleways within it and the consideration of safety for users on them.

#### Policy CON4: Installation of Superfast Broadband for New Development

**Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/21)** state that they now fit fibre to all new Persimmon homes developments but state the speed of the connection cannot be guaranteed as this is influenced by infrastructure in the wider area. They consider it unrealistic to set a speed for a fibre connection when the developer has little control over this.

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/21)** state that it is important to recognise that the connection speed itself depends on wider infrastructure. Therefore, the respondent does not consider it is appropriate to require specific connection speed as the wider infrastructure is not controlled by homebuilders on a given site and it would therefore not be possible for them to upgrade it, as this is the responsibility of infrastructure providers.

#### Policy CON5: Communications Infrastructure

**Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21)** request that the Policy is updated so that it fully reflects the criteria set out within Paragraphs 295 and 296 of Scottish Planning Policy.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### General

**Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21)** require the Plan to be modified to consider freight in line with the requirements of Paragraph 282 of Scottish Planning Policy.

**Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21)** require the Plan to be modified to identify at least one exemplar walking and cycling friendly settlement to demonstrate how active travel networks can be improved in line with the Scottish Government vision and to accord

with National Planning Framework 3.

#### Policy CON 1: Transportation Requirements for New Development

**Network Rail (PLDP/662/21)** wish the following text to be added after the end of the last paragraph of Policy CON 1:

*"Where appropriate, developer contributions will be grouped and pooled across sites as an Infrastructure levy for qualitative improvements towards rail infrastructure and/or station capacity facilities and level crossings where required as a direct consequence or generated requirement from a proposed development."*

#### Outdoor Access and Policy CON 3: Core Paths and Natural Routes

**SportScotland (PLDP/026/21)** seek the following modifications to the text on Outdoor Access on Page 107:

Insert the following text after paragraph 2:

*"Access rights extend beyond core paths and the formal path network and there are a number of sports in addition to walking and cycling, that use and are dependent on Scotland's natural environment and exercising broader access rights for their practice including off-path (e.g. in water, an important climbing crag). Development needs to consider any impacts of proposals on access for these users."*

**SportScotland (PLDP/026/21)** also seek the following modifications to Policy CON 3 (additions in bold/ deletions ~~abe~~) as follows:

*"Policy CON3*

#### *Core Paths, ~~and~~ Natural Routes **and Access***

*Improvements to and reinstatement of core paths and the development of new routes for core paths, footpaths, bridleways or cycle paths are encouraged and supported by the Council. Development of new routes should demonstrate that they will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of a Natura 2000 site. **Development proposals will recognise outdoor sport and recreation interests and consider any impacts on access rights for these users.***

*The Council, however, will not be supportive of development which disrupts or adversely impacts on any existing or potential core path, right of way, bridle path, or footpath used by the general public for recreational or other purposes. **This includes off-path access rights which must be protected.** Where such disruption or adverse impact is demonstrated to be unavoidable, the Council will require developers, as an integral part of the proposed development, to provide for the appropriate diversion of the route elsewhere within the development site or to put into place appropriate measures to mitigate and overcome the adverse impact expected."*

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/3)** does not seek a specific modification but it is inherent in the representation that bridleways should be added to the policy in some manner.



#### Policy CON4: Installation of Superfast Broadband for New Development

**Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/21)** suggest that Policy CON 4 is reworded as follows:

*“New residential as well as business and industrial developments shall be required to install the necessary infrastructure to enable all new premises to be connected to full fibre optical networks, and in accordance with the relevant telecommunications provider’s standards. Developers of these sites shall be required to ensure that all new premises have a direct full fibre connection at the premises and are encouraged to have early discussions with the relevant telecommunications provider when formulating their development proposals.”*

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/21)** consider the Policy should be amended as set out below (**addition**, deletion):

*“New residential as well as business and industrial developments shall be required, **where appropriate**, to install the necessary infrastructure to enable all new premises to be connected to full fibre optical networks, and in accordance with the relevant telecommunication provider’s standards. ~~Developers of these sites shall be required to ensure that all new premises have a direct full fibre connection ensuring that speeds in excess of 50 Megabytes per second can be provided at the premises and, as a consequence, are encouraged to have early discussions with the relevant telecommunications provider when formulating their development proposals.”~~*

#### Policy CON5: Communications Infrastructure

**Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21)** state that the Policy needs to be amended to reflect the criteria set out within Paragraphs 295 and 296 of Scottish Planning Policy.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council’s responses to the representations received to this chapter have been grouped under the following sub-headings: General; Policy CON 1: Transportation Requirements for New Development; Outdoor Access and Policy CON 3: Core Paths and Natural Routes; Policy CON4: Installation of Superfast Broadband for New Development; and Policy CON5: Communications Infrastructure.

#### General

The representation from the **Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21)** states that the Council, is required by Paragraph 282 to consider the need for improved and additional freight transfer stations and also facilities allowing the transfer of freight by from road to rail or water. The Council would contend that transporting freight by rail is not feasible within West Dunbartonshire due to the location of our regeneration and other business and industrial sites from the main railway lines and the general lack of demand for freight transfer infrastructure within the area. It would potentially also be cost prohibitive and have operational issues for Network Rail and would therefore not be able to be feasibly delivered within the Plan period.

There is the potential to transport freight from road to water at Rothesay Dock; Carless; and the Esso City Deal site, but there are no firm or concrete plans in effect at this time for

provision of freight interchanges at these locations. Therefore, the Council is not convinced that it is prudent to modify the Plan as the Scottish Government wish in this regard, as the provision or delivery of a freight interchange may not be viable within the plan period. Therefore, the Council do not agree that the Plan needs to be modified.

In relation to the second representation from the **Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21)**, the Council is of the view that it would be difficult to identify one settlement as an exemplar for walking and cycling to demonstrate how active travel routes can be significantly improved in line with the requirements of National Planning Framework 3 (CD xx) and the Scottish Governments vision. There are two strategic long distance walking and cycling routes running through the majority of the settlements within West Dunbartonshire: the Forth and Clyde Canal towpath and national cycle route (NCN7) and this is reflected within paragraph 1 on Page 107 of the plan.

In relation to the NCN 7, the Council and Sustrans have delivered five new links to this important cycle route and the Council secured an additional £375,000 worth of funding from Sustrans to upgrade two existing sections of the NCN in Bowling (1km) and Renton (3Km). The Council have submitted further bids to Sustrans for funding to create two additional new links: Clydebank North Circular Link, using the footway of the A82 to provide a link along the northern end of Clydebank between the Forth & Clyde Canal at Great Western Retail Park and Erskine Bridge, where it joins existing infrastructure.

The other proposed new link runs between Dumbarton Central Station and Jamestown using the footways of Townend Road and A813, as well as, Vale of Leven Industrial Estate. The existing upgraded NCN 7 will also be accessible via the existing bridges over the River Leven along the length of the route.

Similarly, Scottish Canals have made improvements to the Forth and Clyde Canal towpath, in partnership with the Council, and as it is a strategic green network project further funding can be used from the Councils developer contribution fund to provide further upgrades to the towpath for cycling and walking when and if required.

The Council therefore does not agree that the Plan needs modified to accord with NPF 3, as it is already in accordance with the Scottish Government's vision of providing an exemplar, namely the national cycle route, which demonstrates how active travel routes can be significantly improved for walking and cycling within West Dunbartonshire as a whole instead of focusing on one settlement.

The support of **SEPA (PLDP/676/21)** in relation to the aims of the strategy and policies within this section of the Plan is noted.

#### Policy CON 1: Transportation Requirements for New Development

The Council, in relation to the representation from **Network Rail (PLDP/662/21)**, does not agree that the Plan requires to be modified to ensure that developer contributions are grouped and pooled across sites as an Infrastructure Levy for qualitative improvements towards rail infrastructure and/or station capacity facilities and level crossings. The Council is of the view that this modification would not be in conformity with the test of Developer Contributions as set out in the Scottish Governments Planning Circular 3/2012: Planning obligations and good neighbour agreements (CD xx) and would potentially make the delivery of the key regeneration sites and other development sites within area unviable. It should be noted that many of these sites have abnormal and higher than average site

development costs. Also the reference to an infrastructure levy is contained within the proposed Planning Bill and not current legislation, therefore the Council is of the view that there is no legal planning framework that exists at this present time that would allow the modification that Network Rail seek to be implemented.

The Council is also of the view that it does not need to provide more detail on how the provision of transport infrastructure would be implemented should developers require to provide it. The reason for this is that it would be on a case by case basis and is more a matter for the development management stage to address.

The support from **SPT (PLDP/675/21)** with regard the potential requirement for developers to contribute to transport services as well as infrastructure is welcomed.

#### Outdoor Access and Policy CON 3: Core Paths and Natural Routes

The Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to Paragraph 2 on Page 107 being made, as requested by **SportScotland (PLDP/026/21)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the policy.

With regard to the representation from **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/21)**, it should be noted that Policy CON 3 does refer to Bridleways and Bridlepaths. No modification to the Policy is therefore required.

#### Policy CON4: Installation of Superfast Broadband for New Development

Although the issues contained within the representations from **Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/21)** and **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/21)** are understood, the European Union and the Digital Scotland Superfast Broadband programme, which the Council and residents of West Dunbartonshire benefited from, defined superfast broadband as speeds of 30 Megabytes per Second (Mbps) or above. The Scottish Government's Digital Strategy (2017) (Supporting Information xx) seeks to ensure that every premise in Scotland is able to access broadband speeds of at least 30 Megabits per second by 2021. The Council believe that it is important to set a minimum speed so that the correct infrastructure is in place for new developments. This is the responsibility of the developer in conjunction with infrastructure providers, to ensure that each premise is future proofed for superfast broadband speed, which is in line with the Scottish Government's Digital Strategy. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

#### Policy CON5: Communications Infrastructure

With regard to the representation from the **Scottish Government (PLDP/659/21)**, the Council is of the view that the Policy, whilst not regurgitating Paragraphs 295 and 296 of SPP (CD xx) verbatim, reflects the content of these Paragraphs and sets out the matters to be addressed in planning applications for developments associated with Communications Infrastructure. No modifications to the Policy are therefore required.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 22	Renewable Energy	
Development plan reference:	Renewable Energy (Pages 110 -116)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/22) Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/22) (Support) East Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/648/22) (Support) RSPB (PLDP649/22) (Support) Scottish Government (PLDP/659/22) Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/22) SEPA (PLDP/676/22) (Support)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates the development polices of the Plan in relation to renewable energy and the Councils requirements in this regard.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
The representations to this chapter are broken down into the following sub-headings: General; Policy RE 2: Spatial Framework for Wind Energy; Policy RE 3: Wind Energy Developments outwith the Spatial Framework; Policy RE 4: Heat Generation; and Policy RE5: Low and Zero Carbon Buildings.		
<u>General</u>		
<b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/22)</b> support all policies within the Renewable Energy section of the Proposed Plan, particularly Policy RE 5. The Community Council considers that these policies are contributing and providing urgent steps to helping Scotland achieve a low carbon economy.		
<b>RSPB (PLDP649/22)</b> support Policies RE1 and RE2.		
<b>SEPA (PLDP/676/22)</b> support the strategies and policies in the plan as they allow for renewable developments to be considered and that they are subject to the development management criteria set out in Scottish Planning Policy. The location, type and scale of the proposals will be clearly be critical in determining the potentially acceptability of the scheme and in all cases it will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated that these proposals will not case detrimental environmental impacts.		
<u>Policy RE 2: Spatial Framework for Wind Energy</u>		
<b>East Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/648/22)</b> consider that the approach to Windfarm Development on the Kilpatrick Hills (see Issue 12) through Policy RE 2 is consistent with the approach taken in East Dunbartonshire. The Council note that Supplementary Guidance will be prepared on Renewable Energy and wish to be consulted on the Guidance.		

**The Scottish Government (PLDP/659/22)** is of the view that the Policy should not require wind energy proposals within the spatial framework to be acceptable in all terms of the development management criteria within Paragraph 169 of Scottish Planning Policy as the list of criteria is not exhaustive and that considerations will vary to the scale of the proposal and area characteristics. It therefore does not require all decisions to be assessed against all the considerations that are listed.

#### Policy RE 3: Wind Energy Developments outwith the Spatial Framework

**The Scottish Government (PLDP/659/22)** is of the view that the Policy is not clear that it applies to wind turbine proposals outwith the spatial framework.

#### Policy RE 4: Heat Generation

**Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/22)** raise concerns over the viability of incorporating heat generating technology into housing developments. They question the appropriateness of safeguarding land within new developments for future unknown technology as this cannot be factored into the land price.

**The Scottish Government (PLDP659/22)** is of the view that Paragraph 169 of Scottish Planning Policy does not require that decisions should always be assessed against all the considerations listed as they are not exhaustive and considerations will vary to the scale of the proposal and area characteristics.

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/22)** state that they have consistently raised concerns over the potential that a requirement to deliver heat networks in new developments could further undermine the commercial viability of those developments. They refer to the fact that revisions to Building Standards have made new homes 75% more efficient than they were in 1990 and are likely to see further revisions to Building Standards will see new homes require next to zero space heating by 2021.

They are of the view that the continuation of a fabric first approach through building standards rather than a policy is appropriate. They further question the merit of safeguarding land within new developments which include new homes with a far higher efficiency energy performance than older housing stock and are of the view that this land could be better utilised for more beneficial uses such as new homes or green space rather than future projects which are not currently planned and do not have funding agreed.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/22)** are supportive of the requirements on all developments to prepare and submit energy statements with their planning applications and the need to set aside land, in certain circumstances, for the installation of appropriate infrastructure i.e. pipe networks.

SEPA refer to the Queens Quay Developments as an excellent example of alternative sources of heat being delivered within a large mixed use development but do recognise that the provision of district heating networks will not always be achievable. In these circumstances, alternative options are available which still result in the promotion of lowering the carbon footprint on new developments as detailed in Policy RE 5 and Table 9.

#### Policy RE5: Low and Zero Carbon Buildings

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/22)** is of the view the continuation of a fabric first approach through building standards rather than a policy is appropriate. The ambition of the policy, to reduce emissions, is already covered by Building Standards and does not need to be replicated. Furthermore, the reliance on brownfield sites, may already with challenging viability, means that further policy requirements need to be weighed against the desirability of new development coming forward on vacant land.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### Policy RE 2: Spatial Framework for Wind Energy

**The Scottish Government (PLDP/659/22)** seek the following changes to the Policy:

Amend the Policy so that it does not require a proposal to be acceptable in terms of all of the development management criteria contained within Paragraph 169 of SPP in every case.

##### Policy RE 3: Wind Energy Developments outwith the Spatial Framework

**The Scottish Government (PLDP/659/22)** seek the following changes to the Policy:

The Policy should be clarified to make clear that the policy only refers to applications within the Local Authority area.

##### Policy RE 4: Heat Generation

**Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/22)** suggest that Policy RE4 is amended by omitting the following wording from the second paragraph:

*Proposals for new development should ensure that the site can be connected to Energy Centres and Heat Networks, including district heating, which may be developed in the future. Developers should ensure that the necessary capacity, infrastructure and land for future connections and the potential development of Energy Centres are safeguarded within the site.*

**The Scottish Government (PLDP659/22)** seek the following changes to the Policy:

Amend sentence 2 of paragraph 3 to read: 'All proposals will require to meet with the relevant development management criteria set out in paragraph 169 of SPP'.

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/22)** seek the following changes **additions/ deletions** to:

Policy RE 4: Developments associated with the renewable generation of heat will be supported. Where non-renewable generation of heat is proposed, the Council will support these developments only where greenhouse gas emissions are significantly reduced; form part of a carbon capture development; or where the applicant can demonstrate plans for conversion to renewable or low carbon sources of heat in the future.

The Council will also be supportive of the provision of energy centres, where appropriate, within new development. All new heat generating developments should, where possible,



be located close to potential heat users and the possibility of developing heat networks, including district heat networks, should be investigated. Proposals for new development should **give consideration to whether connection to existing** ensure that the site can be connected to Energy Centres and Heat Networks, including district heating **could be achieved.** , which may be developed in the future. Developers should ensure that the necessary capacity, infrastructure and land for future connections and the potential development of Energy Centres are safeguarded within the site.

Where heat networks are not viable, micro-generation and heat recovery technologies, within or associated with individual properties, will be encouraged by the Council. All proposals will require to meet with the Development Management criteria set out in Paragraph 169 of Scottish Planning Policy. Thermal treatment plants will also require to meet with SEPA's Thermal Treatment of Waste Guidelines 2014.

#### Policy RE5: Low and Zero Carbon Buildings

**Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/22)** state that the policy should be deleted.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council's responses to the representations to this chapter are broken down into the following sub-headings: General; Policy RE 2: Spatial Framework for Wind Energy; Policy RE 3: Wind Energy Developments outwith the Spatial Framework; Policy RE 4: Heat Generation; and Policy RE5: Low and Zero Carbon Buildings.

#### **General**

The support for policies within the section by **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/22)** and **RSPB (PLDP649/22)** is welcomed.

The support for the strategy and policies within the section by **SEPA (PLDP/676/22)** is welcomed.

#### Policy RE 2: Spatial Framework for Wind Energy

The support of **East Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/648/22)** is welcomed.

The **Scottish Government (PLDP/659/22)** in response to Policy RE 2, the Council accept the amendment to Policy RE 2 to specify that wind energy developments within the spatial framework should be assessed against the relevant considerations contained within Paragraph 169 of Scottish Planning Policy (CD xx). Should the Reporter wish to amend the policy, the Council would have no objection to the policy being changed and would suggest the following amendments (the proposed amendments are in bold):

*"Significant protection will be given to Group 2 areas as shown on Spatial Framework for Wind Energy Development Map over. Development may be appropriate in some circumstances within these areas but only in cases where it can be demonstrated that any significant adverse effects on the qualities of these areas can be substantially overcome by siting, design or other mitigation and where the proposal is acceptable in terms of **the relevant** Development Management criteria set out in Paragraph 169 of Scottish Planning Policy.*



*Within Group 3 areas, as shown on Spatial Framework for Wind Energy Development Map over, proposals for wind energy developments will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that they are acceptable in terms of **the relevant** Development Management criteria contained within Paragraph 169 of Scottish Planning Policy and accord with the guidance set out in the Renewable Energy Supplementary Guidance.”*

#### Policy RE 3: Wind Energy Developments outwith the Spatial Framework

The Council believes that Policy RE 3 is adequately clear enough from its title to differentiate that it applies to those wind energy developments outwith the spatial boundary and that it clearly applies to the areas within the West Dunbartonshire Local Planning Authority Boundary. The area that is outwith this, but within the Local Authority Boundary, is the responsibility of the Local Lomond and Trossachs National Park Planning Authority and the Local Development Plan in force within that area. No modifications are required as a result of the representation by the **Scottish Government (PLDP/659/22)**.

#### Policy RE 4: Heat Generation

With regard to the **Scottish Government’s (PLDP659/22)** suggested modification to Policy RE 4, the Council consider that an amendment to the policy may be appropriate to ensure that the policy applies to the relevant development management criteria set out in paragraph 169 of Scottish Planning Policy. Should the Reporter wish to amend the policy, the Council would have no objection to the policy being changed as the Scottish Government suggest.

However, the Council does not share the views of **Persimmon Homes West Scotland (PLDP/173/22)** and **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/22)** that Policy RE 4 is required to be amended as they suggest, as the Policy is fully compliant with paragraphs 158, 159 and 160 of Scottish Planning Policy and should not be left solely to the requirements of the Building Standards regulations. The Policy is also fully compliant with the Scottish Government’s aims of moving towards a low carbon economy and will help to meet the climate change targets set in this regard by the Government. No modification to the Policy is required.

#### Policy RE5: Low and Zero Carbon Buildings

The Council is of the view that Policy RE 5 should not be deleted as **Homes for Scotland (PLDP/669/22)** suggest, as Local Development Plan 2 is required to conform to Section 3F of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) (CD xx) by requiring low and zero-carbon generating technologies to be installed on new buildings in order to deliver a percentage of the carbon dioxide emissions reduction required in Building Standards. Policy RE 5 is designed to ensure that the percentage reduction to be achieved through low and zero-carbon generating technology is always a part of the Building Standard at any point in time. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

#### **Reporter’s conclusions:**

#### **Reporter’s recommendations:**

Issue 23	Minerals and Coal	
Development plan reference:	Minerals, Aggregates and Coal Extraction Chapter (Pages 118-119); Policy MIN 1; Policy MIN 2; Policy MIN 3; and Unconventional Oil and Gas	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
East Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/648/23) (Support) RSPB (PLDP/649/23) (Support) Scottish Government (PLDP/659/23) SEPA (PLDP/676/23) (Support)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to Minerals, Aggregates and Coal Extraction chapter of the Plan, particularly Policy MIN 1: Minerals and Aggregates Extraction; Policy MIN 2: Financial Guarantees; and Policy MIN 3: Coal.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>The representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped into the following sub-headings: Minerals, Aggregates and Coal Extraction Introductory text; Policy MIN 1: Minerals and Aggregates Extraction; Policy MIN 2: Financial Guarantees; Policy MIN 3: Coal; and Unconventional Oil and Gas.</p> <p><u>Minerals, Aggregates and Coal Extraction Introductory text</u></p> <p><b>SEPA (PLDP/676/23)</b> support the safeguards provided in the text and policies proposed in the plan and state that the aim of the planning authority will be to ensure that where these type of activities are to be permitted, they will be subject to appropriate assessment, mitigation and financial provision. In addition, current sites with existing reserves will continue to ensure there is an adequate supply of minerals/aggregates to support economic growth.</p> <p><u>Policy MIN 1: Minerals and Aggregates Extraction</u></p> <p><b>RSPB (PLDP/649/23)</b> states that it would be useful to give some examples of the end-uses that would be supported following restoration and recommends that uses, such as tourism, leisure, forestry, nature conservation and agriculture, are added to the Policy.</p> <p><b>Scottish Government (PLDP/659/23)</b> seek a change to the Policy to bring it into alignment with Paragraph 237 of SPP in order to make reference to the fact that all workable mineral resources which are of economic or conservation value are not sterilised by other development.</p> <p><u>Policy MIN 2: Financial Guarantees</u></p> <p><b>RSPB (PLDP/649/23)</b> recommend that the Council set out guidance in this regard along similar lines to that of East Ayrshire Council. Whilst this is particularly required for</p>		

opencast coal sites, this is also a relevant issue for other industries including landfill, onshore wind and, potentially, unconventional gas development. The respondent also recommends that consideration is given to the new approach by East Ayrshire Council to compliance monitoring.

Furthermore, the respondent states that the Council should conduct annual reviews of the provision of financial guarantees for major developments with significant restoration and aftercare liabilities. This will help avoid a situation where liabilities pass to local authorities in the case of failure of the developer to make adequate financial provision.

#### Policy MIN 3: Coal

**East Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/648/23)** support the approach to mineral resources in Policy MIN3 and the presumption against coal extraction within the Antonine Wall Heritage Site Buffer Zone.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/23)** supports this Policy.

**Scottish Government (PLDP/659/23)** seek a change to the Policy to ensure that there is a presumption against development within a buffer zone of 500 metres from the edge of settlements, unless there are overriding benefits which outweigh the likely benefits from development. This is required to bring the Policy into alignment with Paragraph 237 of SPP.

#### Unconventional Oil and Gas

**RSPB (PLDP/649/23)** supports the position on unconventional oil and gas.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**RSPB (PLDP/649/23)** suggest Policy MIN 1 should be amended to include the following Paragraph:

‘Restoration proposals are required to restore the land to the highest possible standards to ensure its suitability for appropriate uses, including tourism, leisure, forestry, nature conservation and agriculture to the benefit of local communities.’

**Scottish Government (PLDP/659/23)** seek a change to Policy MIN 1 to make reference to the need to safeguard all workable mineral resources which are of economic or conservation value and ensure that these are not sterilised by other development.

**RSPB (PLDP/649/23)**, although not seeking a specific amendment to Policy MIN 2, seem to suggest the at the Policy is amended to commit the Council to bringing forward Supplementary Guidance on Financial Guarantees and to reference this within Policy MIN 2.

**Scottish Government (PLDP/659/23)** seek a change to Policy MIN 3 to reference the need to ensure that there is a presumption against development within a buffer zone of 500 metres from the edge of settlements, unless there are overriding benefits which outweigh the likely benefits from development.

## **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Councils responses to the representations to this section of the Plan have been grouped into the following sub-headings: Minerals, Aggregates and Coal Extraction Introductory text; Policy MIN 1: Minerals and Aggregates Extraction; Policy MIN 2: Financial Guarantees; Policy MIN 3: Coal; and Unconventional Oil and Gas.

### **Policy MIN 1: Minerals and Aggregates Extraction**

The Council have no objections to the proposed modifications to the Policy as requested by **RSPB (PLDP/649/23)**, should the Reporter be agreeable to this amendment and considers that a change to the Policy is required. Should this be the case then the Council suggests that last paragraph of the Policy is amended as suggested by the RSPB.

With regard to **Scottish Government (PLDP/659/23)**, the Council is of the view that an amendment to the Policy may be required to make specific reference to the requirements of SPP (CDxx) in relation to the sterilisation of mineral resources. Should the Reporter wish to amend the policy, the Council would have no objection to the policy being changed and would suggest the following wording is inserted after paragraph 2:

*“When assessing development proposals, the Council will ensure that that all workable minerals resources, which are of economic or conservation value, are safeguarded. There will be a presumption against other forms of developments which would permanently sterilise these resources, unless their retention in the ground can be fully justified.”*

The support and comments from **SEPA (PLDP/676/23)** are welcomed and noted.

### **Policy MIN 2: Financial Guarantees**

Although the recommendation by **RSPB (PLDP/649/23)** is noted and understood, the Council is of the view that the provisions of the Policy itself is considered to be robust and effective to not require Supplementary Guidance on Financial Guarantees to be provided.

The Council, on an annual basis, reports to Planning Committee on the monitoring of the conditions attached to existing operational Quarries and the developers compliance with them. The report would also flag up any other issues that the Council's Compliance Officer and the Planning Officer has noted when monitoring the sites. The Council is of the view that this approach is effective, but benchmarking with other authorities and learning from them will ensure that our approach is flexible and can be updated to take on board best practice elsewhere.

No modification to the Policy is therefore required in this regard.

### **Policy MIN 3: Coal**

The support of **East Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/648/23)** and the **RSPB (PLDP/649/23)** is welcomed.

In response to the representation made by **Scottish Government (PLDP/659/23)**, the Council would point out that it has a presumption against the extraction of coal in West Dunbartonshire, which is reinforced through the Policy itself. The Council is therefore of

the view that the modification sought by the respondent does not require to be inserted into the policy, as the Policy is not supportive of any application for coal extraction. One of the reasons for this is that the coal reserves within West Dunbartonshire are in close proximity to existing communities.

### **Unconventional Oil and Gas**

The support of **RSPB (PLDP/649/23)** is welcomed.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 24	Private Housing Sites: Clydebank	
Development plan reference:	Policy H2 (Page 78) and Schedule 2: Opportunity for Private Housing (Pages 123-125)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Clydebank Engineering & Fabrication Ltd (PLDP/009) Mr Stephen Laurie (PLDP/012) Mrs Linda Walker (PLDP/013) Mr Marc Walker (PLDP/015) Mr Petr Josifek (PLDP/017 ) SportScotland (PLDP/026) SNH (PLDP/640/24) Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/24) Councillor John Mooney (PLDP/667/24) Clydebelt (PLDP/673/24)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the private housing opportunity sites within Clydebank.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<u>H2 (8) Braidfield High School</u>  <b>Mr Petr Josifek (PLDP/017)</b> raises a number of issues about the allocation, design and construction work on this consented housing site and the impact on his property, which is surrounded on 3 sides by the development site. He states that his property will be overshadowed and overlooked by the proposed development. Mr Josifek also raises issues regarding the proposed rerouting of a power cable and mains water switch, land ownership for the boundaries of his garden, the potential removal of a tree within his garden as a result of the development, and alleged damage to a fence through spraying, and dust creation from drilling of the adjacent land. He also requests details about the siting of new dwellings relative to wastewater infrastructure.  <b>SportScotland (PLDP/026/24)</b> state that as the site comprises a former Secondary school and two synthetic grass pitches it is likely that sportscotland would be a statutory consultee, should a planning application be submitted for development of the Site. They note that as the school merged with Clydebank High School compensatory sports provision may have already been provided locally following the school redevelopment. They request details of this when being consulted on any such planning application to ensure that the development complies with SPP.  <u>H2 (9) Cable Depot Road</u> <b>Please note that this issue is also considered within Issue 3: Queens Quay, Clydebank.</b>		

**Clydebank Engineering & Fabrication Ltd (PLDP/009)** state that they currently occupy numbers 30,31,33 and 111 Cable Depot Road employing 40 staff. Their business is laser cutting and steel fabrication, which can generate noise. As such they are concerned that having housing so close by would be problematic.

#### H2 (11) Queens Quay

**Please note that this issue is also considered within Issue 3: Queens Quay, Clydebank.**

**Ms L Walker (PLDP/013)** object to housing on this site as it will restrict the light coming into the respondents property; it will increase traffic; and put a strain on traffic. Housing should not be allowed adjacent to Glasgow Road and if buildings were to be erected, they should be no taller than the existing buildings on Glasgow Road.

**Mr M Walker (PLDP/015)** objects to the proposed change from commercial to residential development due to the detrimental effect on the light entering the respondents property; will heavily impact upon the road infrastructure; and would have environmental issues. Also seeks clarification on the height of the housing on the site and states that it cannot be any higher than the original building.

#### H2 (25) Carleith

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/24)** states that any future proposed housing at this site should be of a design and layout that is appropriate to its setting as part of a farmyard, backed by the greenbelt, Kilpatrick Hills and Antonine Wall World Heritage Site. They would object to any additional greenbelt land beyond this site being used for residential or tourist facilities.

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/24)** separate to their other representation, Clydebelt are supportive of the residential designation of the site.

#### H2 (33) Carless

#### **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/24)**

**Please note this representation is fully considered and addressed within Issue 5: Carless.**

#### H2 (36) Clydebank Health Centre

**SNH (PLDP/640/24)** support the designation of the site, however, to ensure the development relates to the key landscape characteristics and reduces visual effects, they recommend the Council sets out developer requirements which cover green links and pathways through and around the site, tree planting and tree retention, and the siting and design of the new housing.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/24)** call into question the effectiveness of the site and whether the 40 units can be delivered by 2024.

**Councillor John Mooney (PLDP/667/24)** states that as his constituents need modern community facilities, the site should be designated for mixed uses rather than housing.



## H2 (37) Hardgate Health Centre

**Mr Stephen Laurie (PLDP/012)** states that he does not think residential use of the site is sensible, given that the site is currently used by the NHS and has no parking facilities onsite. He also states the building is in a difficult position on the corner of Stewart Drive and Kilbowie Road, with a school (Goldenhill Primary) on Stewart Drive and a crossing controlled by lights adjacent to the site, on Kilbowie Road, which make it very difficult to get cars in and out of his house and the site. He is also concerned that as his property is joined on to the Health Centre, there may be damage to the house if the building is taken down.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/24)** call in the questions the effectiveness of this site as there is no indication of when it will be made available to the market.

## Site H2 (38) RHI Site

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/24)** question the effectiveness of this site and state there is no planning proposal in the pipeline, as far as they are aware, that could see 40 units delivered by 2024.

## **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

### H2 (8) Braidfield High School

**Mr Petr Josifek (PLDP/017)** is seeking the removal of the residential designation on the site.

**SportScotland (PLDP/026/24)** request to be consulted on any future planning application for the site.

### H2 (9) Cable Depot Road

**Please note that this issue is also considered within Issue 3.**

**Clydebank Engineering & Fabrication Ltd (PLDP/009)** seek removal of the residential designation on the site.

### H2 (11) Queens Quay

**Ms L Walker (PLDP/013) and Mr M Walker (PLDP/015)** seek removal of the residential designation on the site.

### H2 (25) Carleith

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/24)** are seeking a modification to only allow the ground proposed in the previous consent to be developed.

### H2 (33) Carless

**The representation from Clydebelt (PLDP/673/24) is fully considered and addressed within Issue 5.**

## H2 (36) Clydebank Health Centre

**SNH (PLDP/640/24)** are seeking a modification to include setting out developer requirements for the site covering the following:

- Establishment of green links and pathways alongside West Thomson Street and Kilbowie Road, across the site and between Kilbowie Primary School and Boquhanran Park.
- The need for tree planting and streetscape design along the edges of West Thomson Street and Kilbowie Road.
- Retention of existing trees by the junction of West Thomson Street and Kilbowie Road.
- Siting and design of the housing to reduce visual effects from existing residents, especially to the north and south.

**Councillor John Mooney (PLDP/667/24)** is seeking that the designation of the site is changed from residential to mixed use.

## H2 (37) Hardgate Health Centre

**Mr Stephen Laurie (PLDP/012)** is seeking the removal of the allocation of the site for residential use.

## **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

### H2 (8) Braidfield High School

With regard to the representation from **Mr Petr Josifek (PLDP/017)**, the Council notes that this site now has detailed planning consent and that construction of the site has commenced. It is further noted that most of the detailed site design and layout issues, and other issues that the respondent has raised, were addressed as part of the Development Management consideration of the planning application. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

The comments of **SportScotland (PLDP/026/24)** are duly noted; however, the site has been granted planning permission and development has commenced.

### H2 (9) Cable Depot Road

**Please note that this representation is also considered within Issue 3 and the response below is the same that is given within that particular Issue.**

With regard to the representation from **Clydebank Engineering & Fabrication Ltd (PLDP/009)**, the site is considered to be an effective housing site and is required as part of the wider housing land requirement for the plan; will assist with the removal of a vacant and potentially contaminated land; and will contribute to the wider regeneration of Queens Quay as a whole. Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Plan will help to ensure that the amenity of the new housing site is not unduly affected by its location close to existing businesses. Issues with noise and amenity are detailed design considerations which will be addressed

at the Development Management stage. The Council is therefore of the view that the site should not be deleted from the Plan for the reasons set out above.

#### H2 (11) Queens Quay

**Please note that this representation is also considered within Issue 3 and the response below is the same that is given within that particular Issue.**

With regard to the representations from **Ms L Walker (PLDP/013)** and **Mr M Walker (PLDP/015)**, the Council would point out that this site already has full planning permission for residential development. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

#### H2 (25) Carleith

The Council notes the support of **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/24)** for designation of the site, and acknowledges their concerns expressed in their separate representation (**PLDP/673/24**) regarding potential proposals beyond the proposed site. The Council would point out that planning consent for residential use has been previously granted – although this has now lapsed, and no additional uses, or areas beyond the site, are proposed for development within the Plan. The land beyond remains designated as Greenbelt in Local Development Plan 2. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### H2 (33) Carless

The representation to this site from **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/24)** is fully considered and addressed within Issue 5.

#### H2 (36) Clydebank Health Centre

With regard to the representation from **SNH (PLDP/640/24)** the Council would point out that the developer requirements sought by the SNH are matters that would normally be considered through the Development Management process for a planning application. However, it is considered that Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Plan will help to address the concerns expressed by the respondent when an application is considered. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

With regard to **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland's (PLDP/664/24)** representation, the NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde indicate that disposal of this site will be before 2024 based on the timescale for the construction and completion of the new Clydebank Health Centre on Queens Quay. As a result of this information, the site is programmed for delivery before 2024 and the Council is of the view that this is sufficient information to consider that the site is effective, contrary to the view of Taylor Wimpey.

In response to the representation from **Councillor John Mooney (PLDP/667/24)**, the Council would note that in order to allocate a site for a particular use, the Council must have a reasonable expectation that the proposed use is realistic and deliverable within the Plan period. This site was proposed to the Local Development Plan process by the NHS as a residential site, and they have committed to releasing the site for development before 2024. There is a continuing requirement to maintain a varied and effective housing land supply, and this site is considered to be able to contribute to this supply. Equally, the Council is not aware of any established need for, or proposals for, new community facilities or mixed uses for the site. As such it is considered that the residential allocation is

justified and appropriate and that no modifications are required.

#### H2 (37) Hardgate Health Centre

In response to the representation by **Mr Stephen Laurie (PLDP/012)**, the Council acknowledges his concerns regarding development of the site. However, the site has been put forward for residential use by NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, who intend to vacate the site once the new Clydebank Health Centre at Queens Quay is open. Detailed design and layout issues, including parking and access arrangements, and the connection to Mr Laurie's property, are a matter for the Development Management process once a planning application for the site is received. However, it is considered that Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Plan will help to address the concerns expressed by the respondent when an application is considered. It is also noted that residential use of the site may potentially involve the reuse and adaption of the existing building, rather than demolition, given that it is already of a broadly domestic scale and design. Overall, the Council considers that the site is suitable and effective as a residential site, and that no modification to the Plan is required.

With regard to **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/24)**, they do not provide any substantive evidence or reasoning for their assertion that this site is not effective. Not knowing the timescales for bringing a site to market is not a reason for determining that a site is not effective. The NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde indicate that disposal of this site will be before 2024 based on the timescale for the construction and completion of the new Clydebank Health Centre on Queens Quay. As a result of this information, the site is programmed for delivery before 2024 and the Council is of the view that this is sufficient information to consider that site is effective, contrary to the view of Taylor Wimpey.

#### H2 (38) RHI Site

Contrary to the view of **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/24)**, the site has been purchased by a Homes for Scotland Member who has submitted a Pre-application Notice (PAN) for the site on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2019 and prior to that, the Council had pre-application discussions about the planning application for the site. It is anticipated that a planning application for the site will be brought forward in summer 2019. The Council is of the view that this site is indeed effective and will be delivered within the Plan period.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 25	Private Housing Sites: Dumbarton	
Development plan reference:	Policy H2 (Page 78); Schedule 2: Opportunities for Private Housing (Pages 123-125); and Schedule 3: Opportunities for Social Rented Housing (Page 126)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
SportScotland (PLDP/026/25) Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP182/25) SNH (PLDP/640/25) Avant Homes (Scotland) (PLDP/642/25) (Support) Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/25) Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/25) SEPA (PLDP/676/25)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the housing opportunity sites within Dumbarton that are included within Schedule 2; Schedule 3 and Policy H2: Housing Sites.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<u>H2 (17) Crosslet Estate, Dumbarton</u>  <b>Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP182/25)</b> request the removal of this site as it is immediately adjacent to the Local Nature Conservation Site of Overtoun Estate, Overtoun Burn and Barrwood Hill. They state that the Environmental Report suggests that there would be a potential adverse impact on the Local Nature Conservation Site.  <u>H2 (18) Castlegreen Street, Dumbarton</u>  <b>SNH (PLDP/640/25)</b> seek modifications to the notes in Schedule 2 (p.125) of the Plan, relating to the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) to provide additional clarity and consistency across the Plan and with the Habitats Regulation Appraisal (HRA) text.  <u>H2 (20) Kiel School Phase 2, Dumbarton</u>  <b>Avant Homes (Scotland) (PLDP/642/25)</b> support the residential designation of the site.  <u>H2 (22) Notre Dame Convent</u>  <b>Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/25)</b> state that, although Homes for Scotland have not challenged the programming, there is considerable uncertainty over the delivery of this site, as it has been in the housing land supply since 1998 with little progress shown. It is evident that there remain many constraints to bringing this site forward in a reasonable timescale.		

H2(23) Our Lady & St Patrick's High School

**SportScotland (PLDP/026/25)** state that as this site contains a synthetic pitch, SportScotland would likely be a statutory consultee under the Development Management (2013) Regulations, for any application for development that would impact on the pitch, and consideration will need to be given to compensation requirements.

H2 (24) Sandpoint Marina

**SNH (PLDP/640/25)** seek modifications to the notes in Schedule 2 (p.125) of the Plan, relating to the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) to provide additional clarity and consistency across the Plan and with the Habitats Regulation Appraisal (HRA) text.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/25)** suggest that the site may not be capable of delivering the number of housing units presented within the plan in order to avoid putting people and property at risk.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

H2 (17) Crosslet Estate, Dumbarton

**Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP182/25)** seek the removal of this site from the Plan.

H2 (18) Castlegreen Street, Dumbarton

**SNH (PLDP/640/25)** seek that the wording in the Notes on Schedule 2, page 125, relating to the site should be replaced with the following:

*“Development at Castlegreen Street Dumbarton must also not have an adverse effect on the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC) for which Atlantic salmon, Brook lamprey and River lamprey are the qualifying interests or on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development”.*

H2 (22) Notre Dame Convent

**Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/25)** seek to remove this site from the housing land supply as contributing towards the LDP Housing Supply Target.

H2(23) Our Lady & St Patrick's High School

**SportScotland (PLDP/026/25)** seek to be consulted on any planning application for the site. Any proposals affecting the synthetic pitch will require compensation measures.

H2 (24) Sandpoint Marina



**SNH (PLDP/640/25)** seek that the wording in the Notes on Schedule 2, page 125, relating to the site should be replaced with the following:

*“Development at Sandpoint Marina, Dumbarton must also not have an adverse effect on the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC) for which Atlantic salmon, Brook lamprey and River lamprey are the qualifying interests or on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development”.*

H2 (62) Littlemill Distillery, Bowling

**SNH (PLDP/640/25)** are seeking that the Council attaches developer requirements to the site designation, covering the following:

- Retention and reinforcement of the existing trees along the western and northern boundaries. In addition, new trees along the eastern and southern boundaries may improve integration of the new housing within the landscape pattern and reduce visual effects from nearby properties.
- The layout of the units should relate to the linear shape and orientation of the site in parallel to the A814 and cycle path whilst their scale, massing and materials should relate to other properties within the surrounding landscape.
- Repair or reinstatement of the stone wall along the edge of the A814 and protection of the existing watercourse.

**Woodland Trust Scotland (PLDP/646/25)** are seeking the inclusion of a developer requirement that ensures that trees are retained on site and if appropriate, replacement native tree planting should be requested.

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

H2 (17) Crosslet Estate, Dumbarton

In relation to the representation from **Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP182/25)**, the Council does acknowledge that the Environmental Report highlights likely adverse impacts on biodiversity, such as the natural assets that the Community Council raise; however, this has been taken out of context as the Environmental Report states that the assessment of this site in terms of biodiversity has been undertaken on a precautionary principle due to the layout of the site being unknown. The Environmental Report has then suggested mitigation measures, which any developer of the site will have to address to be in conformity with Policy ENV 10 of the Plan. The revised assessment, assuming that the mitigation measures would be implemented, concluded that there were likely to significant positive impacts on the site. The Council therefore disagrees with the Community Council that the site should be removed on these grounds and is of the view that this site will improve the environment that surrounds it through good design in accordance with Policies CP 1 and CP 2 of the Plan. No modification to the Plan is



therefore considered necessary.

#### H2 (18) Castlegreen Street, Dumbarton

The Council has no objection to the proposed modification to the Note on Schedule 2 on page 125 of the Plan as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/25)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the note.

#### H2 (20) Kiel School Phase 2, Dumbarton

The Council welcomes the support of **Avant Homes (Scotland) (PLDP/642/25)** for the residential designation of the site.

#### H2 (22) Notre Dame Convent, Dumbarton

It should be noted that the representation by **Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/25)** relates more closely to Housing Land Supply matters, which are considered in full within Issue 15. However, the Council considers that the position agreed with Homes for Scotland for the 2017 Housing Land Audit (and reflected in Tables 1 and 2 and Schedule 2 of LPD 2) is reasonable, and that the site is capable of being effective, with 50 units programmed by 2024. The Council would point out that detailed planning consent was granted in 2010 with a PAN process completed in 2016, indicating a recent commitment and interest in delivering the site. It is further considered that there are no apparent constraints that would render the site non-effective. As such no modification is considered necessary.

#### H2(23) Our Lady & St Patrick's High School

The Council welcomes the comments of **SportScotland (PLDP/026/25)** and confirms that they would be statutory consultees on any planning application for proposed development of the site.

#### H2 (24) Sandpoint Marina

The Council has no objection to the proposed modification to the Note on Schedule 2 on page 125 of the Plan as requested by **SNH (PLDP/640/25)**, should the Reporter wish to amend the Note.

In response to the representation from **SEPA (PLDP/676/25)** suggesting the site may not be capable of delivering the indicative capacity, the Council is of the view that the site can, through good design and layout, achieve 87 units on site. However, this number is indicative and it would be up to the detailed design of the site at planning application stage to demonstrate that 87 units could be delivered at the site. No modification to the Plan is therefore necessary.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 26	Private Housing Sites: Vale of Leven	
Development plan reference:	Policy H2 (Page 78) and Schedule 2: Opportunities for Private Housing (Pages 123-125)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Mrs Elizabeth McArdle (PLDP/001) Mr Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/02) Mr Jim Conroy (PLDP/004) Ann Neeson (PLDP/006) SportScotland (PLDP/026/26) SNH (PLDP/640/26) Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/26) SEPA (PLDP/676/15) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26) Mr Grahame Wardlaw (PLDP/784)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the housing opportunity sites within the Vale of Leven that are included within Schedule 2 and Policy H2: Housing Sites.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<u>H2 (2) - Heather Avenue</u>  <b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)</b> raise parking and pedestrian access issues if the access to the site is taken from Wilson Street  <u>H2 (4) – Haldane Primary School</u>  <b>SportScotland (PLDP/026/26)</b> comment that because this site contains a grass pitch, they would likely be a statutory consultee, under the Development Management (2013) Regulations, for any application for development that would impact on the pitch. In this event, consideration will need to be given to compensation requirements.  <u>H2 (29) – Jamestown IE</u>  <b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)</b> are concerned that development of this substantial housing site would have an impact on road infrastructure and with traffic potentially going through a housing area.  <u>H2 (35) Former Council Office, Church Street, Alexandria</u>  <b>Mrs Elizabeth McArdle (PLDP/001)</b> asks that any development on the site respects and maintains the existing views to open countryside from the adjacent St Andrew's Court properties.  <b>Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/26)</b> query the effectiveness and deliverability of this site. They		

point out that this is a brownfield site and it is not clear when it could come forward for development.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** question why this is being developed for housing when it could have been sold for the Church that wishes to lease land in the Town Centre.

#### H2 (34) – Dalquhurn

**Mr Jim Conroy (PLDP/004); Ms Ann Neeson (PLDP/006); and Mr Grahame Wardlaw (PLDP/784)** state that the site boundary shown in the Vale of Leven Proposals Map is incorrect, as an area of land to the south side of Dalquhurn Lane is jointly owned and maintained by the residents of Dalquhurn Lane and is used for parking. It should not be part of the residential development site. Any change to this will result in it being almost impossible to park cars and allow access to waste collection, deliveries etc.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/26)** advise that, as the consent for the site is 10+ years old, if amendments to the site proposals subsequently come forward, there may be a need to re-examine the flood risk at the site (and for other 'legacy sites' in LDP 2).

#### H2 (42) - Carman Waterworks

**Mr Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/26)** does not object to the proposed housing site but points out difficulties with the site in terms of its triangular shape, steep slope, access points and position on a sharp, hillside road corner with poor visibility and current poor road safety. However, any development is an opportunity to improve the road issues.

**SNH (PLDP/640/26)** agree that the site has capacity for the proposed allocation, however they wish for design criteria/requirements to be attached in order to ensure that development of the site is sensitive to the landscape setting and reduces visual effects.

**Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/26)** question the effectiveness of the site and state that as the site has a capacity of 3 units it should not be included in the housing land supply figures.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** wish to register their concerns regarding vehicular access and road infrastructure for the site.

#### Wilson Street

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** express concern regarding the lack of parking provision in the street at the current time and the impact of further housing without suitable additional parking provision.

### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

#### H2 (2) - Heather Avenue

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** wish to see parking and access issues addressed, if access to the site is to be taken from Wilson Street.

#### H2 (4) – Haldane Primary School

**Sport Scotland (PLDP/026/26)** require that consideration be given to compensation requirements for any loss of the grass pitch that results from development of the site, and that they be consulted as part of the planning application process.

H2 (29) – Jamestown IE

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** are not seeking specific modifications.

H2 (34) – Dalquhurn

**Mr Jim Conroy (PLDP/004); Ms Ann Neeson (PLDP/006); Mr Grahame Wardlaw (PLDP/784)** seek that the site boundaries should be revised to exclude the area Mr Conroy and Mr Wardlaw have marked on their submitted maps, to reflect the land ownership.

**SEPA (PLDP/676/26)** advise that if any new or revised plans emerge for the site the flood risk may need to be re-examined. No specific modification is requested.

H2 (35) Former Council Office, Church Street, Alexandria

**Mrs Elizabeth McArdle (PLDP/001)** is seeking that any redevelopment of the site takes into account the height of any new buildings in order to preserve the quality of life and views from existing properties on Church Street.

**Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/26)** are seeking that the site is shown within the Plan as non-effective.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** are seeking that the site should be used for the Church group that wishes to lease land in the town centre, rather than for residential use.

H2 (42) - Carman Waterworks

**Mr Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/26)** insists that suitable conditions are applied to any residential development, relating to access points, roadway sight lines, massing etc. in order to address the road safety issues and enable sensitive development of the site.

**SNH (PLDP/640/26)** are seeking that the Council specifies developer requirements for the site, covering the following:

- The proposed houses should relate to existing houses nearby in terms of their rural character, scale, massing, materials and being set low upon the hillside.
- The siting and design of the houses should consider potential views of these from the surrounding landscape given the elevated and prominent position of the site.
- The existing stone wall should be retained and repaired where necessary to maintain this feature and improve integration of the houses with the landscape pattern (this may require access from Cardross Road to the north of the site to avoid having to create a wide bell-mouth opening in the wall).
- Tree planting to provide linkage to the woodland to the south west, improve integration of the housing with the landscape pattern and reduce visual effects.

**Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/26)** are seeking that this site should not be included within the

housing land supply figures.

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** are not seeking specific modifications.

Wilson Street

**Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** are not seeking specific modifications.

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

H2 (2) - Heather Avenue

The Council notes the concerns raised by **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** but considers that there are issues of detailed site design, layout and parking provision and are a matter for the planning application process. No modification to the Plan is considered necessary.

H2 (4) – Haldane Primary School

The Council agrees with **Sport Scotland (PLDP/026/26)** that in the event of a planning application on the site that affects the grass pitches, Sportscotland will be consulted in line with normal Development Management procedures, and any resulting recommendations will be taken into account at that stage. No modification to the Plan is considered necessary.

H2 (29) – Jamestown IE

The Council notes the concerns raised by **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** but considers that there are issues of detailed site design, layout and parking provision and are a matter for the planning application process. No modification to the Plan is considered necessary.

H2 (34) – Dalquhurn

In response to the representations by **Mr Jim Conroy (PLDP/004)**, **Ms Ann Neeson (PLDP/006)** and **Mr Grahame Wardlaw (PLDP/784)**, the Council notes that the site boundary shown in the Plan reflects the 2009 planning consent for the site (ref. DC09/145/FUL), rather than being an indication of current site ownership and use. While it is not considered that a modification is required, nonetheless, given the time elapsed since the 2009 planning consent, the Council would not be opposed to a change to the site map to reflect the revision sought by the representations, if the ownership of the site can be established, should the Reporter be of the view that a change to the site boundary is required.

The Council notes the comments made by **SEPA (PLDP/676/26)** and agrees that if revised plans come forward for this site, and other sites with older consents, this may trigger a requirement for a new flood risk assessment to be undertaken. However, this would be a matter for the Development Management process to consider at that time and it is not considered that a modification to the Plan is required.

H2(35) Former Council Office, Church Street, Alexandria

The concerns of **Mrs Elizabeth McArdle (PLDP/001)** regarding potential loss of views from any future development of site H2 (35), would be addressed as part of the Development Management process as part of any future planning application on the site. No modification to the Plan is therefore considered necessary.

In terms of the representation by **Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/26)**, the Council considers that the site is effective and the Council intend to dispose of the site within the Plan period. There are no constraints to the site that would render it undevelopable and existing services are nearby.

In response to the representation from **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)**, the Council notes that the proposed allocation for housing was made based on the intentions of the Council's Asset Management Service. At the time of preparing Local Development Plan 2, the Council was not aware of any alternative interest in this site, and still has no evidence that an alternative use is being sought, or that residential use would be inappropriate. Notwithstanding, as a town centre site, any future proposals for alternative uses could be considered through the Development Management process. No modification to the Plan is therefore considered necessary.

#### H2 (42) - Carman Waterworks

The Council agrees with **Mr Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/26)** that the proposed site offers an opportunity to improve the existing road safety issues relating to the sharp corner and poor sightlines around the corner that are due to the site topography and the high boundary wall. Indeed, the environmental and road safety improvements that could be secured through limited residential development of this disused site were among the principal reasons for its allocation. Such issues, and any related planning conditions, will be addressed fully at the planning application stage. As such, no modification to the Plan is considered necessary.

In response to the representation by **SNH (PLDP/640/26)** the Council is not opposed to three of SNH's four recommended design requirements. However, it is considered that the requirement in bullet-point 3, to retain and repair the existing stone wall, and create a vehicle access further north of the site to avoid any down-taking of the wall, is likely to be odds with the need to create a safe and appropriate access point and the intention to improve road safety and sightlines around the tight corner (which may require the lowering of the existing wall). As such it is considered that it would be more appropriate to consider these detailed design matters at the Development Management stage of a future planning application. No modification is therefore considered necessary.

Likewise, the Council notes the concerns of **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)** regarding access and road infrastructure, but considers that these detailed design matters can be considered fully at the Development Management stage of a future planning application.

In terms of the representation by **Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/26)**, the Council would point out that the site was promoted as an opportunity site in order to help realise the environmental and road safety improvements that can be delivered from limited residential redevelopment of this brownfield site within the greenbelt. However, as a small site (less than 4 units) the site is not included within the Local Development Plan 2 Housing Land calculations (Tables 1 and 2 of the Plan); nor is it in the Housing Land Supply and Audit.

No modification to the Plan is considered necessary.

Wilson Street

The Council notes the concerns raised by **Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/26)**. While the representation does not refer to specific housing sites on Wilson Street, and none are included within the Plan, it is noted that there are two housing sites on Wilson Street within the established housing land supply, for 24 units in total. However it is considered that issues of parking provision in relation to housing sites are a Development Management matter that would be considered at the planning application stage. As such, no modification to the Plan is considered necessary.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**



<b>Issue 27</b>	<b>Strauss Avenue, Clydebank</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Policy H2 (Page 78), Schedule 2: Site 39(H) (Page 123) and Clydebank Proposals Map	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Sportscotland (PLDP/026/27) Mrs E Moran (PLDP/109) Mrs M McGregor (PLDP/111/27) Mrs Mary Lee (PLDP/112) Ms C Lee (PLDP/113) Mr S Morrison (PLDP/114) Mr G & Mrs E Doogan (PLDP/119) Ms M Collins (PLDP/120) Mr W Paterson (PLDP/159) Mr Mackie (PLDP/160) Ms J Clark (PLDP/161) Ms D Fyfe (PLDP/167) Ms C Costello (PLDP/170) Ms E Oxford (PLDP/171) Ms K Conlin (PLDP/172) Mr J Flemming (PLDP/176) Miss M Lang (PLDP/181) Mrs D and Mr G Hopkirk (PLDP/209) L Hefford (PLDP/210) Mr R and Mrs I Martin (PLDP/213) Mr J McInnes (PLDP/214) Ms F Kelly (PLDP/216) Mr J McDonald (PLDP/217) Mr R Curran (PLDP/219) Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/220) (Support) Mrs C Fairweather (PLDP/221) Ms E Mackie (PLDP/222) Mrs A Duffy (PLDP/224) Mr J Duffy (PLDP/225) Mrs K Pryde (PLDP/226) Mr Brian Robert Allison (PLDP/229) B Wylie (PLDP/230) S Gabriel (PLDP/231) Mr M Hirst (PLDP/232) Ms E Cairns (PLDP/233) Mrs A & Mr J McHugh (PLDP/234) Ms M Rae (PLDP/235) Ms C Bell (PLDP/236) Mr A McElhinney (PLDP/238) Mrs L & Mr M McKelvie (PLDP/239) Mr I and Mrs M Wilson (PLDP/240) Mr T Hoss (PLDP/241)	Ms L McGeever (PLDP/426) Mr F Cairns (PLDP/427) Mr J Allison (PLDP/428) Ms M Hopkirk (PLDP/429) Ms R McCann (PLDP/430) Mr D Gibson(PLDP/431) Mr M Carr (PLDP/433) Ms A McKechnie (PLDP/434) Ms A Carcary (PLDP/435) M Smith (PLDP/437) Ms J Naismith (PLDP/438) Ms M Yanny (PLDP/441) Mr J McCreath (PLDP/442) Ms A Wallace (PLDP/443) Mr M Lyon (PLDP/444) Ms M Mathison (PLDP/445) Ms J Johnston (PLDP/446) Ms L Kennedy (PLDP/447) Ms J R McIntyre (PLDP/448) Mr J Cosgrove (PLDP/449) Ms J Chisholm (PLDP/450) Mr J McLafferty (PLDP/451) Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/452) I Walker (PLDP/453) Ms D Hopkins (PLDP/454) Mr W Bolling (PLDP/455) Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/456) Ms A Rae (PLDP/457) Mr J Maxwell (PLDP/458) J White (PLDP/459) Mr & Mrs Feely (PLDP/460) J Yantren (PLDP/461) Mr R Russell (PLDP/462) Mrs A Higgs (PLDP/463) Mr R Martin (PLDP/464) Mr & Mrs Docherty (PLDP/465) Ms M Smith (PLDP/466) Ms M Moran (PLDP/467) Ms E Molden (PLDP/468) Ms J McLaughlin (PLDP/469) Ms W Cameron (PLDP/470) Mrs S McSporran (PLDP/471) Ms C Barron (PLDP/472)	

Ms A McGee (PLDP/242)	Mrs M Yooh (PLDP/473)
S Izett (PLDP/243)	D&R McGregor (PLDP/474)
Ms K Cameron (PLDP/244)	Mrs A Dale (PLDP/475)
Mrs E & Mr N Bell (PLDP/245)	Mrs P Abram (PLDP/476)
Mrs E McInally (PLDP/246)	Mr R Brown (PLDP/477)
Ms A King (PLDP/247)	Mr S Fuery (PLDP/478)
Ms L Hay (PLDP/248)	Ms A McKinney (PLDP/479)
Mrs L and Mr Breslin (PLDP/249)	Ms C McLean (PLDP/480)
Mrs H & Mr S Barbour (PLDP/250)	Ms T Campbell (PLDP/481)
Mr J Daly (PLDP/251)	Mr J T Nellis (PLDP/482)
Mr G & Mrs M Anderson (PLDP/252)	Mr M Buchanan (PLDP/483)
Ms L McElwee and Mr Alan, Naimh & David McNeil (PLDP/253)	Mr C Kelly (PLDP/484)
Ms M Cowie (PLDP/254)	Mr J MacDonald (PLDP/485)
Mr S McInally (PLDP/256)	Mrs C ODonnell (PLDP/486)
Ms D Holley (PLDP/257)	Mr C & Mrs L Maginn (PLDP/487)
Ms P Stirling (PLDP/258)	Ms J Bartley (PLDP/488)
Ms L McFarlane (PLDP/259)	Mrs D J McKinnie (PLDP/489)
Mr D Hopkirk (PLDP/260)	Mr J Guthrie (PLDP/490)
K Gallagher (PLDP/261)	Ms A Biggerstaff (PLDP/491)
Mr W Hopkirk (PLDP/262)	Mr & Mrs McGuire (PLDP/492)
Mrs K Brown (PLDP/263)	Ms A Campbell (PLDP/493)
Mr J McIlveney (PLDP/264)	Ms T Sweeney (PLDP/494)
Mrs A McElwee (PLDP/265)	Mr E Ferguson (PLDP/495)
Mrs J Peter (PLDP/266)	Ms S Wright (PLDP/496)
Mrs J McFarlane (PLDP/267)	Ms M Gallagher (PLDP/497)
Mr A McFarlane (PLDP/268)	Ms J Macphee (PLDP/498)
Mr B Callaghan (PLDP/269)	Mr A Zalezny (PLDP/499)
J Cameron (PLDP/270)	Mr J Murray (PLDP/500)
Mr D McGeever (PLDP/271)	Ms M Gibson (PLDP/501)
K M Craggan (PLDP/272)	Mr P Doyle (PLDP/502)
Miss M Wallace (PLDP/273)	Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/503)
Miss M Sweeney (PLDP/274)	Mr J Wilson (PLDP/504)
Mr B Wood (PLDP/275)	Mr J Morrow (PLDP/505)
Ms G McIlveney (PLDP/276)	Mr T McCord (PLDP/506)
Ms A Cameron (PLDP/277)	Ms E Hood (PLDP/507)
Ms E Cameron (PLDP/278)	Ms R McColl (PLDP/508)
M Narey (PLDP/279)	Mr L Nally (PLDP/509)
Ms CA Lamb (PLDP/280)	Mrs M McGinley (PLDP/510)
Mr J O'Neill (PLDP/281)	Mr A McGowan (PLDP/511)
Ms M Cairns (PLDP/282)	Mr R McKay (PLDP/512)
Ms I Gabriel (PLDP/283)	A Stevenson (PLDP/513)
Mr S Gallagher (PLDP/284)	Ms M McGeachie (PLDP/514)
Mr J & Mrs T Costello (PLDP/285)	Ms S Campbell (PLDP/515)
Mr S Gray (PLDP/286)	Mr S Ramage (PLDP/516)
Ms E Doohan (PLDP/287)	Mr I McLeod (PLDP/517)
Ms K McColgan (PLDP/289)	M Smith (PLDP/518)
Mr J McDermott (PLDP/290)	Mr R McKinlay (PLDP/519)
Mr G McDermott (PLDP/291)	Mr B & Ms A McGarvie (PLDP/520)
Mr A & Ms K McLeod (PLDP/292)	Ms C Smith (PLDP/521)
Ms M Milne (PLDP/293)	Ms M Parsons (PLDP/522)
Mr R Cameron (PLDP/294)	R MacPhee (PLDP/523)
	Ms V Flynn (PLDP/524)

Mr J Rae (PLDP/295)	Saji Joseph (PLDP/525)
Ms P Gunnion (PLDP/296)	A Kenny (PLDP/526)
Mr J Hay (PLDP/297)	Mr M & Mrs A Bowman (PLDP/527)
Mr J Cuthbertson (PLDP/298)	Mrs S Doogan (PLDP/528)
Mrs E Cooper (PLDP/299)	L McGrath (PLDP/529)
Mrs M Lennie (PLDP/300)	Ms V Wilson (PLDP/530)
Ms E Briant (PLDP/301)	Ms I Cairns (PLDP/531)
Mr W Abraham (PLDP/302)	MT Quinn (PLDP/532)
Ms L Brown (PLDP/303)	Ms V Edwards (PLDP/533)
Ms J Mowatt (PLDP/304)	Mrs C & Mr G Tait (PLDP/534)
K McBain (PLDP/305)	Ms L Ferrol (PLDP/535)
Ms S Lydon (PLDP/306)	A Came (PLDP/536)
Mr D Richford (PLDP/307)	Ms L Buckley (PLDP/537)
Mr J McCallum (PLDP/308)	Mr P MacDonald (PLDP/538)
Mrs Poles (PLDP/309)	Mr R Cathro (PLDP/539)
Ms E Clark (PLDP/310)	Ms L Fraser (PLDP/540)
Mr W McConnell (PLDP/311)	Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/541)
Mr J McNeil (PLDP/312)	Ms C Miller (PLDP/542)
Mr D Nicholson (PLDP/313)	Ms J Merry (PLDP/543)
Ms B Kirkwood (PLDP/314)	Ms P Tyrrell (PLDP/544)
C Campbell (PLDP/315)	Mrs K and Mr N Gill(PLDP/545)
Ms G Moir (PLDP/316)	Mr S Dixon (PLDP/546)
Ms LConnelly (PLDP/317)	Ms S Aston (PLDP/547)
Mr J & Mrs M McLucas (PLDP/318)	Mr A Beaton (PLDP/548)
Mr E Markey (PLDP/319)	Ms C Rowlands (PLDP/549)
Mr T Drain (PLDP/320)	Mr B Hodgeson (PLDP/550)
Mr F McEwan (PLDP/321)	Mr F McCosh (PLDP/551)
Mr S Owens (PLDP/322)	Mr J McMillan (PLDP/552)
Ms M Harris (PLDP/323)	Mr G Stirling (PLDP/553)
Mrs A Miller (PLDP/324)	Ms S Feely (PLDP/554)
Ms S Aitken (PLDP/325)	Mrs M & Mr P Shiach (PLDP/555)
Ms A Bell (PLDP/326)	Mr G and Mrs A Smith (PLDP/556)
Mr M Quantich (PLDP/327)	Ms E Walker (PLDP/557)
Ms S McCafferty (PLDP/328)	Ms L Wightman (PLDP/558)
Ms E Craig (PLDP/329)	Mr A Hart (PLDP/559)
T Rankin (PLDP/330)	Ms A Dickson (PLDP/560)
Mr & Mrs J Hart (PLDP/331)	Ms V Sweeney (PLDP/561)
M S McArthur (PLDP/332)	Mr J Dickson (PLDP/562)
Mr R & Mrs M Scullion (PLDP/333)	Mr R Sweeney (PLDP/563)
Mrs S L Williams (PLDP/334)	Mrs G Daly (PLDP/564)
Ms H Rae (PLDP/335)	Mr R McKenzie (PLDP/565)
Mr J Hynes (PLDP/336)	Ms E Hamilton (PLDP/566)
Mr L Keenan (PLDP/337)	Mr R & Mrs M Carroll (PLDP/567)
Mr N Morrison (PLDP/338)	Ms C Maxwell (PLDP/568)
Mr M Bradley (PLDP/339)	Ms K Burns (PLDP/569)
V Mason (PLDP/340)	Mrs S Sheridan (PLDP/570)
Ms J, Mr J & Ms H McTaggart (PLDP/341)	Ms J Thomson (PLDP/571)
Ms C Spence (PLDP/342)	Mr G Alexander (PLDP/572)
Ms M Irvine (PLDP/343)	Ms J Drummond (PLDP/573)
Ms R Gallaher (PLDP/344)	Mrs C & Mr E Connolly(PLDP/574)
Mr G Bowie (PLDP/345)	Ms M Kemmett (PLDP/575)
	Mr A Murray (PLDP/576)

Mr S Cairns & Mrs S Gray (PLDP/346)	Mrs M and Mr S Savage (PLDP/577)
R Anderson (PLDP/347)	R Savage (PLDP/578)
Ms L McArthur (PLDP/348)	E Beaton (PLDP/579)
Mrs A & Mr K O'Donnell (PLDP/349)	Ms R Fitzsimons (PLDP/580)
Ms M Pollok (PLDP/350)	W Reid (PLDP/581)
Ms D McGowan & Mr F Mersey (PLDP/351)	Mr A Reid (PLDP/582)
Mr S Gorman (PLDP/352)	Ms M Campbell (PLDP/583)
Mr T Taylor (PLDP/353)	Mr P McBryan (PLDP/584)
Mr Hugh Mealyea (PLDP/354)	Ms H Ingham (PLDP/585)
Ms L Allison (PLDP/355)	Mr A Walker (PLDP/586)
A & E Shepherd (PLDP/356)	Mrs S & Mr C Monaghan (PLDP/587)
Mr E Robertson (PLDP/357)	Ms E Harper (PLDP/588)
Mrs V McClure (PLDP/358)	Ms S Hastings (PLDP/589)
Ms J McGill (PLDP/359)	Mr A Whitelaw (PLDP/590)
Mr D McGrory (PLDP/360)	Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/591)
Mr J Patrick & Ms P McGrory (PLDP/361)	Mr P Smith (PLDP/592)
Mrs M Murray (PLDP/362)	Mr G McNellan (PLDP/593)
Mr J Murray (PLDP/363)	Mrs M & Mr J Meiklejohn (PLDP/594)
Mr S Kilpatrick (PLDP/364)	Ms D Martin (PLDP/595)
Mr G Carlyle (PLDP/365)	Mr S W Sievwright (PLDP/596)
J.S. & E McNeil (PLDP/366)	Mr D Gunnion (PLDP/597)
Mr & Mrs Bradley (PLDP/367)	Ms S Greig (PLDP/598)
Mr M Halfpenny (PLDP/368)	Mr A Greig (PLDP/599)
Mr K Farrell (PLDP/369)	Mr T Cherian (PLDP/600)
Ms A Welsh (PLDP/370)	Mr S Watson (PLDP/601)
Ms J Friel (PLDP/371)	Ms K Hendry (PLDP/602)
G Morrison (PLDP/372)	Ms M Bruce (PLDP/603)
Mr B W Chessell (PLDP/373)	Mr P Cassidy (PLDP/604)
F Miller (PLDP/374)	Mr D Sinclair (PLDP/605)
Ms L Anderson (PLDP/375)	Ms E Sinclair (PLDP/606)
Ms D Kidd (PLDP/376)	Ms M E Venables (PLDP/607)
Mr D Kidd (PLDP/377)	Mr G Cameron (PLDP/608)
Ms S Kidd (PLDP/378)	Mr S Byren (PLDP/609)
Mr C Kidd (PLDP/379)	S Stirling (PLDP/610)
Mr S McBride (PLDP/380)	Lennox (PLDP/611)
Mrs M Kauf (PLDP/381)	Mr C and Mrs A Lees (PLDP/612)
Mr R Smith (PLDP/382)	Mr A Morgan (PLDP/613)
Ms L McDermott (PLDP/383)	Mr W and Mrs B Chlosta (PLDP/614)
Ms K Johnston (PLDP/384)	Mr A Chambers (PLDP/615)
Ms I Hair (PLDP/385)	Mr I and Mrs A Forbs (PLDP/616)
Ms J Turner (PLDP/386)	Ms A Buchanan (PLDP/617)
Mr A Turner (PLDP/387)	Mr I & Mrs P McCallum (PLDP/618)
Ms M Holloway (PLDP/388)	Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/619)
Mrs C Hanlon (PLDP/389)	Mr A & Mrs E Edmonds (PLDP/620)
Ms C Brash (PLDP/390)	W Kirkwood (PLDP/621)
Mr M Senior (PLDP/391)	Ms C Millar (PLDP/622)
G Little (PLDP/392)	Ms S McGinley (PLDP/623)
Mr G Kane (PLDP/393)	Ms A Griffin (PLDP/624)
M Fraser (PLDP/394)	Ms M Young (PLDP/625)
Mr I Campbell (PLDP/395)	Ms C Kemp (PLDP/626)
	Ms M McGinley (PLDP/627)
	Ms M McCowan (PLDP/628)

<p>Mr G Gallagher (PLDP/396)  Mr M and Mrs H Bain (PLDP/397)  Mr S C Paterson (PLDP/398)  Ms T Paterson (PLDP/399)  Mr S Paterson (PLDP/400)  Ms C Cassidy (PLDP/401)  Mrs T McLaughlin (PLDP/402)  Mr S Doogan (PLDP/403)  Mr K Stanley (PLDP/404)  Ms L Jordan (PLDP/405)  Mr M Jordan (PLDP/406)  Ms M Jennings (PLDP/407)  Ms S McCarthy (PLDP/408)  Mr A A Anderson (PLDP/409)  Ms S O'Conner (PLDP/410)  J Stevenson (PLDP/411)  Mr M McHale (PLDP/412)  Mr M McCandlish (PLDP/413)  Ms S Carson (PLDP/414)  Mr W Fulton (PLDP/415)  Mr J MacPherson (PLDP/416)  Mr J Mirren (PLDP/417)  Ms NRobertson (PLDP/418)  Ms R Shields (PLDP/419)  Mr I Pexton (PLDP/420)  Mr A Baldacci (PLDP/421)  Mr K Pexton (PLDP/422)  Ms K Pexton (PLDP/423)  Ms S Gillespie (PLDP/424)  Mr M Hunter (PLDP/425)</p>	<p>Mr J Brown (PLDP/638)  Mr N Bell (PLDP/639)  SNH (PLDP/640/23)  Mr G Faller (PLDP/652)  Logan Factoring and Management Ltd (PLDP/653) (Support)  Mrs S Veeramootoo (PLDP/657)  Taylor Wimpey (PLDP/664/27)  Cllr J Mooney (PLDP/667/27)  Clydebelt (PLDP/673/27)  Karen McElwee (PLDP/760)  Mrs Watson (PLDP/761)  Roseleen Donnelly (PLDP/762)  Scottish Canals (PLDP/786)</p>
<p><b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b></p>	<p>This issue relates to the allocation of Land at Strauss Avenue, Clydebank (Site Ref: H2(39) for residential use with an indicative capacity of 100 units.</p>
<p><b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b></p>	
<p>The representations made to the allocation of this site have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Support for Allocation of the Site; Loss of Open Space; Traffic; Development within Clydebank; Suitability of the Site for Development; Education and other.</p> <p><u>Support for Allocation of the Site</u></p> <p><b>Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/220)</b> supports the allocation of the site and states that the possible implications noted on the pre-printed form are not valid.</p> <p><b>Logan Factoring and Management Ltd (PLDP/653)</b> support the residential allocation at Strauss Avenue. The site would form a logical and sensitive extension to east of Clydebank, with the site adjacent to existing residential development to the west, east and</p>	

south. The site is an appropriate and deliverable opportunity and can come forward through the emerging Local Development Plan. Strauss Avenue is considered an appropriate location for additional housing which can be delivered in a sustainable way to respond to the site location and incorporate the highest standards of placemaking as set out in Scottish Government Planning Policy. In carefully planning an appropriate housing mix and sensitive phasing of new development, Strauss Avenue can deliver new homes of quality and value within close proximity to Clydebank, Yoker and Drumchapel.

A detailed Access Statement was submitted alongside the response to the Main Issues Report in September 2017. The Access Statement (Representation Supporting Information xx) established the principle of access into the development, with Option 7 being identified as feasible and providing access onto Great Western Road, in line with the Council requirement. Figure 16 within the Access Statement illustrates where the signalised access from Great Western Road could be located. Great Western Road is a dual carriageway and there is an existing gap in the central reservation, as indicated by Figure 17 of the access statement. Figure 17 also illustrates the location of the speed change signs at this location.

The representation also states that the clients consultants act as strategic advisors to national housebuilders in the West of Scotland and that there have already been a number of notes of interest from a number of parties. No insurmountable barriers to the development of the site have been identified to date relating to transport and access, topography, flooding, cultural heritage or noise. As such, the land at Strauss Avenue should be included as a residential allocation along with a LDP policy to guide its future development.

#### Loss of Open Space

PLDP/109; PLDP/111; PLDP/112; PLDP/113; PLDP/114; PLDP/119; PLDP/120;  
 PLDP/160; PLDP/170; PLDP/171; PLDP/172; PLDP/176; PLDP/181; PLDP/209;  
 PLDP/210; PLDP/213; PLDP/214; PLDP/216; PLDP/217; PLDP/219; PLDP/221;  
 PLDP/222; PLDP/224; PLDP/225; PLDP/226; PLDP/229; PLDP/230; PLDP/231;  
 PLDP/232; PLDP/233/27; PLDP/234; PLDP/235; PLDP/236; PLDP/238; PLDP/239;  
 PLDP/240; PLDP/241; PLDP/242; PLDP/243; PLDP/244; PLDP/245; PLDP/246;  
 PLDP/247; PLDP/248; PLDP/249; PLDP/250; PLDP/251; PLDP/252; PLDP/253;  
 PLDP/254; PLDP/256; PLDP/257; PLDP/258; PLDP/259; PLDP/260; PLDP/261;  
 PLDP/262; PLDP/263; PLDP/264; PLDP/265; PLDP/266; PLDP/267; PLDP/258;  
 PLDP/259; PLDP/260; PLDP/261; PLDP/262; PLDP/263; PLDP/264; PLDP/265;  
 PLDP/266; PLDP/267; PLDP/268; PLDP/269; PLDP/270; PLDP/271; PLDP/272;  
 PLDP/273; PLDP/274; PLDP/275; PLDP/276; PLDP/277; PLDP/278; PLDP/279;  
 PLDP/280; PLDP/281; PLDP/282; PLDP/283; PLDP/284; PLDP/285; PLDP/286;  
 PLDP/287; PLDP/228; PLDP/289; PLDP/290; PLDP/291; PLDP/292; PLDP/293;  
 PLDP/294; PLDP/295; PLDP/296; PLDP/297; PLDP/298; PLDP/299; PLDP/300;  
 PLDP/301; PLDP/302; PLDP/303; PLDP/304; PLDP/305; PLDP/306; PLDP/307;  
 PLDP/308; PLDP/309; PLDP/310; PLDP/311; PLDP/312; PLDP/313; PLDP/314;  
 PLDP/315; PLDP/316; PLDP/317; PLDP/318; PLDP/319; PLDP/320; PLDP/321;  
 PLDP/322; PLDP/323; PLDP/324; PLDP/325; PLDP/326; PLDP/327; PLDP/328;  
 PLDP/329; PLDP/330; PLDP/331; PLDP/332; PLDP/333; PLDP/334; PLDP/335;  
 PLDP/336; PLDP/337; PLDP/338; PLDP/339; PLDP/340; PLDP/341; PLDP/342;  
 PLDP/343; PLDP/344; PLDP/345; PLDP/346; PLDP/347; PLDP/348; PLDP/349;  
 PLDP/350; PLDP/351; PLDP/352; PLDP/353; PLDP/354; PLDP/355; PLDP/356;  
 PLDP/357; PLDP/358; PLDP/359; PLDP/360; PLDP/361; PLDP/362; PLDP/363;

PLDP/364; PLDP/365; PLDP/366; PLDP/367; PLDP/368; PLDP/369; PLDP/370;  
 PLDP/371; PLDP/372; PLDP/373; PLDP/374; PLDP/375; PLDP/376; PLDP/377;  
 PLDP/378; PLDP/379; PLDP/380; PLDP/381; PLDP/382; PLDP/383; PLDP/384;  
 PLDP/385; PLDP/386; PLDP/387; PLDP/388; PLDP/389; PLDP/390; PLDP/391;  
 PLDP/392; PLDP/393; PLDP/394; PLDP/395; PLDP/396; PLDP/397; PLDP/398;  
 PLDP/399; PLDP/400; PLDP/401; PLDP/402; PLDP/403; PLDP/404; PLDP/405;  
 PLDP/406; PLDP/407; PLDP/408; PLDP/409; PLDP/410; PLDP/411; PLDP/412;  
 PLDP/413; PLDP/414; PLDP/415; PLDP/416; PLDP/417; PLDP/418; PLDP/419;  
 PLDP/420; PLDP/421; PLDP/422; PLDP/423; PLDP/424; PLDP/425; PLDP/426;  
 PLDP/427; PLDP/428; PLDP/429; PLDP/430; PLDP/431; PLDP/433; PLDP/434;  
 PLDP/435; PLDP/437; PLDP/438; PLDP/441; PLDP/442; PLDP/443; PLDP/444;  
 PLDP/445; PLDP/446; PLDP/447; PLDP/448; PLDP/449; PLDP/450; PLDP/451;  
 PLDP/452; PLDP/453; PLDP/454; PLDP/455; PLDP/456; PLDP/457; PLDP/458;  
 PLDP/459; PLDP/460; PLDP/461; PLDP/462; PLDP/463; PLDP/464; PLDP/465;  
 PLDP/466; PLDP/467; PLDP/468; PLDP/469; PLDP/470; PLDP/471; PLDP/472;  
 PLDP/474; PLDP/475; PLDP/476; PLDP/477; PLDP/478; PLDP/479; PLDP/480;  
 PLDP/481; PLDP/482; PLDP/483; PLDP/484; PLDP/485; PLDP/486; PLDP/487;  
 PLDP/488; PLDP/489; PLDP/490; PLDP/491; PLDP/492; PLDP/493; PLDP/494;  
 PLDP/495; PLDP/496; PLDP/497; PLDP/498; PLDP/499; PLDP/500; PLDP/501;  
 PLDP/502; PLDP/503; PLDP/504; PLDP/505; PLDP/506; PLDP/507; PLDP/508;  
 PLDP/509; PLDP/510; PLDP/511; PLDP/512; PLDP/513; PLDP/514; PLDP/515;  
 PLDP/516; PLDP/517; PLDP/518; PLDP/519; PLDP/520; PLDP/521; PLDP/522;  
 PLDP/523; PLDP/524; PLDP/525; PLDP/526; PLDP/527; PLDP/528; PLDP/529;  
 PLDP/530; PLDP/531; PLDP/532; PLDP/533; PLDP/534; PLDP/535; PLDP/536;  
 PLDP/537; PLDP/538; PLDP/539; PLDP/540; PLDP/541; PLDP/542; PLDP/543;  
 PLDP/544; PLDP/545; PLDP/546; PLDP/547; PLDP/548; PLDP/549; PLDP/550;  
 PLDP/551; PLDP/552; PLDP/553; PLDP/554; PLDP/555; PLDP/556; PLDP/557;  
 PLDP/558; PLDP/559; PLDP/560; PLDP/561; PLDP/562; PLDP/563; PLDP/564;  
 PLDP/565; PLDP/566; PLDP/567; PLDP/568; PLDP/569; PLDP/570; PLDP/571;  
 PLDP/572; PLDP/573; PLDP/574; PLDP/575; PLDP/576; PLDP/577; PLDP/578;  
 PLDP/579; PLDP/580; PLDP/581; PLDP/582; PLDP/583; PLDP/584; PLDP/585;  
 PLDP/586; PLDP/587; PLDP/588; PLDP/589; PLDP/590; PLDP/591; PLDP/592;  
 PLDP/593; PLDP/594; PLDP/595; PLDP/596; PLDP/597; PLDP/598; PLDP/599;  
 PLDP/600; PLDP/601; PLDP/602; PLDP/603; PLDP/604; PLDP/605; PLDP/606;  
 PLDP/607; PLDP/608; PLDP/609; PLDP/610; PLDP/611; PLDP/612; PLDP/613;  
 PLDP/614; PLDP/615; PLDP/616; PLDP/617; PLDP/618; PLDP/619; PLDP/620;  
 PLDP/621; PLDP/622; PLDP/623; PLDP/624; PLDP/625; PLDP/626; PLDP/627;  
 PLDP/628; PLDP/638; PLDP/639; PLDP/640/27; PLDP/652; PLDP/657; PLDP/673/27;  
 PLDP/760; PLDP/761; and PLDP/762 all object to the proposed rezoning of Strauss  
 Avenue from Open Space to residential as it is contrary to the Council's policies for open  
 space.

**Ms J Clark (PLDP/161); Mrs D and Mr G Hopkirk (PLDP/209); Mr D Gunnion (PLDP/597); Clydebelt (PLDP/673/27); Ms D Fyfe (PLDP/167)** raise further issues with regard to open space; the impact that losing the open space would have on the community and children; that it has the potential for better sporting facilities or better facilities for the community.

**Ms Carol-Ann Lamb (PLDP/280); Mr J O'Neil (PLDP/281); Ms M Cairns (PLDP/282); Ms I Gabriel (PLDP/283); Mr S Gallacher (PLDP/284); Mr J and Mrs T Costello (PLDP/285); Mr S Gray (PLDP/286); Ms E Doohan (PLDP/287); and Ms K McColgan (PLDP/289)** are also of the view that the rezoning of this site is against the Council's own



'Our Green Network' Planning Guidance and the policies formulated to protect green spaces i.e. Policy GN1. They raise further issues on the history of the site; cutbacks; and use of the developer contributions fund to redevelop the site.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP664/27)** state that the proposed allocation H2(39) is designated as 'Protected Open Space' in the 2010 adopted Local Plan and again, the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan 2016 shows the site as protected open space. The inclusion of the site as a housing allocation goes against the Council's policies of open space protection and retaining public open spaces.

#### Traffic

PLDP/109; PLDP/111; PLDP/112; PLDP/113; PLDP/114; PLDP/119; PLDP/120;  
 PLDP/160; PLDP/170; PLDP/171; PLDP/172; PLDP/176; PLDP/181; PLDP/209;  
 PLDP/210; PLDP/213; PLDP/214; PLDP/216; PLDP/217; PLDP/219; PLDP/221;  
 PLDP/222; PLDP/224; PLDP/225; PLDP/226; PLDP/229; PLDP/230; PLDP/231;  
 PLDP/232; PLDP/233/27; PLDP/234; PLDP/235; PLDP/236; PLDP/238; PLDP/239;  
 PLDP/240; PLDP/241; PLDP/242; PLDP/243; PLDP/244; PLDP/245; PLDP/246;  
 PLDP/247; PLDP/248; PLDP/249; PLDP/250; PLDP/251; PLDP/252; PLDP/253;  
 PLDP/254; PLDP/256; PLDP/257; PLDP/258; PLDP/259; PLDP/260; PLDP/261;  
 PLDP/262; PLDP/263; PLDP/264; PLDP/265; PLDP/266; PLDP/267; PLDP/258;  
 PLDP/259; PLDP/260; PLDP/261; PLDP/262; PLDP/263; PLDP/264; PLDP/265;  
 PLDP/266; PLDP/267; PLDP/268; PLDP/269; PLDP/270; PLDP/271; PLDP/272;  
 PLDP/273; PLDP/274; PLDP/275; PLDP/276; PLDP/277; PLDP/278; PLDP/279;  
 PLDP/280; PLDP/281; PLDP/282; PLDP/283; PLDP/284; PLDP/285; PLDP/286;  
 PLDP/287; PLDP/228; PLDP/289; PLDP/290; PLDP/291; PLDP/292; PLDP/293;  
 PLDP/294; PLDP/295; PLDP/296; PLDP/297; PLDP/298; PLDP/299; PLDP/300;  
 PLDP/301; PLDP/302; PLDP/303; PLDP/304; PLDP/305; PLDP/306; PLDP/307;  
 PLDP/308; PLDP/309; PLDP/310; PLDP/311; PLDP/312; PLDP/313; PLDP/314;  
 PLDP/315; PLDP/316; PLDP/317; PLDP/318; PLDP/319; PLDP/320; PLDP/321;  
 PLDP/322; PLDP/323; PLDP/324; PLDP/325; PLDP/326; PLDP/327; PLDP/328;  
 PLDP/329; PLDP/330; PLDP/331; PLDP/332; PLDP/333; PLDP/334; PLDP/335;  
 PLDP/336; PLDP/337; PLDP/338; PLDP/339; PLDP/340; PLDP/341; PLDP/342;  
 PLDP/343; PLDP/344; PLDP/345; PLDP/346; PLDP/347; PLDP/348; PLDP/349;  
 PLDP/350; PLDP/351; PLDP/352; PLDP/353; PLDP/354; PLDP/355; PLDP/356;  
 PLDP/357; PLDP/358; PLDP/359; PLDP/360; PLDP/361; PLDP/362; PLDP/363;  
 PLDP/364; PLDP/365; PLDP/366; PLDP/367; PLDP/368; PLDP/369; PLDP/370;  
 PLDP/371; PLDP/372; PLDP/373; PLDP/374; PLDP/375; PLDP/376; PLDP/377;  
 PLDP/378; PLDP/379; PLDP/380; PLDP/381; PLDP/382; PLDP/383; PLDP/384;  
 PLDP/385; PLDP/386; PLDP/387; PLDP/388; PLDP/389; PLDP/390; PLDP/391;  
 PLDP/392; PLDP/393; PLDP/394; PLDP/395; PLDP/396; PLDP/397; PLDP/398;  
 PLDP/399; PLDP/400; PLDP/401; PLDP/402; PLDP/403; PLDP/404; PLDP/405;  
 PLDP/406; PLDP/407; PLDP/408; PLDP/409; PLDP/410; PLDP/411; PLDP/412;  
 PLDP/413; PLDP/414; PLDP/415; PLDP/416; PLDP/417; PLDP/418; PLDP/419;  
 PLDP/420; PLDP/421; PLDP/422; PLDP/423; PLDP/424; PLDP/425; PLDP/426;  
 PLDP/427; PLDP/428; PLDP/429; PLDP/430; PLDP/431; PLDP/433; PLDP/434;  
 PLDP/435; PLDP/437; PLDP/438; PLDP/441; PLDP/442; PLDP/443; PLDP/444;  
 PLDP/445; PLDP/446; PLDP/447; PLDP/448; PLDP/449; PLDP/450; PLDP/451;  
 PLDP/453; PLDP/454; PLDP/455; PLDP/456; PLDP/457; PLDP/458; PLDP/459;  
 PLDP/460; PLDP/461; PLDP/462; PLDP/463; PLDP/464; PLDP/465; PLDP/466;  
 PLDP/467; PLDP/468; PLDP/469; PLDP/470; PLDP/471; PLDP/472; PLDP/474;  
 PLDP/475; PLDP/476; PLDP/477; PLDP/478; PLDP/479; PLDP/480; PLDP/481;

PLDP/482; PLDP/483; PLDP/484; PLDP/485; PLDP/486; PLDP/487; PLDP/488;  
 PLDP/489; PLDP/490; PLDP/491; PLDP/492; PLDP/493; PLDP/494; PLDP/495;  
 PLDP/496; PLDP/497; PLDP/498; PLDP/499; PLDP/500; PLDP/501; PLDP/502;  
 PLDP/503; PLDP/504; PLDP/505; PLDP/506; PLDP/507; PLDP/508; PLDP/509;  
 PLDP/510; PLDP/511; PLDP/512; PLDP/513; PLDP/514; PLDP/515; PLDP/516;  
 PLDP/517; PLDP/518; PLDP/519; PLDP/520; PLDP/521; PLDP/522; PLDP/523;  
 PLDP/524; PLDP/525; PLDP/526; PLDP/527; PLDP/528; PLDP/529; PLDP/530;  
 PLDP/531; PLDP/532; PLDP/533; PLDP/534; PLDP/535; PLDP/536; PLDP/537;  
 PLDP/538; PLDP/539; PLDP/540; PLDP/541; PLDP/542; PLDP/543; PLDP/544;  
 PLDP/545; PLDP/546; PLDP/547; PLDP/548; PLDP/549; PLDP/550; PLDP/551;  
 PLDP/552; PLDP/553; PLDP/554; PLDP/555; PLDP/556; PLDP/557; PLDP/558;  
 PLDP/559; PLDP/560; PLDP/561; PLDP/562; PLDP/563; PLDP/564; PLDP/565;  
 PLDP/566; PLDP/567; PLDP/568; PLDP/569; PLDP/570; PLDP/571; PLDP/572;  
 PLDP/573; PLDP/574; PLDP/575; PLDP/576; PLDP/577; PLDP/578; PLDP/579;  
 PLDP/580; PLDP/581; PLDP/582; PLDP/583; PLDP/584; PLDP/585; PLDP/586;  
 PLDP/587; PLDP/588; PLDP/589; PLDP/590; PLDP/591; PLDP/592; PLDP/593;  
 PLDP/594; PLDP/595; PLDP/596; PLDP/597; PLDP/598; PLDP/599; PLDP/600;  
 PLDP/601; PLDP/602; PLDP/603; PLDP/604; PLDP/605; PLDP/606; PLDP/607;  
 PLDP/608; PLDP/609; PLDP/610; PLDP/611; PLDP/612; PLDP/613; PLDP/614;  
 PLDP/615; PLDP/616; PLDP/617; PLDP/618; PLDP/619; PLDP/620; PLDP/621;  
 PLDP/622; PLDP/623; PLDP/624; PLDP/625; PLDP/626; PLDP/627; PLDP/628;  
 PLDP/638; PLDP/639; PLDP/640/27; PLDP/652; PLDP/657; PLDP/667/27; PLDP/760;  
 PLDP/761; and PLDP/762 all object to the allocation of Strauss Avenue as a residential  
 site on the grounds that increased traffic will be experienced in the streets of Linnvale and  
 this will be a danger to the residents.

**Ms M McGregor (PLDP/111); Mr W Patterson (PLDP/159); Ms J Clark (PLDP/161); Ms D Fyfe (PLDP/167); Mrs D and Mr G Hopkirk (PLDP/209); Mrs K Pryde (PLDP 226); Ms Carol-Ann Lamb (PLDP/280); Mr J O'Neill (PLDP/281); Ms M Cairns (PLDP/282); Ms I Gabriel (PLDP/283); Mr S Gallagher (PLDP/284); Mr J and Mrs T Costello (PLDP/285); Mr S Gray (PLDP/286); Ms E Doohan (PLDP/287); Ms K McColgan (PLDP/289) Mr D Gunnion (PLDP/597); Mr N Bell (PLDP/639); Ms C Milne (PLDP/622) and Clydebelt (PLDP/673/27)** also raise further and specific issues in relation to traffic congestion and delay and the impact the site would have on this; site capacity; road design issues; capacity of the existing road network to cope with increased traffic throughout the year; impact that congestion would have on emergency vehicles; the proposed emergency/secondary access; road and child safety; the need to upgrade roads; traffic assessment of the site; car parking and speeding; vehicle drive through; impact the development would have on the town centre; the need to have access to Whitecrook and the new bridge; the development would create a fragmented community centre

#### Development within Clydebank

**Ms D Fyfe (PLDP/167)** is of the view that until such times as the waterfront is development, it is unrealistic to ask a community to make a decision on other allocations whilst this development remains outstanding.

#### Suitability of the Site for Development

**Ms D Fyfe (PLDP/167)** states that the site floods in bad weather and is akin to a marshland. There is an underground stream which contributes to the dampness of the

ground. Raises issues that properties on Kirkwood Avenue suffer from the same ground dampness in their back gardens in wet weather. Is of the view that if the ground cannot be suitable dried for residents then how can it for new housing, which the respondent is of the view that the flats will subside and sink over time.

**Ms J Friel (PLDP/371)** states that area floods and has an impact on gardens facing the field, making them unwalkable.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP 664/27)** object to the allocation of Strauss Avenue and seeks the removal of the site and Duntiglennan Fields allocated in its place. *(The representation should also be read in conjunction with Issue's 15, 24, 27, 28, 29 and 30 as the representation also covers these issues seeking to challenge the Housing Land Requirement and the New Housing Sites H2(35) to H2(42) of Schedule 2 of the Plan to demonstrate that Duntiglennan Fields should be allocated instead of Strauss Avenue and also to meet a perceived shortfall in the private sector housing land supply.)* A supporting statement (Respondent Supporting Information xx) has been submitted with the representation and the main points are summarised below:

- The site is designated as protected open space within both the adopted Local Plan and the Local Development Plan Proposed Plan, 2016 and forms an extensive area of open space that provides a green buffer between Clydebank and Glasgow City, the administrative boundary between WDC and Glasgow City Council being Duntreath Avenue to the east. Great Western Road forms the boundary to the north, with the Forth and Clyde Canal to the south.
- Site access is not good and it would appear difficult to secure access from a road safety perspective.
- There are a number of constraints to development and as such the site would appear to be difficult to develop and has a number of significant environmental constraints. There seems little ambition from volume housebuilders to undertake a large-scale development at this location. Also questions the assessment of the SEA and describes the mitigations as questionable.
- The allocation is premature in their view to base housing land supply and Proposed LDP2 Housing Allocations on sites that have not been properly assessed with regards to their developability and delivery; therefore, these sites cannot be considered effective. The Proposed LDP2 site at Strauss Avenue (H2(39)), clearly, in addition to significant access constraints, has significant surface water drainage issues and is prone to ponding and at risk of flooding. The site in their view has therefore not been fully assessed to merit inclusion in the Proposed LDP2. The site is shown on plans as playing fields and is one of the few open spaces in a wide area that allows access for passive recreation, dog walking, etc.
- The site provides a buffer of protected open space between West Dunbartonshire and Glasgow City and is bound by major transport routes, on the north by the A82 Great Western Road and to the east by the elevated Duntreath Avenue, whilst the site is constrained to the south by the Forth and Clyde Canal. It is, in terms of accessibility, almost inaccessible and the Council makes it clear that access cannot be taken through the existing road network. The former Yoker Burn also used to transect the site and it is unclear how this has been addressed. The low lying

nature of the site is compounded by the fact that the roads to the north and east sit at a higher surface level.

The inclusion of this site in the Proposed LDP2 has no therefore justification according to Taylor Wimpey.

**SNH (PLDP/640/27)** state that the site is unlikely to be able to accommodate the indicative capacity of the site due to the requirements of the Environmental Report in relation to a high quality gateway design that maintains, as far as possible, the natural environment that exists at present whilst enhancing the site to provide a high-quality urban landscape. The capacity of the site will be strongly influenced by the need to relate to the existing scale and density of houses to the west; include green space and access links, and protect the amenity of the Canal. The capacity level should therefore be reconsidered. SNH also suggests that a series of developer requirements should be set in order to reduce visual effects on the landscape character of the area.

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/27)** state that the proposed housing site is under the Glasgow Airport Flight Path and houses could also be subject to air pollution from the A82. They also state that the present situation has a relatively pleasant landscape with houses looking outward towards the main road.

#### Education

**Mrs D and Mr G Hopkirk (PLDP/209)** ask if the School is big enough for new families.

#### Other

**Sportscotland (PLDP/026/27)** request that as the site is a former playing field, they would require details relating to the site history and ongoing pitch demand/supply locally at the time of the submission of a planning application for the site.

**Mr J Wilson (PLDP/504)** questions why they were not notified of the site and why it was left so late to notify them.

**Cllr J Mooney (PLDP/667/27)** states that local residents have concerns about the capacity of local services.

In terms of improvements to the natural environment of the area, **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/27)** state that the site could plant a natural wildlife /woodland strip along A82 and Canal side to soak up fumes from traffic and provide the much need wildlife corridor which is supposed to exist along the canal.

**Scottish Canals (PLDP/786)** are keen to understand more about the potential housing site at Strauss Avenue and engage with the Council and any developer to ensure that the site fully respects and integrates with the canal.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

PLDP/109; PLDP/111; PLDP/112; PLDP/113; PLDP/114; PLDP/119; PLDP/120;  
PLDP/160; PLDP/161; PLDP/170; PLDP/171; PLDP/172; PLDP/176; PLDP/181;  
PLDP/209; PLDP/210; PLDP/213; PLDP/214; PLDP/216; PLDP/217; PLDP/219;



PLDP/595; PLDP/596; PLDP/597; PLDP/598; PLDP/599; PLDP/600; PLDP/601; PLDP/602; PLDP/603; PLDP/604; PLDP/605; PLDP/606; PLDP/607; PLDP/608; PLDP/609; PLDP/610; PLDP/611; PLDP/612; PLDP/613; PLDP/614; PLDP/615; PLDP/616; PLDP/617; PLDP/618; PLDP/619; PLDP/620; PLDP/621; PLDP/622; PLDP/623; PLDP/624; PLDP/625; PLDP/626; PLDP/627; PLDP/628; PLDP/638; PLDP/639; PLDP/640/27; PLDP/652; PLDP/657; PLDP/664/27; PLDP/667/27; PLDP/673/27; PLDP/760; PLDP/761 and PLDP/762 request the deletion of site H2(39) from the Plan and it to be retained as open space.

**Mr W Patterson (PLDP/159)** seeks a reduction in the number of houses and that consideration is given to improving parking facilities within Linnvale itself to accommodate the new vehicles and people that will arrive.

**Ms D Fyfe (PLDP/167)** does not specifically propose a modification but would like to see the site used for recreation and allotments etc.

**SNH (PLDP/640/27)** state that the capacity of the site should be re-appraised and that a series of developer requirements should be inserted into the plan as follows:

- Establish a green buffer including trees along the A82 which will reduce the effects of vehicles along the road upon existing residents and the proposed housing and focus attention towards the canal to the south;
- Develop a housing layout that relates to the existing pattern and scale of houses to the west as well as the distinct landscape elements of the A82 and the canal;
- Develop a network of paths that provides links across the site and with the canal-side path;
- Include green, open spaces within the site, including the creation of some focal spaces for public amenity; and
- Design the site to protect and enhance the landscape characteristics, qualities and visual amenity along the canal-side path.

**Logan Factoring and Management Ltd (PLDP/653)** seek an Policy within the LDP to guide the future development of Strauss Avenue and request the following modification to the Plan:

*Housing Allocation H2 39 - Strauss Avenue, Clydebank*

*Capacity: 100 units*

*Masterplan for the redevelopment of the site to be brought forward to include the following requirements:*

- *A masterplan layout drawing;*
- *A transport assessment;*
- *A Flood Risk Assessment may be required.*

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Councils responses to the representations made to the allocation of this site have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Support for Allocation of the Site; Loss of



Open Space; Traffic; Development within Clydebank; Suitability of the Site for Development; Education and other.

#### Support for the Allocation of the Site

The support from **Anonymous (Address Provided) (PLDP/220)** is noted.

The support from **Logan Factoring and Management Ltd (PLDP/653)** is noted. However, the Council does not agree that a Policy within the Plan is required to guide the development of this site. Policy CP 3 of the Plan and the Notes within Schedule 2 already cover these requirements.

#### Loss of Open Space

In response to the majority of the representations stating that the allocation of Strauss Avenue is contrary to the Council's policies on the protection of Open Space and the 'Our Green Network' Planning Guidance, the Council is of the view that the allocation of this site for residential purposes will have significant positive impacts on improving/enhancing the quality of open space within the site boundary and the wider area for the benefit of the community, which is line with the Policy GI 1 of LDP 2 (CD xx) and also in line with Policy requirements of the Adopted Local Plan 2010 (CD xx) and the LDP: Proposed Plan (2016) (CD xx).

Currently, the open space on the site is for general recreation and amenity use and it is considered that the vegetation on the site does not allow it to be used for any recreational use other than dog walking etc. Therefore, the open space is considered to be of low quality and is in need of significant improvement. However, contrary to some of the views expressed within the representations, the level of investment needed to improve the open space cannot be addressed solely from developer contributions. Residential development is required to be able to cross-fund the necessary improvements to enhance the quality of open space in this location.

The proposed development of the site was considered by the Place and Design Panel in order to provide some independent and expert context to the issues raised by the representations, namely the impact on the existing open space and on traffic. The Panel considered that development of the site would create a good and connected housing site, designed from a green-infrastructure first approach. It was stated within the Place and Design Panel Report (March 2019) (Supporting information xx), stated that:

*"the Panel considered the concerns of the residents over loss of open space and amenity and access at every stage of the conversation and suggested ways that might allow the site to be developed successfully while addressing the concerns with balanced and well thought out solutions. This included linkage of existing and future communities by careful consideration of how the open space and pedestrian and cycling permeability was achieved across the site..... A strong theme of the discussions was around recognising the nature of the site as a real pedestrian bridge between the pedestrians and cyclists on the cycle path and the communities south of the canal over to the retail park."*

The Panel were also supportive of some residential development to the edge of the Forth and Clyde Canal to allow passive surveillance and create a place. The Panel however suggested that:



*“a development brief or future design guidance on the site should set out how the landscape and the edge at the canal should be treated”*

The housing site will be designed around a significantly higher quality open space environment which provides opportunities for the current use of the site to continue, whilst introducing new multi-functional uses, such as community gardens etc. The Council considered that this approach to the layout of the site will help to strengthen the existing and adjacent community whilst creating a new one through shared high quality greenspace and high quality design.

The Panel also felt that an area of open space, to the south of the site and on the opposite side of the Canal, could be considered as a wider development framework for the whole area. This would maximise the opportunity for connected amenity and outdoor spaces within the area and would help to create a much more integrated place with higher quality green infrastructure centred around the new housing development.

The area of open space in question is also considered to be of low quality and in need of improvement and can be accessed by the existing road bridge at Duntreath Avenue and also via the existing bridge over the Canal to the south west of the site. The Council is strongly of the view that there should be a policy requirement for the developer to significantly upgrade the open space for multi-functional use and to compensate for the loss of open space on the Strauss Avenue site.

Taking all of the above on board, the Council is of the view that the proposed development of the site will create a high quality environment, based on a green-infrastructure first approach to its design, which will provide enhanced green space provision for a multitude of recreational and community uses.

The Council will prepare a Development Brief for the site which will be based on the advice contained within the Place and Design Panel Report. A masterplan for the site will also be required to be prepared by the developer of the site, which must fully reflect the provisions of the development brief.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the schedule, the Council would have no objection to Schedule 2 being changed and would suggest the following wording is inserted as a new paragraph 2 and 3 to the note:

*“In accordance with Policy CP 3 of the Plan, the Developer will be required to provide a masterplan for development of the site which must fully incorporate the provisions of the Development Brief. The Masterplan will also be required to be submitted to the Council’s Place and Design Panel.*

*Development of the site must ensure that there is a substantial area of enhanced multi-functional open space provided onsite. The Developer will also be required to enhance the area of open space to the south of the site on the opposite side of the Forth and Clyde Canal.”*

#### Traffic

Referring to the representations in relation to traffic, access and parking issues, the Council’s Roads and Transportation Service and Glasgow City Council’s Roads Section have raised no objections to the development of the site but requested that the note

contained within Schedule 2 should be added to Local Development Plan 2. Transport Scotland have also not objected to the site.

It should also be noted that at the Main Issues Stage, an access statement was submitted by **Logan Factoring and Management Ltd (PLDP/653)** (Supporting Information xx) which demonstrates there are a number of access options to enable the site to be developed. The Council's Roads and Transportation Service and Glasgow City Council's Roads and Transportation Section have reviewed this document and are both of the view that the access could potentially come from the A82.

The Place and Design Panel considered the issue of access as one of its deliberations on the proposed development of the site. The Place and Design Panel Report stated that:

*“a site under 100 units could be supported with one access/egress option with another access for emergency vehicles only. It was a key suggestion that the language around this secondary access avoided using the words ‘secondary access’ and focused on this being called ‘emergency access’.*

*Considering the possible access arrangements that could be achieved on the site the most practical solution was to take access from the A82. The transport planning Panellist suggested the geometry of the junction in relation to the slip road would have to be considered carefully, possibly incorporating a give way or stop junction treatment. It is a difficult and unpleasant junction currently but traffic is slowing in anticipation of the lights just beyond the junction. It was thought this was an achievable solution but that this would be resolved in the Traffic Assessment for the site.”*

The Council would point out that a Transport Assessment will be required for the site, as detailed in the Notes contained within Schedule 2 of the Plan.

In relation to the representation from **Mr W Patterson (PLDP/159)**, the Council would point out that these are detailed matters which are best addressed at the Development Management and Roads Construction Consent stages. The Council would also reiterate the Note contained within Schedule 2 of the Plan states that there will not be any primary access to Linnvale from the site. The only intention is to have an emergency access to the site for emergency vehicles but this will be taken from Duntreath Avenue in Glasgow.

In relation to the issues raised by **Ms M McGregor (PLDP/111); Ms J Clark (PLDP/161); Ms D Fyfe (PLDP/167); Mrs D and Mr G Hopkirk (PLDP/209); Mrs K Pryde (PLDP 226); Mrs M Yooh (PLDP/473); Mrs A Dale (PLDP/475); Mr J Wilson (PLDP/504); Mrs G Daly (PLDP/564); Mr D Gunnion (PLDP/597) and Mr N Bell (PLDP/639)**, the Council would reiterate that there will only be an emergency access between Duntreath Avenue and the Strauss Avenue sites; therefore, there will be no additional traffic within the Linnvale area as a result of this development. In relation to the emergency access and how this will operate in practice is a detailed matter which should be addressed at the Development Management Stage.

In relation to issues raised by **Ms M McGregor (PLDP/111); Mr J Flemming (PLDP/176); Ms J Lafferty (PLDP/451); Ms C McLean (PLDP/480) and Mr D Gunnion (PLDP/597)** with regard to child/road safety, the Council reiterates that there will be no access from the Strauss Avenue site into Linnvale. Therefore, there will be no impact on the road network within Linnvale. It should also be noted that the Council's Roads and Transportation Section have not objected to the allocation of the site or raised any issues

with road safety.

In relation to issues raised by **Ms M McGregor (PLDP/111)**; **Mr and Mrs J Hart (PLDP/331)** and **Mrs S Williams (PLDP/324)** with regard to parking etc at School drop off and pick up times and speeding, the Council would point out that this is not an issue that the Plan can address; however, the Council do not see the development adding to this situation as the primary access will be from the A82 and that the Council's Roads and Transportation Section have not objected to the development of this site on these grounds. The matter of speeding cars is an issue that is required to be dealt with by Police Scotland and is outwith the remit of the Council and the Plan.

In relation to the representation by **Ms J Clark (PLDP/161)** with regard to access to and from the A82 being voted against twice, no information on what was proposed at that time has been provided; therefore, it is not possible to comment on this point. However, it is considered that the site can be accessed from the A82, subject to a Transport Assessment demonstrating that safe access can be provided, and that there is no intention of creating a 'rat run' into Linnvale. With regard to the point raised by the respondent in relation to Construction Traffic, the Council is of the view that this would come from the A82 and would require the primary access to be formed before any construction would be allowed to start. The Council will not allow construction traffic to come through Linnvale.

In relation to the issues of delay onto the A82 and a divided community centre raised by **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/27)**, the Council would state that its Roads service, Glasgow City Council's Roads Section and Transport Scotland have raised no objections to the development of the site on this basis. The Council is also of a view that the development of Strauss Avenue, especially in relation to requirements of Policies CP1, CP2, CP3 and CP4 of LDP 2, will ensure that the development of the site integrates with Linnvale and Clydebank thus strengthening the existing community. The issue of maintaining an strong landscape/open space buffer will also be addressed by the Development Brief and masterplan

Taking all of the above on board, the Council is strongly of the view that development of the site will not exacerbate existing traffic, parking and congestions issues within Linnvale. The Council is however of the view that an amendment to the Note attached to Strauss Avenue within Schedule 2 of the Plan should be made to remove the word 'Secondary' from the text and replace it with 'emergency' and allow emergency access to come from Duntreath Avenue in Glasgow if required.

Should the Reporter wish to amend the schedule, the Council would have no objection to Schedule 2 being changed and would suggest that the Note is amended as follows (~~deletions~~/additions are in **bold**):

*"Strauss Avenue, annotated with '6', requires a primary access to be formed from the A82, or from other appropriate roads within Glasgow City Councils boundary. A Transport Assessment for the site is required to be provided, which among other requirements, should demonstrate the optimum point for this new primary access to the site and that safe access to the site can be satisfactorily demonstrated to the satisfaction of both West Dunbartonshire Council and Glasgow City Council, whilst meeting the appropriate Roads geometric standards of both Councils. West Dunbartonshire Council will not support a primary access from Livingstone Street and Strauss Avenue. **Strauss Avenue Duntreath Avenue in Glasgow City Council's boundary** will only be allowed to provide an*

~~**emergency secondary** access for emergency vehicles and as an emergency access.~~  
*Early discussions with West Dunbartonshire Council's Roads Service and Glasgow City Council's Roads and Transportation Service are required in this regard."*

#### Development within Clydebank

With regard to the points made by **Ms D Fyfe (PLDP/167)**, the Council would point out that to meet the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (CD xx), Local Development Plan 2 is required to provide a range and choice of land suitable for housing, which meets the Housing Land Requirement of the Plan, otherwise it will not be in conformity with Scottish Government policy.

The Council has identified a wide range of housing sites of varying scales from vacant brownfield sites within settlements to greenfield sites on the edge of towns and within villages, whilst protecting the integrity, character and appearance of the Greenbelt. As brownfield sites can take a period of time to develop, there also needs to be a supply of 'shovel ready' sites which are capable of being developed in the short term to ensure that there is not an undersupply of housing land within the Plan period. Strauss Avenue has therefore been allocated as a new greenfield release to ensure that there is a supply of 'shovel ready' land within Clydebank to meet the housing land requirements of the Plan. No modifications are therefore required in this instance.

#### Site Capacity

A number of respondents have raised issues in relation to the capacity of the site. The number of units allocated for the site is 100 and it must be stressed this is indicative at this stage in the planning process. The masterplan for the site will ultimately decide the exact amount of units that can be delivered, but the Council is satisfied that the site could deliver 100 units. No modifications to the Plan are therefore considered necessary.

#### Suitability of the Site for Development

With regard to the issues raised by **Ms D Fyfe (PLDP/167)** and **Ms J Friel (PLDP/371)**, in relation to ground stability and flooding, the Council have assessed the sites suitability for development in terms of infrastructure capacity (water, drainage, flood risk, access, wider road/public transport network, schools). The land also has no known infrastructure development constraints that would make the site undevelopable. However, the Council does acknowledge that the ground does not properly drain from its site inspections and some of the site can become quite boggy in wet conditions. That being said, the Council is satisfied that the site is appropriate for development and will alleviate the issues that the respondent has raised.

In relation to the representation from **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/27)**, the Council would respond as follows:

- The site can be developed whilst maintaining a green buffer between Clydebank and Glasgow;
- The access statement, submitted by **Logan Factoring and Management Ltd (PLDP/653)**, provides a high level analysis of access to the site and both the Council's Roads service and Glasgow City Council are of the view that safe access from the A82 is achievable. It should be noted that the Taylor Wimpey has not

provided any transport assessment or other information to substantiate their claims;

- There are no known constraints to development on the site and, as detailed above, the Council's proposed modification to the plan will ensure that a substantial area of safeguarded and enhanced open space will be provided thus complying with the Council's own development policies in this regard;
- In relation to the Environmental Report (CD xx), the respondent has respectfully mis-interpreted some of the criteria and the assessment in this regard i.e. there is likely to be a significant positive impact on air quality as the site is close to a public transport stop and near to a railway station, which will mitigate against the increase of cars thus having positive impacts. The mitigation measures are also considered to be appropriate for a high level SEA of the site and Taylor Wimpey has provided no quantifiable information to back up their claims that the environmental assessment of the site is questionable;
- The significant environmental constraints that the respondent refers to are addressed in the Environmental Report alongside the mitigation measures, which address identified significant adverse environmental impacts. The assessment concluded that the site was likely to have significant positive/negative impacts. It should be noted that the Consultation Authorities have not disagreed with the proposed mitigation measures and, in fact, Historic Environment Scotland has requested that a buffer zone, to protect the setting and integrity of the Forth and Clyde Canal Scheduled Monument, is added to the mitigation measures.
- Taylor Wimpey claim that the site has significant surface water drainage issues; is prone to ponding; and is at risk of flooding. The Council would point out that ponding will occur on any undeveloped site and can be addressed through construction and design. The issues regarding flooding are not disputed; however, again this can be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures detailed in a Flood Risk Assessment. It should be noted both Scottish Water and SEPA have not objected to development of the site;
- The site has been fully assessed by the Council and is considered to be in a much more sustainable location than the Duntiglennen Fields site that Taylor Wimpey wishes to be included in preference to this site. The Place and Design Panel commented that it is unusual to have such a well-connected site, in close proximity to facilities and public transport links.
- The consultants acting on behalf of **Logan Factoring and Management Ltd (PLDP/653)** indicate that there have already been notes of interest from a number of housebuilders (some are Homes for Scotland members) which is at odds with Taylor Wimpey's view that there is little ambition from volume housebuilders to develop this site. The notes of interest from these housebuilders can be made available to the Reporter should they be required to demonstrate interest in the site;
- In relation to the point raised regarding the Yoker Burn; historical information shows that the burn is culverted within the site. The Place and Design Panel considered this issue and, whilst acknowledging that it is a potential constraint, also saw it as an excellent opportunity as part of a wider greenspace offering. The Panel also felt that the burn could be utilised as sustainable drainage solution via an attenuated



feed. Overall, the Panel felt that the Yoker Burn could be a real asset to the site if treated carefully.

The Council therefore disagrees with Taylor Wimpey's view that the inclusion of the site has no justification. It is the Council's view that the site has been through a rigorous assessment process and is justified for inclusion as a viable greenfield release site, which is in an much more sustainable location than the site proposed by Taylor Wimpey.

In relation to the representations from **Mr W Patterson (PLDP/159)** and **SNH (PLDP/640/27)**, the Place and Design Panel did not raise any issues with the proposed capacity of the site, which reflects the Council's view that the indicative capacity of the site should be 100 units. The Council is also of the view that the developer requirements suggested by **SNH (PLDP/640/27)** are detailed matters to be addressed within the development brief and masterplan for the site. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

In relation to the representation from **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/27)**, the Council is of the view that the air noise and pollution would apply to most sites within this area of Clydebank and into Glasgow. It should be noted that Glasgow Airport have not objected to the inclusion of this site and it would be for the developer of the site to ensure that the effects of aircraft noise are mitigated as far as is practically possible.

In response the comments made in relation to the current character of the area, the Council is of the view that although development would change the nature of the site, the design of the site will ensure that there the area still provides a pleasant landscape whilst upgrading the quality of open space within the area.

### Education

With regard to the representation from **Mrs D and Mr G Hopkirk (PLDP/209)**, the Council is of the view that there is sufficient capacity within the nearby Schools to cope with the development of this site at its indicative capacity.

### Other

The Council will ensure that **Sportscotland (PLDP/026)**, as a statutory consultee, is provided with the information that they require, by the developer, at planning application stage. For information, the Council's Greenspace section have stated that there is no demand for sports pitches within this part of Clydebank.

In relation to the comments of **Mr J Wilson (PLDP/504)**, the site was contained within the Main Issues Report as a preferred housing site and that the consultation on the Main Issues Report followed the Development Plan Scheme Participation Statement and the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended). In relation to the proposed plan, the Council are only required by legislation to neighbour notify properties within 20 metres of the site boundary and the consultation and publication requirements set out in Legislation and those contained within the Participation Statement. The Council has complied with all requirements set within legislation and detailed in the Participation Statement and is of the view that site was preferred for residential development from an early stage in the plan preparation process.

With regard to the point raised by **Cllr J Mooney (PLDP/667/27)**, the Council would point

out that the Councils Education Service, the NHS Greater Clyde and Glasgow and other service providers have not objected to the allocation of this site. Therefore, the Council is of the view that local services will be able to cope with the indicative capacity of this site.

The suggestions for improvements to the natural environment from **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/27)** will be considered when the development brief is being prepared.

The comments from **Scottish Canals (PLDP/786/27)** are noted. The Council will seek to engage with Scottish Canals as proposals for the site are progressed through preparation of a development brief, masterplan and planning application.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>



Issue 28	Main Street, Jamestown	
Development plan reference:	Policy H2 (Page 78) and Schedule 2: Opportunity for Private Housing (Pages 123-125)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<div><div><div>M Nixon (PLDP/005) Miss Annette Falconer (PLDP/016) Eileen Cairns (PLDP/233) SNH (PLDP/640/28) Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/28) Pauline Healy (PLDP/678) Caroline Malkron (PLDP/679) Mrs M Lynch (PLDP/680) Lynda McCoshan (PLDP/681) Sandra Burrowes (PLDP/682) Taylor McNaught (PLDP/683) Linsay McLean (PLDP/684) Rebecca Shanks (PLDP/685) Mrs Agnes Ann Kelly (PLDP/686) Connor O'Neill (PLDP/687) Marc Queen (PLDP/688) Donna Urbanik (PLDP/689) Matthew Goodwin (PLDP/690) Lynn Skinner (PLDP/691) John Urbanik (PLDP/692)</div><div>Abby McNaught (PLDP/693) Margaret Stephens (PLDP/694) Michelle Stephens (PLDP/695) Frank Michael Stephens (PLDP/696) Natasha Walker (PLDP/697) Stephaine Chalmers (PLDP/698) Ryan Baxter (PLDP/701) Scott Ewing (PLDP/702) Megan Carmichael (PLDP/703) Sharon MacKay (PLDP/704) Lawrence Millar (PLDP/705) Dylan James McLean (PLDP/706) Ann Marie Brockett (PLDP/707) Lisa Gray (PLDP/708) Jade McDade (PLDP/709) Melissa Queen (PLDP/710) Matilda Brockett (PLDP/711) Lauren Cairns (PLDP/712) Aiden Cairns (PLDP/713) John Cairns (PLDP/714) Anne Queen (PLDP/715) Liz Cunningham (PLDP/716)</div></div></div>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to representations received in relation to a Private Housing Opportunity Site: H2(40) Main Street, Jamestown	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>PLDP/005; PLDP/016 PLDP/233; PLDP/678; PLDP/679; PLDP/680; PLDP/681; PLDP/682; PLDP/683; PLDP/684; PLDP/685; PLDP/686; PLDP/687; PLDP/688; PLDP/689; PLDP/690; PLDP/691; PLDP/692; PLDP/693; PLDP/694; PLDP/695; PLDP/696; PLDP/697; PLDP/698; PLDP/701; PLDP/702; PLDP/703; PLDP/704; PLDP/705; PLDP/706; PLDP/707; PLDP/708; PLDP/709; PLDP/710; PLDP/711; PLDP/712; PLDP/713; PLDP/714; PLDP/715; and PLDP/716 all object to the principle of development on the site and all raise the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concerned about loss of open space, which is used for access and dog walking;</li><li>• Concerned about loss of trees;</li><li>• Questions the ability for the site to comply with the council's design policies particularly in relation to Policy CP1 Creating Places point a) as well as Policy CP2 Green</li></ul>		

Infrastructure points d) and e);

- Would like to know if the Council will ensure that the houses are affordable;
- Would like to ensure that the site will fit with the existing residential character;
- Questions if development of site can comply with Policy GI2 – Open Space Standards;
- Believe that the residents will not benefit from the development because the site is unlikely to have associated developer contributions;
- Concerned that development will increase flood risk;
- Believe that new development will have a negative impact on public transport services, which are already considered to be poor;
- Highlight potential negative and unknown impacts from the Environmental Report (CD/XX);
- Concerned that existing parking issues will be exacerbated by the development.

**SNH (PLDP/640/28)** believe that the site to has capacity for the proposed allocation and that it may be able to fit within the existing landscape pattern. To relate to the landscape character and reduce visual effects, SNH recommend the Council sets developer requirements within the plan and/or associated development briefs.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/28)** questions the deliverability and/or programming of site and is of the view that this brownfield site is not effective.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**PLDP/005; PLDP/016; PLDP/233; PLDP/678; PLDP/679; PLDP/680; PLDP/681; PLDP/682; PLDP/683; PLDP/684; PLDP/685; PLDP/686; PLDP/687; PLDP/688; PLDP/689; PLDP/690; PLDP/691; PLDP/692; PLDP/693; PLDP/694; PLDP/695; PLDP/696; PLDP/697; PLDP/698; PLDP/701; PLDP/702; PLDP/703; PLDP/704; PLDP/705; PLDP/706; PLDP/707; PLDP/708; PLDP/709; PLDP/710; PLDP/711; PLDP/712; PLDP/713; PLDP/714; PLDP/715; and PLDP/716** all wish the site to be removed from the Plan.

**SNH (PLDP/640/28)** recommend that the Council sets developer requirements, in the plan and/or associated development briefs, covering the following:

- Maintain existing mature trees along the southern edge which are valuable as landscape features;
- Maintain/ reinforce the belt of trees along the northern boundary to protect the green link along the path to the River Leven;
- Maintain/ establish a green buffer along the A813 that mirrors that on the eastern side of the main road, to protect residents' amenity and relate to the existing landscape pattern;
- Provide access across the site or to link with the existing path to the River Leven; and
- Repair/ rebuild the stone wall along the northern boundary of the site to reinforce the landscape pattern and link to the River Leven.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council's response to the representations made to the allocation of this site have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Allocation and Effectiveness of the Site; Open Space and Green Network; Affordable Housing; Residential Character; Flood Risk;

Public Transport; Construction Noise; Parking; and Developer Requirements.

#### Allocation and Effectiveness of the Site

In response to the representations seeking removal of the site from the Plan, in order to meet the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (CD xx), Local Development Plan 2 is required to provide a range and choice of land suitable for housing, which meets the Housing Land Requirement of the Plan.

The Council has identified a wide range of housing sites of varying scales from vacant brownfield sites within settlements to greenfield sites on the edge of towns and within villages, whilst protecting the integrity, character and appearance of the Greenbelt. Although this site has re-naturalised, it has previously been developed and meets with the SPP and the Council's strategy of regenerating brownfield land in preference to greenfield land. The site is within the settlement boundary and close to existing facilities and public transport. There are no known constraints to its development and the site is located in a sustainable location and is an effective housing site, which contributes to meeting the housing land requirement of the Plan.

In response to the representation from **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/28)** the Council is of the view that the site is effective, for the reasons set out above, and that the landowner is willing to sell the site for residential development. The site is therefore capable of being delivered within the Plan period.

No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Open Space and Green Network

The development of this site for a small number of houses will not have a significant detrimental impact on the green network and open space within Jamestown and could result in an enhancement of the greenspace through good design in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP2 of the site. The Council is confident that the site is large enough to meet the open space standards specified in Policy GI 2 of the Plan. However, these detailed issues raised by the majority of the respondents are matters which are best addressed at the Development Management stage.

No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Affordable Housing

In response to the comments relating to the affordability of the proposed housing, the Council has allocated this site for private housing to assist with meeting the housing supply target for this tenure. Clydeplan (CD xx) sets out the housing land requirement for both private and social rented housing and the Plan is required to allocate a range and choice of sites to meet the targets for both tenures. Therefore, the allocation of this site is needed for the Plan to accord with housing land requirement in relation to private housing.

The Council would further point out that it has allocated a number of sites throughout West Dunbartonshire to meet with the requirements of the Local Housing Strategy (CD xx) and the Council's strategic priority of providing affordable housing. This site has not been identified by the Council's Housing service for that purpose.

No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Residential Character

The Council considers that the representations regarding the ability of the development to fit with the residential character of the area is a detailed design matter that is best addressed at the Development Management stage. However, it should be pointed out that Policies CP 1 and CP2 will help to ensure that the design of the development will not have an adverse impact on the existing character and appearance of the area. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Flood Risk

The environmental report indicated that the site had a medium probability of flooding. SEPA has not objected to its allocation but did advise that early contact should be made with them when a planning application comes forward for the site. Mitigation measures for potential flooding on the site are considered to be detailed matters which are best left to the Development Management stage to address. However, the Council considers that these issues can be overcome and that the site is deliverable. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Public Transport

In relation to representation with regard to public transport, the Council considers that a development of this size proposed is unlikely to have a significant impact on public transport provision in the area. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Environmental Report

The Council would point out the purpose of the Environmental Report is to anticipate the likely significant environmental impacts (positive or negative) that may arise from development of the site and to put forward mitigation and/or enhancement measures to alleviate and/or improve these environmental impacts. The Environmental Report has put mitigation measures in place to alleviate these issues and Policy ENV 10 of the Plan requires the developer of the site to provide these mitigation and/or enhancement measures, otherwise the proposed development will not be in accordance with the Plan.

It is also considered that the Policies within the plan in relation to flooding and archaeological sites will also help to ensure that development with unacceptable impacts will not take place or that potential impacts are mitigated where possible.

No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Noise During Construction

With regard to the representation from **Miss Annette Falconer (PLDP/016)**, the Council would point out that all development will generate noise when it is being constructed and that construction noise is considered at the Development Management stage. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Parking

Issues relating to the amount of parking and whether this exacerbates existing parking issues or not is a detailed matter which is best considered at the Development Management stage and is not an issue for the Plan to address. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Developer Requirements

In response to **SNH (PLDP/640/28)**, the Council considers that these requirements provide more detail than is appropriate for inclusion within Local Development Plan 2 for a site of this size. However, given that the site is a sensitive infill development, the Council will prepare a development brief for the site, in line with Policy CP3 of the Plan, and will take incorporate SNH's comments at that stage. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 29	The Glebe, Old Kilpatrick	
Development plan reference:	Policy H2 (Page 78), Schedule 2: Site H2 (41) (Page 123) and Clydebank Proposals Map	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<div><div><div>Ms Linda Mount (PLDP/003) Mrs. Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011) Church of Scotland General Trustees' Secretary's Department (PLDP/018) Mr Gordon Boyd (PLDP/019) Mr George Millar Greig (PLDP/020) Mr Ross MacLeod (PLDP/021) Mrs Andrea MacLeod (PLDP/022) Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024) Mrs Ann Marie Boyd (PLDP/025) Mrs Ethel Bunniss (PLDP/110) Mr David Stuart Graham (PLDP/115) Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118) Mrs Margaret Spence (PLDP/162) Mr Ian Spence (PLDP/163) Ms Yvonne O'Donnell (PLDP/168) Mr Brian O'Donnell (PLDP/169) Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/29) Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180) Mr Gordon McNee (PLDP/183) Mr Brian O'Donnell (PLDP/184) Mrs A Cairns (PLDP/186) Ms Sandra Hay (PLDP/211) Mr David Hay (PLDP/212) Mr Derek Cameron (PLDP/215) Ms Daphne V. MacKay (PLDP/218) Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223) Ms Elizabeth Sharp (PLDP/227) Mr David Sharp (PLDP/228) Mrs McDowell (PLDP/629) Cyril Lees (PLDP/630) Mrs Shirley Black (PLDP/631)</div><div><div>Rena &amp; Catherine McKenzie (PLDP/632) Ms Elizabeth Fairlie (PLDP/633) Mrs Christine &amp; Mr William Frame (PLDP/634) Ms Elizabeth Henry (PLDP/635) Ms Helen Conboy (PLDP/636) Mr Hugh &amp; Mrs Jean Lyon Lester (PLDP/637) SNH (PLDP/640/29) Mrs Julie Chappelle (PLDP/643) Mr George Chappelle (PLDP/644) Mr Paul Thomson (PLDP/654) Mrs Karen Thomson (PLDP/655) Mrs Claire Hamilton (PLDP/658) Old Kilpatrick Community Council (PLDP/661) Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/29) Mr Jim Thomson (PLDP/665) Ms Marianne Docherty (PLDP/666) Mr Allan Savage (PLDP/670) Clydebelt (PLDP/673/29) Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/29) Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/29) Mr Graham Parton (PLDP/721/29) Ms Linda McGregor (PLDP/738) Peachy Trainer (PLDP/763) Moiria Harkness (PLDP/764) Mr &amp; Mrs McGregor (PLDP/765) Mr John McLachlan (PLDP/779) Bowling and Milton Community Council (PLDP/782/29)</div></div></div></div>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates the allocation of Land at the Glebe, Old Kilpatrick (Site Ref: H2(41)) for residential use with an indicative capacity of 15 units.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
The representations made to the allocation of this site have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Allocation of the Site, Site Capacity and Site Effectiveness; Greenbelt, Green Network, Biodiversity and Landscape Character; Character and Amenity; Traffic and Access; Infrastructure, Ground Conditions and Services; Built		



Heritage and Archaeology; Compliance with Other Policies; and Consultation on the Site Allocation Of The Site, Site Capacity and Site Effectiveness

**Ms Linda Mount (PLDP/003); Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011); Mrs Ethel Bunniss (PLDP/110); Ms Yvonne O'Donnell (PLDP/168); Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/29), Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/29), Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/29), Mr Graham Parton (PLDP/721/29), Ms Linda McGregor (PLDP/738), Mr & Mrs McGregor (PLDP/765); Mr Brian O'Donnell (PLDP/184); Mrs A Cairns (PLDP/186); Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223); Ms Helen Conboy (PLDP/636); Mr Paul Thomson (PLDP/654); Mrs Karen Thomson (PLDP/655); Mr Jim Thomson (PLDP/665); and Ms Moira Harkness (PLDP/764)** object to the allocation of the site.

**Mrs Andrea MacLeod (PLDP/022); Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024); Mrs Ann Marie Boyd (PLDP/025); Mr Ian Spence (PLDP/163); Mr Gordon McNee (PLDP/183); Mr George Chappelle (PLDP/644)** raise issues relating to Brownfield land.

**Ms Marianne Docherty (PLDP/666)** understands the need for housing in West Dunbartonshire, but thinks previously developed land should be found.

**Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011); Mr George Millar Greig (PLDP/020) and Mr David Stuart Graham (PLDP/115)** question the number and type of dwellings to be provided.

**Church of Scotland General Trustees' Secretary's Department (PLDP/018)** states that the site, which is 2.4 acres, has the capacity to provide 30 units and that the indicative capacity should be changed to this higher density.

**SNH (PLDP/640/29)** state that the capacity of the site will depend on its layout and recommend that this is considered further through the design of the site and type of properties within it.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/29), Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/29), Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/29), Mr Graham Parton (PLDP/721/29), Ms Linda McGregor (PLDP/738), Mr & Mrs McGregor (PLDP/765)** state that the site has been in use for grazing and is used by the Church for its fetes. They also state that an alternative proposal has been put forward which would not involve development.

**Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/29)** call into question the effectiveness of the site and its deliverability and/or programming.

Greenbelt, Green Network, biodiversity and landscape character

**Ms Linda Mount (PLDP/003)** is of the view that the residents of Mansefield Crescent had been informed that the site was greenbelt and would not be built on.

**Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011); Mr Gordon Boyd (PLDP/019); Mr Ross MacLeod (PLDP/021); Mrs Andrea MacLeod (PLDP/022); Mrs Ann Marie Boyd (PLDP/025); Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118); Ms Yvonne O'Donnell (PLDP/168); Mr Gordon McNee (PLDP/183); Mr Brian O'Donnell (PLDP/184); Ms Elizabeth Sharp (PLDP/227); Mrs Julie Chappelle (PLDP/643); Mr George Chappelle (PLDP/644); Mr Paul Thomson (PLDP/654); Mrs Karen Thomson (PLDP/655); Mrs Claire Hamilton (PLDP/658); Mr Jim Thomson (PLDP/665); Ms Marianne Docherty (PLDP/666); and Mr Allan Savage (PLDP/670);** raise concerns relating to loss of open space and potential



impact on biodiversity.

**Mr George Millar Greig (PLDP/020); Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024); Mrs Ethel Bunniss (PLDP/110); Mr David Stuart Graham (PLDP/115); Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180); Peachy Trainer (PLDP/763); and Ms Moira Harkness (PLDP/764)** raise concerns relating to a loss of open space.

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/29)** is of the view that the site should be kept for community use such as allotments, play park etc.

**Mrs Margaret Spence (PLDP/162); Mr Brian O'Donnell (PLDP/169); Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/29), Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/29), Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/29), Mr Graham Parton (PLDP/721/29), Ms Linda McGregor (PLDP/738), Mr & Mrs McGregor (PLDP/765); Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223); Bowling and Milton Community Council (PLDP/782/29)** raise concerns relating to potential impact on biodiversity on the site.

**Mrs Margaret Spence (PLDP/162); Mr Ian Spence (PLDP/163)** raise concerns relating to the potential impact that development would have on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) and the redshank.

**SNH (PLDP/640/29)** recommend the Council sets developer requirements in relation to landscape character and the reduction of visual effects, within the plan and/or associated development briefs.

#### Character and Amenity

**Ms Linda Mount (PLDP/003); Mr Ross MacLeod (PLDP/021); Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024); Mrs Ethel Bunniss (PLDP/110); Mr David Stuart Graham (PLDP/115); Mr Gordon McNee (PLDP/183); Cyril Lees (PLDP/630); Mr Hugh & Mrs Jean Lyon Lester (PLDP/637); Mr Paul Thomson (PLDP/654); Mrs Karen Thomson (PLDP/655); and Ms Marianne Docherty (PLDP/666)** raise concerns relating to a loss of amenity for residents.

**Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011); Ms Elizabeth Fairlie (PLDP/633); Mrs Christine & Mr William Frame (PLDP/634); Ms Helen Conboy (PLDP/636); and Mr Hugh & Mrs Jean Lyon Lester (PLDP/637)** raise concerns related to disruption, noise and dirt during construction.

**Mr Gordon Boyd (PLDP/019); Ms Yvonne O'Donnell (PLDP/168); Mr Paul Thomson (PLDP/654); Mrs Karen Thomson (PLDP/655); and Mrs Claire Hamilton (PLDP/658)** state that the development would alter the character of the area.

#### Traffic and Access

**Ms Linda Mount (PLDP/003); Mr Gordon Boyd (PLDP/019); Mr George Millar Greig (PLDP/020); Mr Ross MacLeod (PLDP/021); Mrs Andrea MacLeod (PLDP/022); Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024); Mrs Ann Marie Boyd (PLDP/025); Mrs Ethel Bunniss (PLDP/110); Mr David Stuart Graham (PLDP/115); Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118); Mrs Margaret Spence (PLDP/162); Mr Ian Spence (PLDP/163); Ms Yvonne O'Donnell (PLDP/168); Mr Brian O'Donnell (PLDP/169); Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180); Mr Gordon McNee (PLDP/183); Ms Sandra Hay (PLDP/211); Mr David Hay (PLDP/212); Mr Derek Cameron (PLDP/215); Mr Daphne V. MacKay (PLDP/218); Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223); Ms Elizabeth Sharp (PLDP/227); Mr David**

**Sharp (PLDP/228); Rena & Catherine McKenzie (PLDP/632); Ms Helen Conboy (PLDP/636); Mrs Julie Chappelle (PLDP/643); Mr George Chappelle (PLDP/644); Mrs Claire Hamilton (PLDP/658); Mr Allan Savage (PLDP/670); Peachy Trainer (PLDP/763); Ms Moira Harkness (PLDP/764); and Mr John McLachlan (PLDP/779)** state that Mansefield Crescent and/or Erskine View are not suitable for forming a safe access to the site.

**Ms Linda Mount (PLDP/003); Mr Ross MacLeod (PLDP/021); Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024); Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118); Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180); Ms Sandra Hay (PLDP/211); Mr David Hay (PLDP/212); Ms Elizabeth Sharp (PLDP/227); Mr David Sharp (PLDP/228)** state that there is a ransom strip at the end of Mansefield Crescent which prevents access.

**Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011); Mrs Ethel Bunniss (PLDP/110); Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118); Mrs Margaret Spence (PLDP/162); Mr Ian Spence (PLDP/163); Ms Yvonne O'Donnell (PLDP/168); Mr Brian O'Donnell (PLDP/169); Mr Gordon McNee (PLDP/183); Mr David Hay (PLDP/212); Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223); Ms Elizabeth Fairlie (PLDP/633); Mrs Christine & Mr William Frame (PLDP/634); Mr George Chappelle (PLDP/644); Mr Paul Thomson (PLDP/654); Mrs Karen Thomson (PLDP/655); Mrs Claire Hamilton (PLDP/658); Old Kilpatrick Community Council (PLDP/661); Ms Marianne Docherty (PLDP/666); Mr Allan Savage (PLDP/670); Peachy Trainer (PLDP/763);** raise specific concerns in relation to traffic, access and parking.

**Mrs A Cairns (PLDP/186); Mrs McDowell (PLDP/629); Cyril Lees (PLDP/630); Mrs Shirley Black (PLDP/631); Ms Elizabeth Fairlie (PLDP/633); Mrs Christine & Mr William Frame (PLDP/634)** raise concerns relating to access for elderly people with mobility or visual impairments.

**Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223)** states that access through the church's own property would be preferred.

**Ms Elizabeth Henry (PLDP/635) and Mr Hugh & Mrs Jean Lyon Lester (PLDP/637)** state that no safe access can be formed for the development. **Mr Hugh & Mrs Jean Lyon Lester (PLDP/637)** also state that requests to make Erksine View a one way system have gone unnoticed.

**Old Kilpatrick Community Council (PLDP/661)** raises issues for traffic congestion along Dumbarton Road and the impact of development on this issue. They are of the view that a comprehensive review of traffic management arrangements are carried out.

#### Infrastructure, Ground Conditions and Services

**Ms Linda Mount (PLDP/003); Mr Gordon Boyd (PLDP/019); Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024); Mrs Ann Marie Boyd (PLDP/025); Mrs Ethel Bunniss (PLDP/110); Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118); Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180); Mrs Julie Chappelle (PLDP/643); and Mr George Chappelle (PLDP/644)** raise issues related to potential impact on a sewer which runs through the field and there have been issues in the past.

**Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011)** questions how power, water and sewerage services can be accessed.

**Mr Gordon Boyd (PLDP/019); Mrs Andrea MacLeod (PLDP/022); Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180); Mr David Hay (PLDP/212); Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223); Ms Elizabeth Sharp (PLDP/227); Mr David Sharp (PLDP/228); Mr George Chappelle (PLDP/644); and Mr Allan Savage (PLDP/670)** raise concerns about a disused oil pipeline running through the field.

**Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118); Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180)** raise issues relating to ground conditions.

**Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180)** states the site is a landfill site going back to 1949 which carries a statutory grant of servitude.

**Mrs Andrea MacLeod (PLDP/022); Mrs Ann Marie Boyd (PLDP/025); Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118); Mrs Margaret Spence (PLDP/162); Mr Ian Spence (PLDP/163); Ms Yvonne O'Donnell (PLDP/168); Mr Brian O'Donnell (PLDP/169); Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180); Mr Brian O'Donnell (PLDP/184); Ms Sandra Hay (PLDP/211); Mr Derek Cameron (PLDP/215); Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223); Ms Elizabeth Sharp (PLDP/227); Mr David Sharp (PLDP/228); Mr Paul Thomson (PLDP/654); and Mrs Karen Thomson (PLDP/655)** raise concerns in relation to flooding and drainage.

**Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024) and Mr Hugh & Mrs Jean Lyon Lester (PLDP/637)** raise issues in relation to the capacity of local amenities to support new residents.

#### Built Heritage and Archaeology

**Mr Gordon Boyd (PLDP/019) and Mrs Margaret Spence (PLDP/162)** raises issues in relation to impact on the Forth and Clyde Canal.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/29), Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/29), Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/29), Mr Graham Parton (PLDP/721/29), Ms Linda McGregor (PLDP/738), Mr & Mrs McGregor (PLDP/765) (PLDP/670) Mr Jim Thomson (PLDP/665)** raise issues with the site being in close proximity to the Antonine Wall; roman remains under the site; and impact on the Forth and Clyde Canal.

**Mrs Margaret Spence (PLDP/162); Ms Yvonne O'Donnell (PLDP/168); Mr Gordon McNee (PLDP/183); Mr Paul Thomson (PLDP/654); Mrs Karen Thomson (PLDP/655); Mr Jim Thomson (PLDP/665); Mr Allan Savage (PLDP/670); and Bowling and Milton Community Council (PLDP/782)** raise concerns relating to potential archaeological remains under the site.

#### Compliance with other policies

**Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118) and Mrs Claire Hamilton (PLDP/658)** believe that the proposed development would not comply with other parts of LDP 2.

#### Consultation on the Site

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/29), Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/29), Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/29), Mr Graham Parton (PLDP/721/29), Ms Linda McGregor (PLDP/738), Mr & Mrs McGregor (PLDP/765)** state that the proposal was not mentioned in the Main Issues Report and that there is considerable local opposition to the inclusion of the site

for housing.

**Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011)** specifically questions how the designation of the site can be changed without consultation or information provided to residents.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**PLDP/003; PLDP/011; PLDP/019; PLDP/021; PLDP/022; PLDP/024; PLDP/025; PLDP/110; PLDP/115; PLDP/162; PLDP/163; PLDP/168; PLDP/169; PLDP/175/29; PLDP/180; PLDP/183; PLDP/184; PLDP/186; PLDP/211; PLDP/212; PLDP/215; PLDP/223; PLDP/227; PLDP/228; PLDP/629; PLDP/633; PLDP/634; PLDP/635; PLDP/636; PLDP/637; PLDP/643; PLDP/644; PLDP/654; PLDP/655; PLDP/658; PLDP/665; PLDP/666; PLDP/670; PLDP/673/29; PLDP/718/29; PLDP/720/29; PLDP/721/29; PLDP/738; PLDP/763; PLDP/764; PLDP/765; PLDP/782** seek removal of the site from the Plan

**PLDP/011; PLDP/110; PLDP/180; PLDP/658; PLDP/666; PLDP/673/29; and PLDP/763** also seek retention of the site as green open space.

**Church of Scotland General Trustees' Secretary's Department (PLDP/018)** request that the indicative capacity of the site increase to 30 units

**Mr George Millar Greig (PLDP/020), Mr Derek Cameron (PLDP/215), Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223) and Mr John McLachlan (PLDP/779)** seek modifications to the Plan so that Manse Crescent is not used as an access to the site.

**Mr George Millar Greig (PLDP/020)** seeks a modification to the Plan so that access to the site is taken via a new road off Dumbarton Road.

**Mr David Stuart Graham (PLDP/115), Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118) and Mr David Kidd (PLDP/223)** seek a modification to the Plan requiring access to be taken via the church's current access.

**Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118)** requests that flood risk assessment of the site be undertaken and that requirements should be placed on the site to ensure that wildlife is protected.

**Ms Daphne V. MacKay (PLDP/218)** requests that the existing exit in Erskine View is not used as access to and/or from the site and that she is notified if and when construction starts in the future.

**Rena & Catherine McKenzie (PLDP/632)** requests that Erskine View/Church Place made into a one way system.

**SNH (PLDP/640/29)** request that the capacity of the site is reviewed and are seeking a modification to include setting out developer requirements for the site covering the following:

- Protect the existing trees along the canal-side and in the northern part of the site which are valuable as landscape features and for their contribution to the landscape pattern.

- Design the site to enable a green link between the canal and manse gardens (and Old Kilpatrick Bowling Parish Church north of the A814).
- Provide paths across the site to link between the canal and existing housing to the west and east.
- Include open space within the site to maintain some of the existing landscape and visual characteristics and qualities of the site.
- Ensure the layout and design of houses relates to neighbouring housing whilst prioritising the manse and the canal as the most influential landscape features.
- Ensure effects on the visual amenity of surrounding residents is minimised, including from the manse. (PLDP/640/29)

**Old Kilpatrick Community Council (PLDP/661/29)** request that development proposals would be accompanied by a comprehensive review of current traffic management arrangements to ensure that a) the village nature of Old Kilpatrick is maintained and b) any safety issues identified are accompanied by a plan to fix them.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The Council's responses to the representations made to the allocation of this site have been grouped under the following sub-headings: Allocation of the Site, Site Capacity and Site Effectiveness; Greenbelt, Green Network, Biodiversity and Landscape Character; Character and Amenity; Traffic and Access; Infrastructure, Ground Conditions and Services; Built Heritage and Archaeology; Compliance with Other Policies; and Consultation on the Site

#### Allocation Of The Site, Site Capacity and Site Effectiveness

The site has been identified in line with the Spatial Strategy of the Proposed Plan which is focused on delivering, key sites within our existing communities; the reuse of previously developed land; and minimising any extension of the urban area into the greenbelt. The allocation of this site also meets with the requirements from Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (CD/XX) which states that Local Development Plans should identify a range of sites which are suitable for housing and which meet the Housing Land Requirement of the Plan.

The Council has identified a wide range of housing sites of varying scales from vacant brownfield sites within settlements to greenfield sites on the edge of towns and within villages, whilst protecting the integrity, character and appearance of the Greenbelt. As brownfield sites can take a period of time to develop, there also needs to be a supply of 'shovel ready' sites which are capable of being developed in the short term to ensure that there is not an undersupply of housing land within the Plan period. The Glebe has therefore been allocated as a new greenfield release to ensure that there is a supply of 'shovel ready' land within the housing land supply to meet the housing land requirements of LDP 2. The Glebe is considered to be an effective housing site within an existing residential area and is capable of being delivered within the Plan period.

The site itself is not used for any other purpose than grazing, which the landowner has confirmed. The Council is therefore of the view that development of the site, through the application of Policies CP 1, CP 2 and WD 1, will result in an enhancement to the greenspace in this area including enhanced public access to the Canal. It is the intention of the Council, through Policy CP 3, to bring forward a development brief for the site. The Council is therefore of the view that the site should remain allocated for residential use in



the Plan and therefore no modifications should be made to the Plan.

With regard to the representations from **Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011)**; **Mr George Millar Greig (PLDP/020)**; and **Mr David Stuart Graham (PLDP/115)** in relation to site capacity; the indicative capacity of the site is 15 units. The type of dwellings to be provided is not a matter for the Local Development Plan to address as it is a detailed design matter which will be addressed at a planning application stage.

In response to the **Church of Scotland General Trustees' Secretary's Department (PLDP/018)** request to increase the capacity of the site, the Council is also of the view that 30 units is considered to be overdevelopment of this relatively small site and would not be in keeping with the existing low density development within Mansfield Crescent and would also not meet with the Council's Open Space standards on the site. The Council's Roads Service are also not supportive of any more than 15 units on this site due to the proposed access to the site via Mansfield Crescent. The presence of a disused oil pipe to the south of the site, adjacent to the Forth and Clyde Canal, would also restrict the developable footprint of the site. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

In relation to the current use and alternative proposal for the site, raised by **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/29)**; **Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/29)**; **Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/29)**; **Mr Graham Parton (PLDP/721/29)**; **Ms Linda McGregor (PLDP/738)** and **Mr & Mrs McGregor (PLDP/765)**, the landowner submitted the site for residential development at the Main Issues Report stage and that no other proposal for the use of this land has been notified to the Council before or during the preparation of this Local Development Plan. The landowner indicated in their submission that the land is currently let for grazing but they wish to dispose of the site for residential use. The details of other potential buyers or the reasons that the landowner wishes to dispose of the site is not a matter for Local Development Plan 2 to address and is not a consideration which would have any impact on the suitability of the site for housing.

In response to the representation from **SNH (PLDP/640/29)** seeking a review of the indicative capacity of the site, the Council is of the view that the site can, through good design and layout, achieve 15 units on site. However, this number is indicative and it would be up to the detailed design of the site at planning application stage to demonstrate that 15 units could be provided on the site. There is nothing to stop a lesser amount of houses being developed should the developer of the site wish to do that; however, as detailed above, the Council will not be supportive of any more than 15 units on the site due to the access being via Mansfield Crescent and this number of units can be accommodated on the site satisfactorily. No modification to the Plan is therefore necessary.

In response to **Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/29)** representation relating to the effectiveness of this site, the landowner has confirmed that the site is effective and can be delivered in the lifetime of the plan (SI/XX). No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

#### Greenbelt, Green Network, biodiversity and landscape character

In relation to the representation from **Ms Linda Mount (PLDP/003)**, the site is not in the Greenbelt. The site was identified as an existing residential area within the Adopted West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan 2010 (CDxx) and as safeguarded open space in the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016).

With regard to the representations from a majority of the respondents in relation to the loss of open space and the impact on the Green Network, the Council considers that development of this site for residential purposes will not have a detrimental impact on the green network and open space available within Old Kilpatrick. In relation to the impact on wildlife, the Council would point out that the Environmental Report didn't raise any issues with impacts on protected or vulnerable species on the site and, SNH have not raised any issues in relation to wildlife on the site.

The site itself is not used for any other purpose than grazing, which the landowner has confirmed. The Council is therefore of the view that development of the site, through the application of Policies CP 1, CP 2 and WD 1, will result in an enhancement to the greenspace in this area including enhanced public access to the Canal. It is the intention of the Council, through Policy CP 3, to bring forward a development brief for the site.

In response to the recommendations of **SNH (PLDP/640/29)**, the developer requirements sought by the SNH are matters that would normally be considered through the Development Management process for a planning application. However, it is considered that Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Plan will help to address the concerns expressed by the respondent when an application is considered. That being said, the Council, as detailed above, will prepare a development brief for the site, which will take on board SNH's recommendations at that stage and provide further details on the Council's requirements for the design and layout of the site. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Character and Amenity

In relation to the representations from a large number of the respondents with regard to the impact on character and amenity, any development proposal for the site would require to meet the policies of the Local Development Plan. These policies and other relevant policies within the Plan seek to ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts on the amenity of existing residential areas from new developments, as well as, seeking mitigation measures where appropriate.

The site is located between two existing residential areas and through careful design and layout, development of this small site will not have an adverse impact on the existing character of the area and would require to accord with Policies CP 1 and CP 2 of the Plan. However, this is a matter for the development management stage to address.

It is, however, acknowledged that there may be some disruption during the construction phase of the development, but issues relating to construction, noise etc are detailed matters which are best addressed at the Development Management stage. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

#### Traffic and Access

The majority of the respondents raised issues regarding traffic and access, with some of the respondents suggesting alternative access points to the site. The Council Roads Service is of the view, informed by a survey of the area, that Mansfield Crescent, as the primary access to the site, can cope with traffic associated with a total of 15 houses. The Roads Service has not raised any issues with parking, traffic safety, road speed and a blind spots and are of the view that the site can be developed for residential development..



The Council is also of the view that the ransom strip highlighted by a majority of the respondents, which they state would prevent access to the site, is not an issue for Local Development Plan 2 to address. This is an issue for the landowner and/or developer to resolve. However, the landowner (SI/XX) has indicated that the site is effective confirming that there is at least one access to the site which can be taken from an adopted road.

In response to **Old Kilpatrick Community Council (PLDP/661)**, the Council would reiterate that the Council's Roads Service have raised no issues in relation to development of this site with regard to the points the Community Council have raised. The Council would also point that a comprehensive review of traffic management arrangements within Old Kilpatrick is outwith the remit and scope of the Local Development Plan. It should also be noted, the Community Council have not made any previous comments on these matters within the various stages of Local Development Plan 2's preparation.

No modifications to the Plan are therefore required.

#### Infrastructure, Ground Conditions and Services

In response to the issues of sewerage raised by **Ms Linda Mount (PLDP/003)**; **Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011)**; **Mr Gordon Boyd (PLDP/019)**; **Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024)**; **Mrs Ann Marie Boyd (PLDP/025)**; **Mrs Ethel Bunniss (PLDP/110)**; **Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118)**; **Mrs Angela Harkness (PLDP/180)** and **Mrs Julie Chappelle (PLDP/643)**, Scottish Water have not objected to the allocation of this site or raised any issues with the capacity of sewerage within the area.

The Council is aware that the site is within an area with the potential for flooding. Therefore, the developer of the site will require to address this at the detailed design stage; however, SEPA have not objected to the development of the site on these grounds and the Council considers that the flooding issues can be addressed at the development management stage through appropriate mitigation measures if required. Scottish Water and SEPA also have not raised any issues in relation to drainage. Furthermore, the landowner: **Church of Scotland General Trustees' Secretary's Department (PLDP/018)** has indicated (SI/018) that there are no known deficiencies in infrastructure provision.

The developer is responsible for ensuring that there is a connection to power, water and sewerage services, but in principle the Council is satisfied that the site can be connected to these services due to existing infrastructure close to the site. It is also the responsibility of the developer to undertake the necessary site investigations to ensure that the ground is stable to take development platforms etc associated with the residential development. The Council is, however, unaware of any ground conditions that would preclude development of the site.

In relation to the issue of the disused oil pipe that has been raised by a number of the representations to the site, this is a detailed matter which the developer of the site would require to address when designing the site layout, including any safety distances either side of it. However, the Council do not see this as impediment to developing the site.

With regard to the representation from **Miss Lorna Carter (PLDP/024)** and **Mr Hugh & Mrs Jean Lyon Lester (PLDP/637)** in relation to the impact of development on local

facilities, the Council is of the view that it is unlikely that there will be any adverse impacts on existing services and facilities due to the relatively small scale nature of the development. The Council's Education Service; NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde and other service providers have not objected to the development of this site. New development can also contribute to the sustaining of these local facilities within smaller settlements.

No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

#### Built Heritage and Archaeology

A number of the respondents have raised issues relating to the Antonine Wall World Heritage Site; roman and/or other archaeological remains; and the impact on the Forth and Clyde Canal Scheduled Monument. The Council would point out that the site is not in the same vicinity as the route of the Antonine Wall; therefore, it is highly unlikely that there will be any remains of a Roman fort etc within the site. It should be noted that Historic Environment Scotland, who have responsibility for the Antonine Wall along with the Council, has not objected to the allocation of the site or raised any issues relating to the Antonine Wall.

In relation to potential other archaeological remains, the Council would point out that the Environmental Report (CDxx) did not uncover any indication of archaeological remains within the site. However, this is an issue for the development management stage to address.

Both Historic Environment Scotland and Scottish Canals have not objected to the allocation of the site in relation to the Canal and its Scheduled Monument status. Also Policy FCC1 of the Plan requires that development proposals alongside the Canal should enhance this green network asset and proposals which would have an impact on this canal or its setting will not be permitted. Consideration of a detailed proposal against this policy is more appropriate for the development management process.

No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

#### Compliance with other policies

**Ms Rhona Jean Young (PLDP/118)** and **Mrs Claire Hamilton (PLDP/658)** both state that allocation of this site is contrary to the policies within the Plan. The Council is however of the view that development of this site is capable of meeting the requirements of the Plan. However, consideration of a detailed development proposal against the provisions of the Plan is a matter for the development management process to address.

No modification to the Plan is required.

#### Consultation on the Site

**Mrs Eileen McGarvie (PLDP/011); Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/29); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/29); Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/29); Mr Graham Parton (PLDP/721/29); Ms Linda McGregor (PLDP/738) and Mr & Mrs McGregor (PLDP/765)** all raise comments in relation to the consultation of the site. The consultation on Local Development Plan 2 has taken place in relation to the process outlined within the Development Plan Scheme and Participation Statement (September 2018) (CDXx)

Even if a site is not contained within the Main Issues Report, the Council can still consider allocating further sites, if they are raised within representations to the Main Issues Report and include them for allocation within the Proposed Plan. The site was put forward for residential development during the consultation phase of the Main Issues Report and, subsequent to that representation being received, the Council considered that the site should be allocated for residential use as it was in accordance with the Spatial Strategy of the Plan and would help the Plan to meet its Housing Land Requirement, as required by Clydeplan (CD xx) and Scottish Planning Policy (CD xx)

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 30	Non-Allocation of Duntiglennan Fields, Clydebank	
Development plan reference:	Policy H2 (Page xx), Schedule 2 (Page xx) and Clydebank Proposals Map	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/30) Mr Martin Caban (PLDP/785)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issues relates to the non-allocation of an area of land for residential purposes at Duntiglennan Fields, Clydebank, which is within the Greenbelt adjacent to the settlement boundary of Clydebank.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b><i>The representation should also be read in conjunction with Issue's 15, 24, 27, 28 and 29 as Taylor Wimpey's representation also covers these issues seeking to challenge the Housing Land Requirement and New Housing Sites H2(35) to H2(42) proposed within the Plan to demonstrate that Duntiglennan Fields should be allocated instead of Strauss Avenue and also to meet a perceived shortfall in the private sector housing land supply. This Issue only focusses on the representation relating to the non-allocation of Duntiglennan Fields.</i></b></p> <p><b>Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/30)</b> state that in 2014 West Dunbartonshire Council Planning Committee modified the 2013 Proposed Plan by removing the allocated site. Taylor Wimpey objected to the modification and the subsequent LDP Examination Report recommended that the site be reinstated as an allocation. The Council refused to accept the Reporters Recommendations. A subsequent Direction was issued by Scottish Ministers advising that the Council could not adopt the new LDP without including the Duntiglennan site as an allocated housing site. The Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) (CD xx) therefore remains at proposed plan stage.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey questions the deliverability and/or programming of all the new sites in Schedule 2 and objects to site H2(39) at Strauss Avenue, Clydebank being included in the Schedule. The promoted site should be identified as a housing allocation to meet the requirements of the approved SDP and/or replace the site at Strauss Avenue which is neither effective nor appropriate for development taking account of its current designation and site specific constraints. The reasons for this change are laid out in the Statement attached to this representation (Supporting Information xx), in brief, the site is not effective or deliverable.</p> <p>The site at Duntiglennan Fields is an effective housing land supply site and meets all the requirements of SPP 2014 and PAN 2/2010 in terms of effective housing land supply. The site has been subject to detailed assessment through the LDP 2013 Examination process and was found to be an effective site. Development of the site, subject to a number of site specific measures, has no environmental effect and the site can be delivered within the life of the next LDP.</p>		

<p>The detailed case in support of the site at Duntiglennan Fields being included in the Proposed LDP2 as a proposed housing allocation is set out in the detail in the accompanying supporting statement and its appendices.</p> <p><b>Mr Martin Caban (PLDP/785)</b> suggests that there is no requirement to release any significant greenfield sites to achieve a generous housing land supply and that Duntiglennan should not be allocated within the plan because it was rejected during the previous Proposed Plan 2016 (CD/XX) and at planning application in 2017.</p>
<p><b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b></p>
<p><b>Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/30)</b> seek the following modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocate Duntiglennan Fields as a proposed new housing allocation in Schedule 2 to Proposed LDP2, with a capacity of up to 100 units; and</li> <li>• Amend the green belt boundary around the Duntiglennan Fields site to reflect the new allocation in Schedule 2;</li> <li>• Delete Strauss Avenue for the Plan in favour of Duntiglennan Fields.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:</b></p>
<p>In response to <b>Mr Martin Caban (PLDP/785)</b>, the site is not allocated in the Proposed Plan and the support for not including it is noted.</p> <p>In response to the representation from <b>Taylor Wimpey West Scotland (PLDP/664/30)</b>, the Council do not agree that this site is required to be allocated to meet the housing land requirement set out in Clydeplan. Local Development Plan 2 allocates a range and choice of greenfield and brownfield land that is considered to be effective and developable within the lifespan of the Plan. This is discussed in further detail within <b>Issue 15</b>.</p> <p>The reference to the previous examination report for the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) by Taylor Wimpey should be set firmly in the context of the housing land requirement at that time, as set out in the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan 2012, which indicated a shortfall in the allocation of housing land within the first period of the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan. The Reporter's recommendation to allocate Duntiglennan Fields was to reduce the shortfall in the housing land requirement in that Plan and that it was the only alternative greenfield site suggested through the examination process.</p> <p>A planning application for the site was also refused by West Dunbartonshire Council on 26 April 2017. The Council was of the view that the proposed development, as it is located in the greenbelt, is in an inappropriate location for housing development and was contrary to Clydeplan, the Adopted Local Plan (2010) and that there was no requirement for additional green belt land to be identified to meet the strategic housing requirement. The proposed development was also contrary to the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016); the development would not create a place; and additional traffic would contribute to localised traffic congestion in the residential streets leading to the site, which would inconvenience local residents and other road users. The full Planning Committee Report and the reasons for refusal is contained within the Council's Supporting Information xx.</p> <p>As stated within Issue 15, the Council has demonstrated that there is no shortfall in the</p>

housing land requirement for Local Development Plan 2 and there is no requirement to allocate Duntiglennan Fields within this Plan. The Council is also of the view that this site should not be allocated for residential development for the following reasons.

### Impact on the Greenbelt

The purpose of the green belt is set out in paragraph 159 of SPP, which states that growth should be directed to the most appropriate locations and to support regeneration; protect and enhance the quality, character and landscape setting of settlements; and to protect and give access to open space within and around towns.

Clydeplan (2017) (CDxx) reiterates these purposes and calls for Local Development Plans to identify green belt boundaries (Paragraphs 8.14 to 8.15 on Page 75). A Green Belt Boundary Review undertaken for the Local Development Plan: Main Issues Report (2013) (CDxx) concluded that existing green belt boundaries at this location are adequate, and formed by a mix of stone wall and fencing to the rear of houses. The Review concluded that there should be no change to the green belt at this location.

Clydebank has many brownfield sites, some with a capacity for housing similar or greater than Duntiglennan Fields, and thus capable of providing a similar product of family homes. Paragraph 40 of SPP (CD xx) states that *“the re-use or re-development of brownfield land before new development takes place on greenfield sites”*.

Issue 15 deals with the Council’s response to the allocation of brownfield land in preference to greenfield land. The responses given within that Issue are also pertinent here. However, the Council has allocated two new greenfield sites which are within settlement boundaries to accord with SPP’s requirements to provide a range and choice of housing sites and also to ensure that there are shovel ready sites available for housing development to ensure that the Housing Land Requirement of LDP 2 is met in full.

Issue 27 relates to Strauss Avenue; however as detailed within that Issue, the Council is of the view that the greenfield allocation at Strauss Avenue, which is not in the Greenbelt, is in a far more sustainable location than Duntiglennan Fields being within closer walking distance of public transport and close to a train station and other facilities.

Taking all of the above into account, the Council considers that the allocation of Duntiglennan Fields would represent an inappropriate intrusion into the Greenbelt and would be contrary to the purpose of the Greenbelt as set out in SPP and the strategy within Clydeplan. It would dilute the focus on the sustainable development of brownfield land and would result in sustained pressure for further development in the greenbelt, instead of looking for appropriate greenfield locations within settlement boundaries to complement the focus on the redevelopment of brownfield sites.

### Integration with the Landscape

Duntiglennan Fields is not part of a designated landscape area. However, part of the site sits immediately adjacent to the Kilpatrick Hills Local Landscape Area, with the entirety of the site in close proximity to the Kilpatrick Hills LLA.

A Landscape Assessment of the Green Belt was undertaken in 2007 in support of the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CDxx). This concluded that:



- the green belt boundaries at this location are well defined by virtue of garden fencing, but could be reinforced by planting trees adjacent to the housing;
- the Duntiglennan Fields are compatible green belt uses and they meet green belt objectives;
- the south-western field (site 16 in study) is highly sensitive to development, and the north-eastern field (site 15 in study) is moderately sensitive to development. (ref: pgs 27-28 and map)

Scottish Natural Heritage in its response to the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan 2015, as originally published, expressed the view that development in either field would have an adverse impact on the Kilpatrick Hills Local landscape Area and the rugged moorland hills landscape character. However, SNH did not object to development on the site, instead suggesting amendments to the Table 4 requirements in respect of the site so as to strengthen landscape protection.

A landscape report was submitted by Taylor Wimpey in support of development on the site (Supporting Information xx). This concludes that the site can be developed whilst retaining the most significant landscape features and creating a more robust green belt boundary. In response to viewing this landscape report, at the examination into the Proposed Plan (2015), SNH commented on how the landscape concept plan meets its original comments and reiterated the changes it would seek to Table 4 should the site be included by the Reporter in the Plan. SNH do state that with good design and an amendment to the western built edge of the westernmost field, it may be possible to mitigate the landscape and visual effects of the development).

From the Council's perspective, the Duntiglennan Fields lie just outside the designated Kilpatrick Hills Local Landscape Area. The Statement of Importance for the Kilpatrick Hills Local landscape Area (CDxx ) states that:

'The skylines and edges of the Kilpatrick Hills play an important role in views from the Vale of Leven, Dumbarton, Clydebank and Milngavie and in the overall landscape setting of urban areas in the Glasgow conurbation, forming a natural setting and backdrop which visually contrasts with the urban development. With such an extensive visual envelope, and large viewing populations, the hill slopes and skylines have a high level of visual and landscape sensitivity' (ref: p7).

The lower slopes of the hills are recognised throughout the Statement of Importance document as playing an important role in the transition between the urban area and the rugged moorland hills (ref section 4.2, pg 5 & 6) and in many areas the boundary of the former Regional Scenic Area has been moved down the slope to include these transitional hill slopes (Section 4.3, pg 12). The Duntiglennan Fields and other areas of improved pasture have not been included within the designated area, but undoubtedly contribute towards this transition between the urban area and the higher hills, and contribute towards the ease of access into the Kilpatrick Hills from the urban area which is also recorded as significant in the Statement of Importance.

Although it is accepted that the site is unlikely to have significant adverse impacts on the landscape of the area, the layout of the site within the Planning Application did not maximise the landscape potential in this area or successfully integrate with it, therefore falling to create a sense of place which is one of the reasons the site was refused planning permission by the Council.



Therefore the Council is concerned that allocation of Duntiglennen Fields would lead to the resubmission of the same unacceptable layout in landscape terms which did not integrate or enhance the Kilpatrick Hills Local landscape Area and, as a result, would not meet with the requirements of Policy KH1 of LDP 2.

#### Impact on Local Roads

The Council's Roads and Transportation Service consider the Transportation Assessment submitted in support of the allocation of the site at planning application stage was acceptable and demonstrated that the existing network is capable of accommodating projected trip generations.

However, it is noted that there is substantial local concern regarding the capacity of Farm Road to carry additional traffic and the suitability of the Farm Road/Beeches Road junction. The additional traffic resultant from the development and its impact on localised traffic congestion was one of the reasons for refusal.

No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this Plan.

#### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### **Reporter's recommendations:**

Issue 31	Non Allocation of Young's Farm, Dumbarton	
Development plan reference:	Delivering our Places section, Policy GB 1 and the Dumbarton Proposals Maps.	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/31) (Support) Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/31) (Support) Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/31) Mr Martin Caban (PLDP/785) (Support)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This Issue relates to the non-inclusion of Young's Farm within the Delivering Places section of LDP 2 and the revision of the Greenbelt to allow relocation of the Football Stadium to this site.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b>Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/31)</b> supports the Council's approach of not identifying Young's Farm as a location for a stadium for Dumbarton FC nor as a housing opportunity.</p> <p><b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/31)</b> welcome the removal of Young's Farm from consideration for development for the re-location of Dumbarton Football Club and associated housing development (Main issue 6 in the MIR) as a result of the refusal of planning permission for this site.</p> <p><b>Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/31)</b> believes that the Council's Green Belt Policy: Policy GB 1 does not extend to new stadium and refer to the previous section and background in the Our Changing Place's section within the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016), which related to a stadium and community facility development at Young's Farm, Dumbarton.</p> <p>The Club is now in a position where it wants to re-start the process associated with bringing forward its proposals for a new stadium, potentially working with new partners, and continues to want to focus its efforts at the Young's Farm site.</p> <p>The Club's preference would be for the site, or part of the site, to be removed from Green Belt and formally allocated for the development of a new replacement community stadium and appropriate complementary sports and recreation uses. Otherwise the site would remain in Green Belt and the policy requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances would continue to prevail.</p> <p>The Club wish the Council to include a policy/proposal within LDP 2 which reflects the Our Changing Places section in the previous Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016).</p> <p><b>Mr Martin Caban (PLDP/785)</b> is of the view that there is no requirement to release any significant greenfield sites to achieve a generous housing land supply. This site was rejected during the previous Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) and at the planning application stage by Council in 2017. Although not specifying it in the following</p>		

terms, it is clear to see that Mr Caban does not wish to see residential development at Young's Farm.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/31)** request that a new section on Young's Farm, Dumbarton is inserted into the Plan as follows:

***Young's Farm, Dumbarton (Dumbarton FC)***

*Dumbarton Football Club was founded in 1872 and is one of the oldest football clubs in Scotland. Since 2000 the Club has played next to Dumbarton Rock on Dumbarton's waterfront. Their stadium comprises one stand which incorporates the club's offices, dressing rooms and associated facilities along with hospitality, including two conference rooms. It has capacity for just over 2,000 spectators. The existing stadium is clearly inadequate and too small to meet the needs of the Club going forward.*

*The Club's vision is to be successful at the highest level of football in Scotland at which it can be both financially viable and sustainable. It also wishes to play a wider role in the community, contributing to health, social wellbeing and the economy. To achieve this, the Club considers it is necessary to relocate to a new site as there are restrictions associated with its current stadium in relation to increasing crowd capacity, maximising non-matchday income and integration with training facilities. A new community 'sports hub' would allow Dumbarton FC to build football and non-football revenues and contribute to the availability, accessibility and quality of sporting facilities in the area.*

*Having assessed the possibilities afforded by a number of sites in and around Dumbarton – including sites at Dumbuck and Esso Bowling which featured in the Main Issues Report – the Club's preferred location for a new stadium is at Young's Farm, north of the Dennystown area of Dumbarton. This greenfield site is bounded on the eastern side by the River Leven, to the west by the railway and to the north by the A82.*

*The Council is supportive of Dumbarton FC relocating to this site. Technical considerations needing to be addressed include how the site can be accessed by road and sustainable means of travel, its impact on the trunk and local road network, and avoiding flood risk. Environmental considerations include the impact on the River Leven, which is a Local Nature Conservation Site and the migratory route for Atlantic salmon and brook lamprey to and from the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation, a Natura 2000 site designated as a habitat for these fish species. Any development at Young's Farm must not have an adversely affect the integrity of the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation.*

*Another environmental consideration is landscape and visual impact - a new football stadium and associated development would be a significant change to the urban form of Dumbarton. Plans for the site should be based on minimising the intensity of built development. A preferred approach would be to integrate as many of the necessary facilities as possible within the stadium building. Development should be carefully integrated into an enhanced landscape setting.*

*The Club has indicated that enabling development will be required to support the financing of the stadium and increase the Club's non-football revenue base. The preference for*

*containing built development in the stadium applies to the enabling development as well. Appropriate enabling development is to be defined in future but could include some or all of the following uses: limited retail; health and well-being; hotel; events/conferencing facilities; sports related uses such as a gym and sports pitches, although the noise and light pollution impact of the latter would require careful assessment. Retail development would not be supported unless small in scale or ancillary to the operation of the football club. It would be a requirement that the football stadium is developed and operating prior to any enabling development operating.*

*A masterplan should be developed prior to the submission of any planning application, showing all required development and taking account of the above considerations.*

**Dumbarton Football Club Ltd** also seek that the Proposals Map is amended to reflect the Map contained within their representation.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

The comments of **Jeremy Watson (PLDP/002/31)**; **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (PLDP/182/31)** and **Mr Martin Caban (PLDP/785)** are noted.

In response to the representation from **Dumbarton Football Club Ltd (PLDP/783/31)**, the Council does not agree that a section on Young's Farm is required to be inserted into Local Development Plan 2.

The Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) (CD xx) included a section on Young's Farm within the Plan as the Council was supportive of the Football Club undertaking further investigations into the suitability of the site for the development of a community sports hub, including associated infrastructure and appropriate enabling development, which did not include residential development. The Proposed Plan (2016) did not change the designation of the site from greenbelt to a specific use. The Football Club had stated, at the time the Proposed Plan (2016) was in preparation, that residential development did not form part of the proposals to fund the relocation of the Football Stadium to Young's Farm.

The Football Club subsequently submitted a Planning Application for a Mixed use development incorporating a football stadium and associated uses (including restaurant, hospitality and function suites), residential development, commercial and tourism development, floodlit sports pitches, access, parking, and landscaping on land at Young's Farm, Renton Road, Dumbarton by DFC Community Stadium Company Ltd. This planning application was not in conformity with the uses specified within the Proposed Plan (2016) and included a significant amount of enabling residential development required to fund the new Stadium and associated infrastructure.

The Planning Application was refused by the Council on 28 March 2018. The Council was of the view that residential development would not be appropriate at this location as it would undermine the objectives of the Greenbelt and would set a precedent for the release of further housing land within the Greenbelt. The full Planning Committee Report and the reasons for refusal is contained within the Council's Supporting Information xx.

As a result of the decision on the Planning Application, Local Development Plan 2 did not contain a section on Young's Farm and therefore it remains in the Greenbelt. Any future

application within the Greenbelt would need to accord with the provisions of Policy GB 1 of the Plan.

The Council continues to be supportive of the aims of Dumbarton Football Club and of its ambitions to play at the highest level of Scottish Football. However, the Council has taken its decision on the previous application and is of the view that the Football Club would need to demonstrate how the new stadium can be provided without the need for residential development, and how it will be funded. For the information of the Reporter, a new application for the site had been submitted at the time of writing this Schedule 4.

However, no information has been provided by the Football Club within their representation to Local Development Plan 2 that indicates a change in direction from the original position and that residential development at Young's Farm will categorically not be required to fund the relocation of the Football Stadium. The Council therefore does not agree with **Dumbarton Football Club** that Local Development Plan 2 requires to be modified for the reasons set out above. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>

Issue 32	Affordable Housing Sites: Clydebank	
Development plan reference:	Policy H2 (Page 78) and Schedule 3: Opportunities for Social Rented Housing (Page 126)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Miss C Stimpson (PLDP/008) Hardie Polymers Limited (PLDP/014) P J Travel Ltd (PLDP/023) SportScotland (PLDP/026/32) Mr Joseph Baird (PLDP/108) Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/32) SNH (PLDP/640/32) Clydebelt (PLDP/673/32) Ms Bernadette McAteer (PLDP/717) Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/32) Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32) Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32) Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the affordable housing opportunity sites within Clydebank that are included within Schedule 3 and Policy H2: Housing Sites	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<u>H2 (50) St Andrews High School</u>  <b>SportScotland (PLDP/026/32)</b> state that the former school grounds contain a blaze pitch, and if appropriate compensation has not been made in relation to pitches at the new school then consideration will need to be given to compensation requirements.  <u>H2 (51) 354, Dumbarton Road</u>  <b>Clydebelt (PLDP/673/32)</b> support for designation of this site. They state it is a WWII bomb site and query why it has taken so long to redevelop.  <u>H2 (52) Auld Street</u>  <b>Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/32); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/32); Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32); Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32) and Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)</b> object to the designation of the site for residential development and state that the Plan requires transport assessments or further details of access to provided for this site. The surrounding streets are congested evident at certain times of day and further housing will only make this problem worse. The respondents also state that the position of the site next to a wildlife corridor makes it unsuitable for development and the loss of trees on the site is noted. It is also asserted that planning decision for the application on this site was		

based on incorrect information regarding the number and condition of trees that would be felled. The respondents also express concern regarding the lack of green network and biodiversity enhancements associated with the development of the site and with the height of new buildings and amenity impact on existing residents.

#### H2 (54) Caledonia Street

**P J Travel Ltd (PLDP/023)** is seeking clarification that his boundary fence is correctly located, as the red line boundary of the proposed housing site appears to extend onto his property.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/32) Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/32) Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32); Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32) and Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)** object to the designation of the site for residential development and state that the Plan requires transport assessments or further details of access to be provided for this site. The surrounding streets are congested with evident traffic at certain times of day and further housing will only make this problem worse. The respondents also state that the position of the site next to a wildlife corridor makes it unsuitable for development and the loss of trees on the site is noted. The respondents also state that green network and biodiversity enhancements should be required of any development and express concern regarding the height of new buildings and the cumulative impacts of nearby development sites on the amenity of existing residents.

#### H2 (56) Auld Street Phase 2

**Hardie Polymers Limited (PLDP/014)** are seeking reassurance that any development on this site will seek to maintain a similar level of tree cover. They state that the foliage here provides important CO2 reduction and a relaxing environment for local residents and employees in their offices at the Beardmore Business Centre, which directly faces the site.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/32) Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/2); Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32); Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32); Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)** object to the designation of the site for residential development and state that the Plan requires transport assessments or further details of access to be provided for this site. The surrounding streets are congested with evident traffic at certain times of day and further housing will only make this problem worse. The respondents also state that the position of the site next to a wildlife corridor makes it unsuitable for development and the loss of trees on the site is noted. The respondents also state that green network and biodiversity enhancements should be required of any development and express concern regarding the height of new buildings and the cumulative impacts of nearby development sites on the amenity of existing residents.

#### H2 (63) Faifley Bowling Club

**Miss C Stimpson (PLDP/008)** objects to the proposal due to the impact that it will have on the outlook from Abbeylands Road. Miss Stimpson suggests that the site should remain as safeguarded open space and should be included within the public park. She also suggests that there will be an impact on amenity and wildlife. Miss Stimpson also suggests that the Pavilion could be repurposed as a nursery making use of the bowling green as a play area.

**SportScotland (PLDP/026/32)** acknowledge the club has closed and the site is no longer



in active use as a bowling club. However as the land was last used as an outdoor sports facility, SportScotland, in their role as statutory consultee, would require details relating to the club closure and the capacity of nearby facilities to ensure ongoing provision is meeting any needs locally at the time of a planning application submission.

**Mr Joseph Baird (PLDP/108)** states that while he understands the need for social housing in this area, he is concerned about the impact of any new housing on the privacy of his house. He would have no concerns however, if the required greenspace, gardens/allotments were to be located close to his property. He also draws attention to the wildlife on the site, particularly towards the burn, which is also a haven for deer, woodpecker, sparrow hawk, water rail and numerous other birds and animals.

**SNH (PLDP/640/32)** welcome the Council's proposal for this site to include '*...an area of green infrastructure, which could potentially be used for a range of community uses, such as, but not limited to, allotments or community gardens*'. They consider that the site is also likely to have capacity for housing and for this to fit with the existing landscape pattern they recommend the southern area of the site is left as green space. They also recommend the Council sets developer requirements covering inclusion of path links, protection of the burn crossing and mature trees on site, minimising ground modification and enhancing the green network.

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/32)** state that the area is already congested with traffic/parked cars and is already densely populated without additional housing. They suggest the site could be used for an alternative sports use with a MUGA, which could be combined with a community garden/allotments. Car parking could be provided by opening up the lane and a neglected and overgrown play park on south west and extending this with a footpath from Abbeylands Road on to the footpath network on the Faifley Knowes. Provision of a car park may even revive the bowling club as a viable concern. The existing Clubroom could also be used on occasions as a Knowes Local Nature Reserve rangers/information point. Alternatively, the site should be considered as part of the Knowes Local Nature Reserve.

**Ms Bernadette McAteer (PLDP/717)** objects to the proposed residential use of the site, as Abbeylands Road is already severely congested with traffic, which would be made worse by the development. Ms McAteer is also of the view that the street does not have the room to accommodate an access point into the site and that the burn, in the southern portion of the site, could cause flooding or dampness issues for future properties. The site is also close to the former tennis courts designated for biodiversity, which is home to foxes and deer. The respondent proposes that the site is instead retained for community uses, such as allotments or community gardens.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### H2 (50) St Andrews High School

**SportScotland (PLDP/026/32)** are seeking potential provision of alternative sports facilities in any redevelopment of the site, to replace the existing blaze pitch.

##### H2 (51) 354, Dumbarton Road

**Clydebelt (PLDP/673/32)** Support.

H2 (52) Auld Street

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/32) Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/32) Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32); Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32); and Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)** are seeking the removal of the allocation of the site for residential use.

H2 (54) Caledonia Street

**P J Travel Ltd (PLDP/023)** is seeking a modification to the boundary of the site to clarify that his boundary fence is correctly located.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/32); Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/32); Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32); Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32); and Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)** are seeking the removal of the allocation of the site for residential use.

H2 (56) Auld Street Phase 2

**Hardie Polymers Limited (PLDP/014)** are seeking a modification to require that any development of the site will retain a similar level of tree cover to that at present.

**Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/32) Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/32) Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32); Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32); and Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)** are seeking the removal of the allocation of the site for residential use.

H2 (63) Faifley Bowling Club

**SportScotland (PLDP/026/32)** are seeking to be consulted on any planning application for the site and will require details relating to the closure of the bowling club and of alternative local provision, at that time.

**Mr Joseph Baird (PLDP/108)** is seeking a modification to require any housing development to be sited away from his property on Craigs Avenue, with green/community infrastructure instead placed next to his property to avoid any loss of privacy.

**SNH (PLDP/640/32)** are seeking a modification to include developer requirements for the site covering the following:

- Incorporation of path links across the site, including between Abbeylands Road and the path from Craigs Avenue.
- Design of the site to relate to and protect the burn crossing to the south.
- Protection of existing mature trees on the site.
- Design of the access to the proposed houses from the public road to minimise ground modification and encroachment into the site.
- Protection of the landscape qualities of the existing green open space and enhancement of the green network to the south of the site.
- Ensuring development works eradicate and prevent spread of invasive plant species on site.

**Miss C Stimpson (PLDP/008); Clydebelt (PLDP/673/32) and Ms Bernadette McAteer**

(PLDP/717) are seeking the removal of the allocation of the site for residential use.

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

H2 (50) St Andrews High School

In response to the representation by **SportScotland (PLDP/026/32)**, that the former school closed in 2009 to amalgamate into a new school campus at St Peter the Apostle High School. Provision of appropriate new and enhanced pitches was made at that time for the new school. Planning consent for the redevelopment of site H2 (50) for affordable housing has now been granted, and the Council considers that this issue has been addressed. No modification to the plan is therefore required.

H2 (51) 354, Dumbarton Road

The Council welcomes the support of **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/32)** for the designation of this site. Development of brownfield sites can take a while to develop from allocation within the development plan and this is down to a range of factors which are outwith the scope of the Plan and the control of the Council. In relation to the reference to a bomb on the site, the Council would point out that detailed site investigation would uncover any issues with the site, such as unrecorded ordinance, but this is a matter for the developer of the site to arrange and then mitigate against.

H2 (52) Auld Street

In response to the representation by **Ms Susan Dick(PLDP/175/32)**, **Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/32)** **Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32)**; **Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32)**; and **Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)** the Council would point out that this site has received planning consent for residential development, and that the development is now occupied. All relevant matters of design, layout, access and roads impacts were considered as part of the planning application process. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

H2 (54) Caledonia Street

With regard to the representation from **P J Travel Ltd (PLDP/023)**, the Council notes his concerns regarding the position of his boundary fence relative to the site boundary shown in the Plan. This is a long established residential opportunity site, included within the established housing land supply and successive Development Plans. While the site boundary originally included the representor's site (the bus garage), this western portion of the site was removed at the Local Development Plan 2: Main Issues Report stage to reflect the operational status of the bus garage, as opposed to the vacant eastern portion. While the site boundary was redrawn at that time to reflect the operational usage of the site, this may not precisely reflect the mixture of land ownership on the site, which is not in itself a planning matter. Nonetheless, the change to the site boundary was intended to support the continued commercial use of the bus garage, and the Council does not consider that any minor discrepancy in the site boundary is prejudicial to the ongoing operation of the bus garage.

Any residential development of the site would require planning consent, and the precise site boundary and land ownership would be established through the Development

Management process at that stage. As such, it is considered that no modification to the Plan is required in this regard.

In response to the representation by **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/32)**, **Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/32)** **Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32)**; **Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32)**; and **Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)**, the Council considers that all relevant issues of design, layout, access and roads impacts are matters for the Development Management process to address when a planning application for the site is being considered. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

#### H2 (56) Auld Street Phase 2

With regard to the representation by **Hardie Polymers Limited (PLDP/014)**, the Council acknowledges that while the existing tree cover on the site may provide visual amenity to nearby uses, the detailed design of any residential development of the site, included details of any tree retention and planting, would be a matter for the Development Management process when a planning application is being considered. The Council would point out that the trees on this site are not protected by a Tree Preservation Order, and are not part of a wildlife site. However, it is considered that Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Plan will help to address the concerns expressed by the respondent when an application is considered. These policies confirm the value of green infrastructure, including trees, to creating well designed, sustainable places.

In response to the representation by **Ms Susan Dick (PLDP/175/32)**, **Mrs Lesley McEwan (PLDP/718/32)** **Mr G Dick (PLDP/719/32)**; **Mr R McEwan (PLDP/720/32)** and **Mr G Parton (PLDP/721/32)**, the Council considers that all relevant issues of design, layout, access and roads impacts are matters for the Development Management process to address when a planning application is being considered. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

#### H2 (63) Faifley Bowling Club

The Council welcomes the comments of **SportScotland (PLDP/026/32)** and confirms that they would be statutory consultees on any planning application for proposed development of the site.

In response to **Miss C Stimpson (PLDP/008)**, the Council would point out that the right to a view or the impact on the outlook of a view are not material planning considerations. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

With regard to the representation by **Mr Joseph Baird (PLDP/108)**, the Council would note that the detailed design and layout of the site is a matter for the Development Management process to address when a planning application is being considered. The placement of green infrastructure, open space and community facilities/gardens would be considered at that stage, along with the amenity and privacy of neighbouring properties. No modification to the Plan is therefore required.

The Council welcomes the representation from **SNH (PLDP/640/32)** but would point out that the developer requirements set out by the respondent are matters that would normally be considered through the Development Management process for a planning application. However, it is considered that Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Plan will help to address the concerns expressed by the respondent when an application is considered. No modification

to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

Although the Council welcomes the suggested range of alternative uses for the site suggested by **Miss C Stimpson (PLDP/008)**; **Clydebelt (PLDP/673/32)** and **Ms Bernadette McAteer (PLDP/717)**, none of these uses have been formally proposed to the Council, or have any known backing from other organisations. Whereas there has been clear interest expressed from housing associations in developing the site for housing and the site has been identified for social rented housing within the Council's Strategic Housing Investment Plan (SHIP) to help address the identified need and demand for social rented housing within Faifley.

Nonetheless, Local Development Plan 2, within Schedule 3, does require that any development of the site retains an area for green infrastructure, potentially including, but not limited to, community gardens and allotments, in compensation for the loss of the bowling green facilities. The concerns regarding local congestion and parking, and proximity to a burn are noted; however, these are matters for the Development Management process to address when a planning application is being considered. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the size of the site would allow for these issues to be addressed and it should be noted that the Council's Roads service have not objected to the allocation of the site for residential uses..

Overall, the Council considers that the site is suitable and effective as a residential site, and that no modification to the Plan is therefore required.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>

Issue 33	Affordable Housing Sites: Dumbarton	
Development plan reference:	Policy H2 (Page 78) and Schedule 3: Opportunities for Social Rented Housing (Page 126)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Mrs Margaret King (PLDP/158) SNH (PLDP/640/33) Woodland Trust (PLDP/646/33)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the affordable housing opportunity sites within Dumbarton that are included within Schedule 3 and Policy H2: Housing Sites.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<u>Site H2 (45) Former Aitkenbar Primary School, Dumbarton</u>  <b>Mrs Margaret King (PLDP/158)</b> is objecting to her property being shown within the site boundary. Her property (the former primary school janitor's house) was purchased from the Council in 2002 and should be excluded from the rest of the proposed housing site.  <u>H2 (62) Littlemill Distillery, Bowling</u>  <b>SNH (PLDP/640/33)</b> consider that this site is likely to have capacity for housing and this may fit with the existing landscape pattern, but recommend that the level of capacity will depend on the concentration and design of the properties. To relate to the landscape character and reduce visual effects, SNH recommend the Council sets developer requirements relating to tree retention and planting, layout and design of the units and the repair or reinstatement of the stone wall along the edge of the A814.  <b>Woodland Trust (PLDP/646/33)</b> state that they have identified woodland present on the Native Woodland Survey for Scotland surrounding this site. The Trust would like to see this site allocated appropriately with minimal impact on the surrounding native woodland. Should a planning application come forward here, the planning authority should ensure that trees are retained on site and if appropriate, replacement native tree planting should be requested.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<u>Site H2 (45) Former Aitkenbar Primary School, Dumbarton</u>  <b>Mrs Margaret King (PLDP/158)</b> is seeking that the site boundaries are redrawn to exclude her property from the proposed housing site area.  <u>H2 (62) Littlemill Distillery, Bowling</u>  <b>SNH (PLDP/640/33)</b> are seeking a modification to include developer requirements for the		



<p>site, covering the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention and reinforcement of the existing trees along the western and northern boundaries. In addition, new trees along the eastern and southern boundaries may improve integration of the new housing within the landscape pattern and reduce visual effects from nearby properties.</li> <li>• The layout of the units should relate to the linear shape and orientation of the site in parallel to the A814 and cycle path whilst their scale, massing and materials should relate to other properties within the surrounding landscape.</li> <li>• Repair or reinstatement of the stone wall along the edge of the A814 and protection of the existing watercourse.</li> </ul> <p><b>Woodland Trust PLDP/646/33</b> are seeking that the site is allocated appropriately, with a requirement on any development to protect surrounding native woodland.</p>
<p><b>Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:</b></p>
<p><u>Site H2 (45) Former Aitkenbar Primary School, Dumbarton</u></p> <p>In response <b>Mrs Margaret King (PLDP/158)</b> the Council would acknowledge that the site boundaries shown in the Plan have included the former janitor's house in error. As this is now a privately owned property it should not form part of the development area. Whilst the site boundaries shown are considered to be indicative of the residential opportunity site rather than necessarily confirming the actual area of physical development, the Council would have no objection to the proposed modification to site boundary being made, as requested by <b>Mrs Margaret King (PLDP/158)</b>, should the Reporter wish to amend the site boundary.</p> <p><u>H2 (62) Littlemill Distillery, Bowling</u></p> <p>The Council welcomes the representation from <b>SNH (PLDP/640/33)</b> but would point out that the developer requirements set out by the respondent are matters that would normally be considered through the Development Management process for a planning application. However, it is considered that Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Plan will help to address the concerns expressed by the respondent when an application is considered. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.</p> <p>With regard to the representation from the <b>Woodland Trust (PLDP/646/33)</b>, the Council welcomes the comments regarding the native woodland surrounding the site but would point out that issues of tree retention and impact on the surrounding area are matters that would normally be considered through the Development Management process for a planning application. The Council would, however, point out that no native or ancient woodland has been identified within the proposed site. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.</p>
<p><b>Reporter's conclusions:</b></p>
<p><b>Reporter's recommendations:</b></p>



Issue 34	Affordable Housing Sites: Vale of Leven	
Development plan reference:	Policy H2 (Page 78) and Schedule 3: Opportunities for Social Rented Housing (Page 126)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
SportScotland (PLDP/026/34) Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/34)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to an affordable housing opportunity site within the Vale of Leven that is included within Schedule 3 and Policy H2: Housing Sites.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<u>H2(8) Braidfield High School</u>  <b>SportScotland (PLDP/026/34)</b> state that as this site contains synthetic pitches, SportScotland would likely be a statutory consultee under the Development Management (2013) Regulations, for any application for development that would impact on the pitch, and consideration will need to be given to compensation requirements.  <u>H2(44) &amp; H2(4) Haldane Primary</u>  <b>SportScotland (PLDP/026/34)</b> state that as this site contains a grass pitch, SportScotland would likely be a statutory consultee under the Development Management (2013) Regulations, for any application for development that would impact on the pitch, and consideration will need to be given to compensation requirements.  <u>H2 (48) Golfhill Drive</u>  <b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/34)</b> state that there are very severe issues of over-parking in this area.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<u>H2(8) Braidfield High School</u>  <b>SportScotland (PLDP/026/34)</b> seek to be consulted on any planning application for the site. Any proposals affecting the synthetic pitch will require compensation measures.  <u>H2(44) &amp; H2(4) Haldane Primary</u>  <b>SportScotland (PLDP/026/34)</b> seek to be consulted on any planning application for the site. Any proposals affecting the synthetic pitch will require compensation measures.		

<p><u>H2 (48) Golfhill Drive</u></p> <p><b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/34)</b> do not seek a specific modification.</p>
<b>Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:</b>
<p><u>H2(8) Braidfield High School</u></p> <p>The Council welcomes the comments of <b>SportScotland (PLDP/026/34)</b> and confirms that they would be statutory consultees on any planning application for proposed development of the site.</p> <p><u>H2(44) &amp; H2(4) Haldane Primary</u></p> <p>The Council welcomes the comments of <b>SportScotland (PLDP/026/34)</b> and confirms that they would be statutory consultees on any planning application for proposed development of the site.</p> <p><u>H2 (48) Golfhill Drive</u></p> <p>In response to the representation by the <b>Vale of Leven Trust (PLDP/677/34)</b> the Council would point out that issues of parking provision, and any impacts on local roads, are a matter for the Development Management process at a planning application stage. The site itself is relatively small with an indicative capacity of 7 units; therefore the Council is of the view that any potential parking impacts would be limited and capable of being addressed within a planning application. It should be noted that the Council's Roads Service have not objected to the allocation of this site. No modifications to the Plan are therefore required in this regard.</p>
<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>

Issue 35	Re-allocation of land	
Development plan reference:	Vale of Leven and Dumbarton Proposals Maps; Policy H2 and H3 (Pages 78 -79); and Schedule 2 and 3 (Pages 123 – 126)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Ballagan Developments (PLDP/010) Assetcrest Developments (PLDP/663) William Thomson and Son (PLDP/787) West Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/789)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to representations seeking the change of various sites from Greenbelt or Safeguarded Open Space to residential; nursing or care home; business and industrial; and a cemetery extension. The sites are contained within Dumbarton and the Vale of Leven.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b>Ballagan Developments (PLDP/010)</b> requests that an area of land at Overtoun Road, Alexandria (as detailed on the map included within the representation (respondent supporting information xx)) is changed from safeguarded open space to a residential site and included within Policy H2 and Schedule 2 or Policy H3 and Schedule 3 of the Plan. Mr Whyte quotes that the potential new sites document stated that <i>'the site does not appear to be generally used or valued by the general public as open space. There would be limited environmental impact if this sloping site was developed'</i>. Mr Whyte believes that developing this site would be good for employment and for helping the regeneration of the local area.</p> <p><b>Assetcrest Developments (PLDP/663)</b> requests that an area of land at Lesser Boll of Meal Park, Alexandria is changed from safeguarded open space to a small residential development. The respondent states that the information contained within their supporting document (supporting information xx) demonstrates that site is an effective housing site and should be allocated as such within LDP 2.</p> <p><b>Assetcrest Developments (PLDP/663)</b> request that an area of land at Lesser Boll of Meal Park, Alexandria is changed from safeguarded open space to a nursing/care home site as the site has been approved for this type of use in previous planning permissions.</p> <p><b>William Thomson and Son (PLDP/787)</b> seeks an area of land located within the Greenbelt adjacent to Sheephill Quarry to be re-allocated as business and industrial site. The respondent states that the proposed allocation was raised at the Call for Sites and the MIR stage and that the Council's response to the MIR stated that consideration may be given to the proposed allocation at Sheephill if the Council's Business and Industrial study indicated that new business and industrial land was required. The Business and Industrial study, according to the respondent, did not consider this proposed area of land and, as a result, the Proposed Plan has been finalised without any reasonable consideration being given to the representation for the inclusion of the Sheephill land allocation.</p>		

<p><b>West Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/789)</b> seek the reallocation of an area of land within the Greenbelt, adjacent to the Vale of Leven Cemetery, for use as an expansion to the Cemetery.</p>
<p><b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b></p>
<p><b>Ballagan Developments (PLDP/010)</b> seeks the re-allocation of an area of land at Overtoun Road, Alexandria as a housing opportunity under either Policy H2 and Schedule 2 or Policy H3 and Schedule 3 of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Assetcrest Developments (PLDP/663)</b> seeks the re-allocation of an area of land at Lesser Boll of Meal Park, Alexandria for a small residential housing development within an indicative capacity of 6-8 units.</p> <p><b>Assetcrest Developments (PLDP/663)</b> seeks the re-allocation of an area of land at Lesser Boll of Meal Park, Alexandria for a nursing/care home.</p> <p><b>William Thomson and Son (PLDP/787)</b> seek the reallocation of an area of land within the Greenbelt, adjacent to Sheephill Quarry, for business and industrial uses.</p> <p><b>West Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/789)</b> seek the reallocation of an area of land within the Greenbelt, adjacent to the Vale of Leven Cemetery, for use as an expansion to the Cemetery.</p>
<p><b>Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:</b></p>
<p>In response to the representation from <b>Ballagan Developments (PLDP/010)</b>, the site was considered for allocation as a residential site within the Main Issues Report as an alternative option. However, the Council did not consider this as a preferred site for residential development as the area of open space acts as an important buffer zone between residential areas and the main A82. The elevated nature of the site, relative to the existing houses, would make it difficult to be developed for housing and may result in amenity issues for existing properties.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council's Roads service are not supportive of residential development of this site as Overtoun Road is rather steep at this location and the embankment slopes up at a considerable gradient from the road. Sightlines to the west are also an issue, especially given the steep gradient of the road. As a result, there may be significant technical challenges in developing the site in relation to gradient and drainage.</p> <p>The Council is therefore of the view that the site should remain as safeguarded open space within the Plan.</p> <p>With regard to the representation from <b>Assetcrest Developments (PLDP/663)</b>, the Council does not agree that this site is suitable for a small scale housing development. Lesser Boll of Meal is part of a larger area of open space with mature and semi-mature trees which has continued to regenerate naturally, adding to its local nature conservation value over time.</p> <p>The site is understood to previously have been a gravel quarry, but it is now difficult to</p>

distinguish that use from the surrounding woodland. Its value as part of a Local Nature Conservation Site (part of Fishers Wood and Boathouse Wood) was reviewed and confirmed in the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan Review of LNCS December 2008 (CDxx), particularly in relation to its mature trees and the connectivity of the area to surrounding habitats. As a result, the Council therefore disputes the respondents assertion that this is brownfield land. The Reporter also did not agree that the site was brownfield when considering the use of this site for a nursing/care home. The Reporter stated in the Examination Report of the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) (CD xx) that:

*“the site does not have the appearance of a brownfield site, has some local amenity value, and some (albeit fairly limited) nature conservation value.*

The Council's Roads Service has advised that the site is only suitable for a small development as Heather Avenue narrows at this location and is also used to access National Cycle Route (NCN7) at this point. Heather Avenue would therefore require to be upgraded with passing places and suitable traffic calming in order for its current use to be maintained.

The Council also does not agree with the respondent that the site is an effective housing site. One of the physical constraints of the site is that it is within an area at risk of flooding. Although, the respondent has provided a 'high level' flood risk assessment, this statement has not been discussed with SEPA nor has SEPA commented upon its technical correctness. The assessment itself is qualified as it would require much more detailed assessment before the site could be considered suitable for development. Therefore, the Council disputes that the site has been proven to be free from constraints and suitable for development, which is one of the key tests of effectiveness of a site set out in PAN 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Audits (CDxx).

The respondent also makes a comparison with a site allocated within Local Development Plan 2 at Main Street, Jamestown (Site ref H2(40)), which is itself subject to a separate Issue. However, in this case, the respondent's assertion that the two sites are similar is flawed. The open space value of the Lesser Boll of Meal site is of a much higher quality and density than the site at Main Street, Jamestown, which is not an LNCS. The Council would therefore advise the Reporter to disregard this comparison and to not consider this point of representation.

The Council, in conclusion, is strongly of the view that this site should not be allocated for residential development for the reasons set out above.

**Assetcrest Developments (PLDP/663)** has made a similar argument to have the site re-designated for a nursing/care home as the site had previous planning consents for that use. This request was also previously considered by the Reporter during the Examination of the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) and the application was withdrawn. The Council would contend that nothing has materially changed from the evidence given within Councils response to Issue 21 (Pages 189 – 190) of the Examination Report. The Reporter concluded, in relation to that particular representation, that

*“In overall terms, given the expiry of the planning permission, the reconsideration of this matter at the stage of the main issues report, and taking into account the further information relating to the development of the site which has been requested on behalf of the council, I find that circumstances have materially changed since the adoption of the existing local plan. I also find that the site does not have the appearance of a brownfield*

*site, has some local amenity value, and some (albeit fairly limited) nature conservation value. In addition, there is some doubt about the effectiveness of the proposed development.*

*I therefore conclude (in the context of my assessment above of the merits or otherwise of developing the site) that there is sufficient justification not to continue the designation of this site as a public services opportunity.*

The Council's Roads Service has advised that the site is only suitable for a small development as Heather Avenue narrows at this location and is also used to access National Cycle Route (NCN7) at this point. Heather Avenue would therefore require to be upgraded with passing places and suitable traffic calming in order for its current use to be maintained.

The respondent has also used the same technical information as included within their representation seeking residential development on the site. Therefore, the Council's response to **Assetcrest Developments (PLDP/663)** above, should also be viewed as response to the technical aspects of this representation, namely flooding.

In conclusion, the Council is strongly of the view that this site should remain as safeguarded open space, as there is no requirement to allocate the land for a nursing/care home as the previous consents were never enacted and there is no demand for that use within the area at this current time. Should there be a demand for nursing/care homes in the future, Policy H3: Homes for Particular Needs allows the development of nursing/care homes on sites not allocated for that use, subject to the proposal according with other relevant policies in the Plan. No modification to the Plan is therefore considered necessary in this regard.

In response to the representation from **William Thomson and Son (PLDP/787)**, the Council would point out that the Council's Business and Industrial Review (2018) (cdxx) indicates that there is 11 years supply of marketable land within West Dunbartonshire with a further 18 years supply of non-marketable land, which with investment, may be able to replenish the marketable supply.

Whilst, the Council acknowledges the respondents view that this land is required to be allocated for business and industrial uses for their business needs, the Council would contend, taking into account the proven take up rate of 2.76 hectares per annum as detailed in the review, that there is sufficient land available within the Plan period to accommodate their business and industrial uses without developing in the greenbelt as the respondent proposes. Therefore, the Council is of the view that there is no impending need for the Council to allocate any new business and industrial land within the time period for Local Development Plan 2. No modification to the Plan is therefore required in this regard.

**West Dunbartonshire Council (PLDP/789)** seeks the safeguarding of land (as detailed on the map attached to their representation) adjacent to the Vale of Leven Cemetery to provide land for a new cemetery. The existing Cemetery is close to its capacity and needs to be extended to meet future local requirements.

Support for the proposal was given within the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan through Policy BC 5 and Schedule 6: Opportunities for Community Facilities. This policy and schedule was removed within LDP 2, mainly due to the fact that the proposals

outlined in the Schedule had been developed; were no longer being pursued; or consent had lapsed. In relation to the Cemetery, at the time of writing LDP 2, the landowner was not willing to sell the land for the intended purpose and the Council has decided to look for alternative locations within the Vale of Leven. However, during the publication of Local Development Plan 2: Proposed Plan, the Council's Greenspace service has advised that it is currently concluding missives and has an agreement in principle with the landowner for the sale of the land and that the Council's Greenspace service is committed to delivering this new cemetery within the lifespan of Local Development Plan 2.

As detailed in Issue 36, the Council has suggested that an amendment to the Plan is made to include a Policy on Community Facilities, which includes, amongst other things, new cemeteries or extensions to existing cemeteries. Due to the provisions of this new policy, subject to the Reporter agreeing with it, extensions and new cemetery proposals would be able to come forward as a planning application, without the need for a specific allocation in the Plan. These proposals would then be assessed against the relevant policies of the Plan in terms of their acceptability.

Therefore, the Council is view that no modification to the Plan and the Vale of Level Proposals Map is required to specifically allocate this proposed cemetery extension.

<b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>
<b>Reporter's recommendations:</b>



Issue 36	New Policy: Community Facilities	
Development plan reference:	Delivering Homes (Pages 76-79)	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Theatres Trust (PLDP/641)		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	This issue relates to the non-inclusion of a Policy protecting Community Facilities within the Plan.	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><b>Theatres Trust (PLDP/641)</b> The Trust supports the presumption against the loss of community facilities. However, the policy relates only to residential areas and is therefore too narrow in focus. Community facilities which serve residential communities and that are valued by local people may sit outside of residential areas, or have a more central town centre location serving a wider catchment. This would include cultural facilities such as theatres, cinemas and pubs.</p> <p>The guidance notes for 'Network of Centres' (page 84) references cultural and community facilities together in that context. Such facilities contribute towards the social and cultural wellbeing of local people and help reduce isolation, providing opportunities for participation and for people to come together. The promotion and protection of such facilities contributes towards Outcome 1 of Scottish Planning Policy (2014).</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<p><b>Theatres Trust (PLDP/641)</b> seeks that the plan introduces a new policy which provides robust protection for all valued cultural and community facilities from unnecessary loss across West Dunbartonshire, not specifically within residential areas.</p>		
Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:		
<p>The Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) contained Policy BC5, which related to Community Facilities and included Schedule 6 a list of Opportunities for Community Facilities. This policy and schedule was removed within LDP 2, as the proposals outlined in the Schedule had been developed or consent had lapsed. The Council considered that other parts of the Plan, specifically Policy H4: Residential Amenity; the Network of Centres Retail Strategy and Table 4: Network of Centres would give community facilities continued protection without the need for a specific policy.</p> <p>However, after taking on board the representation from the Theatres Trust and the request by the Council for the allocation of land for an extension to the Vale of Leven Cemetery, which is discussed in Issue 35, the need for a bespoke policy on Community Facilities is considered to have merit and would ensure that the Plan further accords with SPP (CD</p>		

xx). However, the Council does not agree that public houses and cinemas should be viewed as community facilities as these are more to do with entertainment and as such should be subject to the Policies within the Supporting Town Centres section of the Plan.

The Council considers that an amendment to the Delivering Homes Section of the Plan to include a new policy on Community Facilities and associated supporting text may be necessary. Should the Reporter wish to insert a new policy, the Council would have no objection this and would suggest that the Policy is inserted after Policy H4: Residential Amenity on Page 79 of the Plan with the proposed supporting text:

**“Community Facilities**

*In addition to housing, there are a range of other facilities that contribute to a community being attractive and successful, for example, schools, local shops, health facilities, leisure centres, cultural facilities, community halls, quality open spaces, and outdoor sports facilities.*

*Many schools, community facilities and other public service buildings are located within or adjacent to residential areas. As public services continue to modernise, new uses may be sought for some of these sites. In some instances another public service use may be sought, and this would be supported. However, there may be no requirement for the site to remain in community use and in such an instance alternative uses in keeping with the surrounding area will be supported.*

*It is also important to recognise that the Council has to ensure that other uses, not necessarily considered as community facilities, are identified and safeguarded for future use, for example, new cemeteries and extensions to existing cemeteries.*

**Policy H5: Community Facilities**

*Proposals which respond to the changing needs and demands for all community, educational, sporting, leisure, cultural and other facilities serving local communities throughout West Dunbartonshire will be supported. The development of new facilities associated with these uses should be appropriately located and be in accordance with the relevant policies of this Plan. The Council also support the upgrading, expansion and improvement of existing facilities to meet local needs.”*

**Reporter’s conclusions:**

**Reporter’s recommendations:**



### Appendix 3: Supported Modifications to Local Development Plan 2: Proposed Plan

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
Introduction		
6	Paragraph 1	Insert <i>'It also contains the internationally important Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) designated for redshank which are a qualifying interest'</i> after 'West Dunbartonshire is a very attractive part of Scotland with the Kilpatrick Hill providing a captivating backdrop over Clydebank and Dumbarton.
6	New paragraph	<p>New paragraph to inserted paragraph 7, as follows:</p> <p><i>Climate Change</i></p> <p><i>The effects of climate change are well documented and it is clear that Local Development Plan 2 has a key role to play in addressing its causes (Mitigation) and dealing with its effects (Adaptation). Whilst there is no chapter within the Plan specifically covering this subject, Climate Change issues are embedded in all aspects of the plan.</i></p> <p><i>Mitigation</i></p> <p><i>The Plan seeks to ensure that everyone has access to new quality homes and employment opportunities but, as a consequence, new development to achieve these goals will result in increased carbon emissions. Local Development Plan 2 mitigates against this by ensuring that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• New developments are within sustainable locations and easily accessible to public transport to reduce the use of the private car;</i></li> <li><i>• The layout, design and construction of new buildings are of a high quality, sustainable and suited to the climate and location and provides sustainable design which reduces carbon</i></li> </ul>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<p><i>emissions in the developments construction and end use;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Buildings are energy efficient and that low and zero carbon technologies are installed wherever appropriate;</i></li> <li><i>• A green infrastructure first approach to development is undertaken;</i></li> <li><i>• Carbon rich soils and peatland are protected from inappropriate development due to their importance as carbon sinks;</i></li> <li><i>• Renewable energy, including heat and electricity from renewable sources is achieved in in line with national climate change targets whilst giving due consideration to environmental, community and cumulative impacts.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Adaptation</i></p> <p><i>In tandem with reducing the our greenhouse gas emissions, it also must be ensured that the effects of climate change are also dealt with. Particular attention must be given to the threats of flooding and in this regard Local Development Plan 2 ensures, as far as possible, that development in areas of flood risk is avoided or where this is not possible that potential flooding issues are flagged up at an early stage so that they can be addressed by the development industry. All development is required to demonstrate sustainable drainage solutions.</i></p> <p><i>The Plan also embeds a green infrastructure first approach for the design of new developments and has strong green network and green infrastructure policies. These policies are seen as being an important part of the Plan's mitigation against and adapting to the threats faced by climate change.'</i></p>
Spatial Strategy		
13	New paragraph	<p>New paragraph to be inserted after Paragraph 1 as follows:</p> <p><i>"The Spatial Strategy directs new development towards the main public transport corridors, where possible, and seeks to maximise the use of existing public transport stops and connections to</i></p>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<i>provide sustainable modes of transport. Where appropriate and directly relevant, new development should seek to enhance public transport infrastructure, including connections to these facilities and services, to ensure that people can easily access sustainable transport and that the infrastructure can cope with the level of new demand."</i>
Delivering Our Places: Queens Quay, Clydebank		
16	6	<p>Additional sentence to be added as follows:</p> <p><i>"The Queens Quay site adjoins the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI)".</i></p> <p>Amend existing paragraph as follows:</p> <p><i>"Development at Queens Quay must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development."</i></p>
16	7	<p>Last sentence to be amended as follows (proposed amendment in bold):</p> <p><i>"Development which could harm an internationally important site will only be approved in certain circumstances <b>as detailed within Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation.</b>"</i></p>
18	QQ Policy 2	<p>New sentence to be added to the end of the Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>"Development proposals are also required to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to allow public transport to be accessed from the site and to ensure that buses can be operated on</i></p>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<i>Cable Depot Road in the future when required.</i>
City Deal Project: Esso and Scott's Yard, Bowling		
4	20	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p><i>“Development at Esso, Bowling and Scott’s Yard must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development.”</i></p>
20	5	<p>Amend final sentence within the paragraph as follows (amendment in bold):</p> <p><i>“Development which could harm an internationally important site will only be approved in certain circumstances <b>as detailed within Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation.</b>”</i></p>
20	New paragraph	<p>Insert new paragraph after paragraph 5 as follows:</p> <p><i>‘Furthermore, a Water and Drainage Impact Assessment is required for the site. Early contact with Scottish Water is required in relation to this assessment and any potential impacts on Scottish Water’s network.’</i></p>
20	Development Strategy	<p>Amend the third bullet point as follows (proposed amendment in bold):</p> <p><i>‘To use the development of the sites to enhance the Green Network <b>and access links and for the proposals to reflect the distinctive landscape and visual characteristics and qualities of the</b></i></p>



Page	Para/Policy/ Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<p><b><i>site, including the features of Dunglass Castle and the Henry Bell Obelisk Memorial’.</i></b></p> <p>Amend the fifth bullet point as follows:</p> <p><i>“To ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI)”.</i></p>
21	Development Strategy Map	<p>Modify the Development Strategy Map to provide an area of safeguarded open space around Dunglass Castle and the Henry Bell Obelisk Memorial.</p> <p>Modify the Development Strategy Map to show an area of Green Network Enhancement along the river shore</p> <p>Remove Green Network Enhancement designation from within the SPA boundary.</p> <p>Non-notifiable change: Amend the colours on the Development Strategy map to clearly distinguish between green belt and Green Network Enhancement designations.</p>
	Dumbarton Proposals Map	<p>Amend Dumbarton Proposals Map to show are of land as Greenbelt to reflect the zoning on the Development Strategy Map.</p> <p>Modify the Proposals Map to show an area of Green Network Enhancement along the river shore.</p>
22	Esso Bowling Policy 1	<p>Amend last paragraph of the Policy as follows (the proposed amendments are made in bold):</p> <p><i>“A comprehensive masterplan for development of the site is required to be submitted as part of any planning application for the site and development proposals should be in accordance with the masterplan for the site. <b>The masterplan should be informed by Landscape and Visual Impact</b></i></p>

Page	Para/Policy/ Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<b><i>Assessment (LVIA) and this assessment should also be provided alongside any planning application for the site.</i></b>
22	Esso Bowling Policy 2	Amend the third bullet point as follows (proposed amendment in bold):  <i>“Provision of bus stops and associated infrastructure to encourage public transport provisions within the site <b>subject to discussion with SPT and bus operators.</b>”</i>
22	Esso Bowling Policy 3	Amend the first bullet point as follows (proposed amendment in bold):  <i>“To ensure that <b>proposals</b> reflect and help to strengthen the biodiversity and landscape character of the site <b>and respond to the surrounding landscape context and wider assets: and...</b>”</i>  Insert new bullet point within the Policy as follows:  <i>“To deliver a designed waterfront edge, that demonstrates successful integration of proposals within wider views, delivers appropriate waterfront recreational access and frames key views”.</i>
22	Scott’s Yard Policy 1	Amend second paragraph of the Policy as follows (the proposed amendments are made in bold):  <i>“.....A comprehensive masterplan for development of the site is required to be submitted as part of any planning application for the site. <b>The masterplan should be informed by Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and this assessment should also be provided alongside any planning application for the site.....</b>”</i>
Carless, Old Kilpatrick		
24	Development Strategy	Development Strategy to be amended as follows (amendments in bold):  <i>‘The Development Strategy for Carless is:</i>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To remediate the Carless site to enable</b> redevelopment for business and industrial uses, appropriate commercial uses and, where appropriate and justified, housing and day-to-day convenience retail uses;</li> <li>• To provide a secondary access point to the site, <b>where residential development is brought forward</b>, and to upgrade the existing access <b>in relation to the Business and Industrial and Mixed Use areas of the site</b>;</li> <li>• To use development of the site to enhance the Green Network;</li> <li>• To protect the Forth and Clyde Canal and its setting; and</li> <li>• <b>To ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</b></li> </ul>
25	Development Strategy Map	<p>Amend Map as follows:</p> <p><i>Extend the Business and Industrial Designation colour at the south east corner southwards and eastwards to the mirror the extent of the jetties.</i></p> <p><i>Amend the current designation of the residential site to mixed-use but retain the H2(33) residential site reference.</i></p>
24	4	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p><i>'Development at Carless must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development'</i></p>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
24	5	<p>Last sentence to be amended as follows (proposed amendment in bold):</p> <p><i>“Development which could harm an internationally important site will only be approved in certain circumstances <b>as detailed within Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation.</b>”</i></p>
24	New paragraph	<p>New paragraph to be inserted after paragraph 5, as follows:</p> <p><i>‘Furthermore, a Water and Drainage Impact Assessment is required for the site. Early contact with Scottish Water is required in relation to this assessment and any potential impacts on Scottish Water’s network.’</i></p>
26	Carless Policy 2	<p>Amend Criterion (c) as follows:</p> <p><i>“To ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).”</i></p> <p>Add new paragraph to the end of the Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>“A masterplan is required to be prepared in advance of any development proposals for the mixed use areas identified on the Development Strategy Map, taking into account the requirements of Policy CP 4. The Masterplan should be submitted as part of any planning application for these sites and development proposals should be in accordance with the masterplan.”</i></p>
26	Carless Policy 3	<p>Policy to be amended as follows (proposed amendments in bold):</p> <p><i>‘Carless Policy 3 Residential Development</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for residential development will be restricted to the area identified on the Development Strategy Map <b>as Site H2 (33)</b> and will only be supported where they meet all of the following criteria:</i></p>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<p>a) <i>The areas identified for business, industrial and mixed-use, identified on the Development Strategy Map, have been substantially developed; and</i></p> <p>b) <i>A new access from Dumbarton Road has been provided to serve the residential development</i></p> <p><i>The capacity of residential development on the site should take account of the site's topography, landscape capacity <b>and characteristics, visual amenity</b>, infrastructure and green network enhancement requirements and be in accordance with Policies CP1, CP2 <b>and ENV 2</b></i></p>
26	Carless Policy 4	<p>Amend policy as follows: (proposed amendments are in bold):</p> <p><i>'Carless Policy 4</i></p> <p><i>Green Network and Green Infrastructure</i></p> <p><i>As the site is identified as a strategic opportunity for the enhancement of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Green Network, development of the site is required to deliver habitat, access, green and open space enhancements site, as identified on the Development Strategy Map. This will entail the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Protecting and enhancing the disused railway corridor;</i></li> <li><i>• Retaining natural screening of the site along the River Clyde corridor <b>and the Forth and Clyde Canal, but where appropriate, open up some of the trees and vegetation to provide views of the River Clyde from the N7 Cycle Route;</b></i></li> <li><i>• <b>Integrate and protect the natural environment by retaining, where appropriate, natural species, habitats and mature trees within the site;</b></i></li> <li><i>• Upgrading existing open space and providing new green spaces within the site;</i></li> <li><i>• <b>Provide links and paths throughout the site, where these would not have adverse health and safety issues or conflict with operational security of the end uses, and ensure that connections are made to existing path networks outwith the site;</b></i></li> </ul>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Providing enhancements to the green network and access for recreation along the Canal and former Railway Line; the western and eastern parts of the site and the waterfront. The enhancements to the Green Network and Green Infrastructure, including access to them for recreation, should take into account issues of health and safety and operational security of the end uses to avoid any adverse impacts or safety risks with public access to the site; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Designing the green network and spaces to reflect and enhance the distinctive landscape characteristics and visual amenity of the site.'</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Prior to remediation or development of the site, temporary uses which enhance the green network value of the site will be supported and encouraged, as will advanced greening of the site in accordance with Policy ENV7, until the site is fully developed.</i></p> <p><b><i>Masterplanning and development of the site should be informed by Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and this assessment should be provided alongside other relevant information, such as, but not limited to, a landscape strategy and a design and access statement, at the planning application stage.'</i></b></p>
26	Carless Policy 4	Add in requirements to the Policy to upgrade the unmade footpath near the river around the whiskey bond to form a walking loop with the canal path and the former railway track
	Clydebank Proposals Map	Amend Clydebank Proposals Map to allocate the green network enhancements as safeguarded open space.
Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront		
28	5 and 6	<p>Amend paragraphs as follows:</p> <p><i>'Development at Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront must also not have an adverse effect on the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC) for which Atlantic salmon, Brook lamprey and River lamprey are the qualifying interests or on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for</i></p>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<p><i>which Redshank are the qualifying interest.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development”.</i></p>
28	7	<p>Last sentence to be amended as follows (proposed amendment in bold):</p> <p><i>“Development which could harm an internationally important site will only be approved in certain circumstances <b>as detailed within Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation.</b>”</i></p>
28	Development Strategy	<p>Add additional bullet point as follows:</p> <p><i>“Protecting and enhancing the natural heritage and ensuring no adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA), the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).”</i></p>
32	Policy 5	<p>Amendments to the bullet points within the Policy as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• ‘Provide high quality design, layout and materials to reflect the sites close proximity to Dumbarton Castle and Rock as well as Levensgrove Park,</i></li> <li><i>• Provide a waterfront path; and</i></li> <li><i>• Ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura site”</i></li> </ul>
32	Policy 6	<p>Add new sentence to the end of the Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>“Proposals for development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of a Natura 2000 site”</i></p>



Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
	Development Strategy Map	To amend the Map to reflect the final boundary of the Conservation Area for the Town Centre once approved by Planning Committee and confirmed by Scottish Ministers.
Bowling Basin		
40	4	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p><i>“Development at Bowling Basin must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development.”</i></p>
40	5	<p>Last sentence to be amended as follows (proposed amendment in bold):</p> <p><i>“Development which could harm an internationally important site will only be approved in certain circumstances <b>as detailed within Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation.</b>”</i></p>
40	Development Strategy	<p>Add new bullet point to the Strategy as follows:</p> <p><i>“To ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).”</i></p>
40	Policy 1	<p>Add new bullet point to the Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>“To avoid any adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA), or on the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).”</i></p> <p>Add new paragraph to the end of the Policy as follows:</p>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<i>“The Council will also support future proposals for the redevelopment of the Outer Harbour for related and compatible uses, such as additional moorings, a marina and associated facilities, to further establish Bowling Basin as tourist destination and also to help regenerate the River Clyde waterfront in conjunction with future development at Scott’s Yard and the Esso City Deal Site.”</i>
Lomondgate		
42	Policy 1	<p>Amend Policy as follows (proposed amendments are in bold):</p> <p><i>Lomondgate Policy 1</i></p> <p><i>Lomondgate Business Park</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for development within this area will only be acceptable to the Council where they meet all of the following criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A Masterplan for the site has been developed, <b>which demonstrates that the site successfully integrates within the landscape and provides details of the massing, scale of development, finished materials and colours, which must not have an adverse impact on the wider landscape character of the area;</b></i></li> <li>• <i>At least 50% of the site is developed for Class 4, 5 or 6 business and industrial development;</i></li> <li>• <i>Proposals for commercial, leisure and tourism uses within the Business Park are restricted to uses such as a garden centre, hotel or gym;</i></li> <li>• <i>Landscaping within the site is required to help strengthen the local landscape character and green network within and through the site. Proposals should strengthen the landscape setting of Lomondgate and enhance linkages with the Local Nature Conservation Site associated with the River Leven and adjoining Vale of Leven Industrial Estate green network;</i></li> <li>• <i><b>Proposals are required to incorporate access and route improvements, as well as,</b></i></li> </ul>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<p><b><i>active travel connections in order to maximise access for employment opportunities to the Business Park and must demonstrate how they integrate and connect with the wider road and path networks within the surrounding area and to existing public transport stops.</i></b></p> <p><i>Proposals for Retail and Housing development on the Mixed-Use Part of the site, as identified on the Development Strategy Map over, will not be supported by the Council.</i></p>
Our Key Assets: Our Waterfront		
52	2 and 3	<p>Amend the paragraphs as follows:</p> <p><i>“Proposals for development which promote recreational access on or adjacent to the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA), for which redshank are the qualifying interest, and/or including the River Leven which is a tributary to the Endrick Water Special Area for Conservation (SAC), where Atlantic salmon, Brook lamprey and River lamprey are the qualifying interest, must not have an adverse effect on any Natura Site. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA).</i></p> <p><i>This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development”.</i></p>
54	New paragraph	<p>Insert new paragraph, after Paragraph 2, as follows:</p> <p><i>“Local Development Plan 2 also fully aligns with Scotland’s National Marine Plan (2015) and the emerging Regional Marine Plan for Clyde Marine Region. Any proposals for planning within the Marine Plan area must be in accordance with Scotland’s National Marine Plan (2015) and the</i></p>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<i>emerging Regional Plan once adopted, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</i>
54	5	Last sentence to be amended as follows (proposed amendment in bold):  <i>“Development which could harm an internationally important site will only be approved in certain circumstances <b>as detailed within Policy ENV 1: Nature Conservation.</b>”</i>
54	Policy WD 1	Add new criteria to the Policy as follows:  <i>e) Development proposals with a marine component or implication (such as marinas, ports, harbours, shipbuilding, marine tourism and recreation, fish farming etc) will, in principle, be supported where they are consistent with Scotland’s National Marine Plan and the emerging Regional Marine Plan for Clyde Marine Region (once adopted). All proposals will require to be in accordance with the criteria detailed above and with all other relevant Policies of the Plan.</i>
Strategic Green Networks		
59 and 61	Strategic Green Network and Strategic Green Network Project Maps	Non-notifiable change:  For clarity purposes, revisit the colouring of the various parts of the green network and amend the colours with consequential changes to the key of both maps.
60	Strategic Green Network Projects	Amend bullet point two, under Access Priorities, as follows (amendment is in bold): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Forth and Clyde Canal, strategic and local connections to and from the Canal and <b>Canal Related Improvements, such as, but not limited to, towpath access upgrades; moorings provision and improvements related to recreational uses.</b></li> </ul>
Forth and Clyde Canal		
64	Paragraph 2	Insert new sentence within paragraph 2 on Page 64 of the Plan after ‘Scheduled Monument Consent’

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		and before 'The Clydebank' as follows:  <i>'Scottish Canals and Historic Environment Scotland should be consulted at an early stage in any planning proposals which may affect the Forth and Clyde Canal and also when a planning application is lodged.'</i>
64	Policy FCC 1	Insert new second paragraph within Policy FCC 1 as follows:  <i>Where development and/or works affect the Canal, they will be required to accord with Scottish Canal's Third Party Works procedures.</i>
Communities and Place		
68	Paragraph 3	Amend the last sentence of the Paragraph as follows (the proposed amendment is in bold):  "This approach will give our Communities a strong voice in how their area can be enhanced and will be prepared jointly by the Council and Communities for defined neighbourhoods within West Dunbartonshire <b>following the guidance set out in the National Standards for Community Engagement and in accordance with the Council's Engaging Communities Framework.</b> "
69	Policy Framework	Amend the first sentence of the Policy Framework as follows (the proposed amendments are in bold):  "The <b>Council</b> will adopt Locality Place Plan(s) prepared within West Dunbartonshire as Supplementary Guidance where they meet the following criteria:...."
69	Policy Framework	Amend Criteria (f) of the Policy Framework as follows (the proposed amendments are in bold):  <i>(f) The Locality Place Plan has been subject to significant and wide-ranging engagement and consultation with different ages, groups and individuals within that community or communities</i>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification																																								
		<i>including, where relevant, landowners and developers.</i>																																								
Creating Places																																										
73	Policy CP3: Masterplanning and Site Briefs	Add new sentence to end of Policy as follows:  <i>“Schedule 1 of the Plan details the type and status of the detailed spatial design guidance that has been prepared/ is being prepared for key regeneration sites as contained within the Delivering our Places section of Local Development Plan 2.”</i>																																								
Delivering Homes: Housing Land Supply and Housing Land Requirement																																										
76	Table 1	Amend Table 1 as follows (amendments are in bold): <table><tr><th colspan="4">Table 1: Housing Land Requirement 2012-2024</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>Private</th><th>Social Rented</th><th>All Tenure</th></tr><tr><td>A Housing Supply Target (2012-2024)</td><td>1,800</td><td>960</td><td>2,760</td></tr><tr><td>B Housing Land Requirement (2012-2024)</td><td>2,070</td><td>1,100</td><td>3,170</td></tr><tr><td><b>C Completions from 2012-2017</b></td><td><b>699</b></td><td><b>361</b></td><td><b>1,060</b></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td><b>D Housing Supply Target 2017 – 2024 (A-C)</b></td><td><b>1,101</b></td><td><b>599</b></td><td><b>1,700</b></td></tr><tr><td><b>E Housing Land Requirement 2017 – 2024 (D x 15%)</b></td><td><b>1,266</b></td><td><b>689</b></td><td><b>1,955</b></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td><b>F Housing Land Audit 2017-2024</b></td><td><b>1,701</b></td><td><b>815</b></td><td><b>2516</b></td></tr></table>	Table 1: Housing Land Requirement 2012-2024					Private	Social Rented	All Tenure	A Housing Supply Target (2012-2024)	1,800	960	2,760	B Housing Land Requirement (2012-2024)	2,070	1,100	3,170	<b>C Completions from 2012-2017</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>1,060</b>					<b>D Housing Supply Target 2017 – 2024 (A-C)</b>	<b>1,101</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>1,700</b>	<b>E Housing Land Requirement 2017 – 2024 (D x 15%)</b>	<b>1,266</b>	<b>689</b>	<b>1,955</b>					<b>F Housing Land Audit 2017-2024</b>	<b>1,701</b>	<b>815</b>	<b>2516</b>
Table 1: Housing Land Requirement 2012-2024																																										
	Private	Social Rented	All Tenure																																							
A Housing Supply Target (2012-2024)	1,800	960	2,760																																							
B Housing Land Requirement (2012-2024)	2,070	1,100	3,170																																							
<b>C Completions from 2012-2017</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>1,060</b>																																							
<b>D Housing Supply Target 2017 – 2024 (A-C)</b>	<b>1,101</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>1,700</b>																																							
<b>E Housing Land Requirement 2017 – 2024 (D x 15%)</b>	<b>1,266</b>	<b>689</b>	<b>1,955</b>																																							
<b>F Housing Land Audit 2017-2024</b>	<b>1,701</b>	<b>815</b>	<b>2516</b>																																							

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification																																															
		<b>G SURPLUS 2017-2024 (F-E)</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>561</b>																																												
77	Table 2	Replace existing Table with the following: <table><tr><th colspan="4">Table 2: Housing Land Requirement 2024 -2030</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>Private</th><th>Social Rented</th><th colspan="2">All Tenure</th></tr><tr><td>A Housing Supply Target (2024-2030)</td><td>900</td><td>480</td><td colspan="2">1380</td></tr><tr><td>B Housing Land Requirement (2024-2030) (A x 15%)</td><td>1,035</td><td>552</td><td colspan="2">1587</td></tr><tr><td>C Surplus from 2017-2024</td><td>+435</td><td>+126</td><td colspan="2">+561</td></tr><tr><td>D Additions from Established Supply (2024-2029)</td><td>765</td><td>371</td><td colspan="2">1,136</td></tr><tr><td>E Additions for Programmed sites (2029-2030)</td><td>72</td><td>72</td><td colspan="2">144</td></tr><tr><td>F Total Supply (C+D+E)</td><td>1272</td><td>569</td><td colspan="2">1841</td></tr><tr><td>G Surplus 2024 – 2029 (F-B)</td><td>237</td><td>17</td><td colspan="2">254</td></tr></table>				Table 2: Housing Land Requirement 2024 -2030					Private	Social Rented	All Tenure		A Housing Supply Target (2024-2030)	900	480	1380		B Housing Land Requirement (2024-2030) (A x 15%)	1,035	552	1587		C Surplus from 2017-2024	+435	+126	+561		D Additions from Established Supply (2024-2029)	765	371	1,136		E Additions for Programmed sites (2029-2030)	72	72	144		F Total Supply (C+D+E)	1272	569	1841		G Surplus 2024 – 2029 (F-B)	237	17	254	
Table 2: Housing Land Requirement 2024 -2030																																																	
	Private	Social Rented	All Tenure																																														
A Housing Supply Target (2024-2030)	900	480	1380																																														
B Housing Land Requirement (2024-2030) (A x 15%)	1,035	552	1587																																														
C Surplus from 2017-2024	+435	+126	+561																																														
D Additions from Established Supply (2024-2029)	765	371	1,136																																														
E Additions for Programmed sites (2029-2030)	72	72	144																																														
F Total Supply (C+D+E)	1272	569	1841																																														
G Surplus 2024 – 2029 (F-B)	237	17	254																																														
Revitalising the Economy																																																	
81	Paragraph 3	Replace the paragraph with the following:  “Development within the Hospital Campus or within the Clydebanks Riverside Strategic Economic Investment Location must not have an adverse effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both																																															



Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<i>during construction and operation of the Development”.</i>
82	Policy E6	Amend Policy E6 as follows (amendments in bold):  <i>“The development of new and existing tourist facilities will be supported and encouraged throughout the Council area where <b>there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of a Natura 2000 site</b> and they avoid adverse impacts on the green network and built heritage and are in accordance with other relevant policies within the Plan.”</i>
83	Policy E7	Amend Policy E7 as follows (amendments in bold):  <i>Development that would adversely impact on the operations of Glasgow Airport or would be adversely affected by aircraft noise will not be permitted. <b>Development which is proposed within an area affected by aircraft noise is required to accompanied by an initial noise risk assessment and the preparation of an Acoustic Design Statement as recommended in the Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise for New Residential Development (published by the Association of Noise Consultants, Institute of Acoustics and Chartered Institute of Environmental Health).</b>”</i>
83	Maps	Non-notifiable modification:  Amend the maps within Page 83 to reflect the LAeq Noise Contours (2017), as published in Glasgow Airport’s Noise Action Plan 2018-2023.
Business and Industrial Opportunities		
127	Schedule 4	Insert ‘**’ against Clydebank Industrial Estate E1(6) and replace the second note within the Schedule with the following text:  <i>“ ** Development at Clydebank Industrial Estate and Cable Depot Road must not have an adverse</i>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<i>effect on the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area (SPA) for which Redshank are the qualifying interest. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert assessment to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). This may require a study of redshank behaviour in the affected area of the SPA, which is likely to involve survey over at least one overwintering season. Account should also be taken of the HRA of this Proposed Plan, including measures potentially required to address disturbance both during construction and operation of the Development”.</i>
Protecting our Built Environment		
89	Policy BE 1	Amend the first sentence of the Policy as follows:  <i>‘Where Development adversely affects the integrity of the setting of a Scheduled Monument, permission would only be granted where there are exceptional circumstances’.</i>
89	Paragraph 2	Amend the first sentence of the Paragraph as follows:  <i>‘Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) is required from Historic Environment Scotland (HES) for any works that would directly affect a Scheduled Monument.’</i>
Safeguarding our Environment		
96	New paragraph 3	Insert following text as new paragraph:  <i>“For Natura 2000 sites, development likely to have a significant effect will be subject to an appropriate assessment of the implications for the conservation objectives”.</i>
96	Policy ENV 1	Amend Policy as follows (amendments in bold):

Page	Para/Policy/ Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<p><i>“Development that adversely effects the integrity of sites designated for nature conservation or harms protected species will not be permitted except:</i></p> <p><i>a) for Natura 2000 sites:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Where there are no alternative solutions</i></li> <li><i>• There are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social and economic nature; and</i></li> <li><i>• compensatory measures are provided to ensure that the overall coherence of the Natura network is protected.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><i>In this event, Scottish Ministers will be notified</i></b></p> <p><i>b) for protected species:</i></p> <p><i>where it accords with relevant legislation and all of the relevant licensing tests are passed c) for SSSI’s:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• where the objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the area will not be compromised; or</i></li> <li><i>• any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by social, environmental or economic benefits of national importance”.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Development that adversely affects non-designated habitats identified in the Dunbartonshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan will be assessed against the level of net impacts. In all instances, the Council will require development proposals to have regard to safeguarding features of nature conservation value including woodlands, hedgerows, lochs, ponds, watercourses, wetlands, wildlife corridors <b>and geological features”.</b></i></p> <p><i>All new development should enhance biodiversity as part of the green network, in accordance with Policy CP2 of this Plan and the Green Infrastructure Supplementary Guidance.</i></p>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
97	Natural Environment Designations Map	Non-notifiable change:  Amend key to fix drafting error in relation to the key and reference of the map regarding reference to the Kilpatrick Hills and SSSI.
98	Paragraph 1	Amend second last sentence of the paragraph to:  <i>"It is important that the siting and design of new development relates directly to the key landscape characteristics to maintain or enhance the distinctive landscape character".</i>
98	Policy ENV 2	Amend first sentence of the Policy to:  <i>'Development proposals should be sited and designed to relate to the local landscape character of the area and ensure that the integrity of this landscape character is maintained or enhanced'.</i>
98	Policy ENV 3	Insert new second paragraph into the Policy as follows:  <i>"Where peat and other carbon rich soils are present, applicants should submit a peat management plan and/or enhancement plan to demonstrate how impacts on peat or peatland habitat have been avoided or minimised".</i>
101	Paragraph 3	Amend second last sentence as follows (amendment in bold):  <i>"It is important to note that climate change is also increasing and frequency of flooding and that new development should, in particular, take account of rising levels within the River Clyde <b>which information on can be found within SNH's commissioned Report: Impacts of sea-level rise and storm surges due to climate change in the Firth of Clyde:</b> <a href="https://www.nature.scot/snh-commissioned-report-891-impacts-sea-level-rise-and-storm-surges-due-climate-change-firth-clyde">https://www.nature.scot/snh-commissioned-report-891-impacts-sea-level-rise-and-storm-surges-due-climate-change-firth-clyde</a>."</i>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
101	Policy ENV 6	Amend the first sentence of the Policy as follows (amendments in bold):  <b><i>“Except in circumstances which are demonstrated to be exceptional and unavoidable, development will not be supported.....”</i></b>
102	Policy ENV 7	Amend last sentence of the Policy as follows:  <i>“Any temporary greening of a site should be preceded by a survey to establish any protected species licensing requirements, should not prevent the future development of the site concerned, and should also take account of any existing wildlife value of the site”.</i>
Connectivity		
107	New paragraph	Insert the following text as a new paragraph, after Paragraph 2:  <i>“Access rights extend beyond core paths and the formal path network and there are a number of sports in addition to walking and cycling, that use and are dependent on Scotland’s natural environment and exercising broader access rights for their practice including off-path (e.g. in water, an important climbing crag). Development needs to consider any impacts of proposals on access for these users.”</i>
107	Policy Con 3	Amend the Policy as follows (additions in bold/ deletions abe):  <b><i>“Core Paths, and Natural Routes and Access</i></b>  <i>Improvements to and reinstatement of core paths and the development of new routes for core paths, footpaths, bridleways or cycle paths are encouraged and supported by the Council. Development of new routes should demonstrate that they will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of a Natura 2000 site. <b>Development proposals will recognise outdoor sport and recreation interests and</b></i>

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<p><b><i>consider any impacts on access rights for these users.</i></b></p> <p><i>The Council, however, will not be supportive of development which disrupts or adversely impacts on any existing or potential core path, right of way, bridle path, or footpath used by the general public for recreational or other purposes. <b>This includes off-path access rights which must be protected.</b> Where such disruption or adverse impact is demonstrated to be unavoidable, the Council will require developers, as an integral part of the proposed development, to provide for the appropriate diversion of the route elsewhere within the development site or to put into place appropriate measures to mitigate and overcome the adverse impact expected."</i></p>
Renewable Energy		
112	Policy RE 2	<p>Amend Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Policy as follows (amendments in bold):</p> <p><i>"Significant protection will be given to Group 2 areas as shown on Spatial Framework for Wind Energy Development Map over. Development may be appropriate in some circumstances within these areas but only in cases where it can be demonstrated that any significant adverse effects on the qualities of these areas can be substantially overcome by siting, design or other mitigation and where the proposal is acceptable in terms of <b>the relevant</b> Development Management criteria set out in Paragraph 169 of Scottish Planning Policy.</i></p> <p><i>Within Group 3 areas, as shown on Spatial Framework for Wind Energy Development Map over, proposals for wind energy developments will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that they are acceptable in terms of <b>the relevant</b> Development Management criteria contained within Paragraph 169 of Scottish Planning Policy and accord with the guidance set out in the Renewable Energy Supplementary Guidance."</i></p>
114	Policy RE 4	Amend the second sentence in Paragraph 3 to:

Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<i>'All proposals will require to meet with the relevant development management criteria set out in paragraph 169 of SPP'.</i>
Minerals, Aggregates and Coal Extraction		
118	Policy MIN 1	<p>Insert new paragraphs after Paragraph 2 of the Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>"When assessing development proposals, the Council will ensure that that all workable minerals resources, which are of economic or conservation value, are safeguarded. There will be a presumption against other forms of developments which would permanently sterilise these resources, unless their retention in the ground can be fully justified."</i></p> <p><i>'Restoration proposals are required to restore the land to the highest possible standards to ensure its suitability for appropriate uses, including tourism, leisure, forestry, nature conservation and agriculture to the benefit of local communities.'</i></p>
Schedule 2: Opportunities for Private Housing		
125	Note	<p>Amend the Note as follows (deletions/ additions are in <b>bold</b>):</p> <p><i>"Strauss Avenue, annotated with '6', requires a primary access to be formed from the A82, or from other appropriate roads within Glasgow City Council's boundary. A Transport Assessment for the site is required to be provided, which among other requirements, should demonstrate the optimum point for this new primary access to the site and that safe access to the site can be satisfactorily demonstrated to the satisfaction of both West Dunbartonshire Council and Glasgow City Council, whilst meeting the appropriate Roads geometric standards of both Councils. West Dunbartonshire Council will not support a primary access from Livingstone Street and Strauss Avenue. <b>Strauss Avenue Duntreath Avenue in Glasgow City Council's boundary</b> will only be allowed to provide an <b>emergency</b> secondary access for emergency vehicles and <del>as an emergency access</del>. Early</i></p>



Page	Para/Policy/Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<p><i>discussions with West Dunbartonshire Council's Roads Service and Glasgow City Council's Roads and Transportation Service are required in this regard.</i></p> <p><b><i>In accordance with Policy CP 3 of the Plan, the Developer will be required to provide a masterplan for development of the site which must fully incorporate the provisions of the Development Brief. The Masterplan will also be required to be submitted to the Council's Place and Design Panel.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Development of the site must ensure that there is a substantial area of enhanced multi-functional open space provided onsite. The Developer will also be required to enhance the area of open space to the south of the site on the opposite side of the Forth and Clyde Canal."</i></b></p>
New Policy		
79	New supporting text and new Policy H5	<p>Insert the following text and Policy after Policy H4 as follows:</p> <p><b><u>"Community Facilities</u></b></p> <p><i>In addition to housing, there are a range of other facilities that contribute to a community being attractive and successful, for example, schools, local shops, health facilities, leisure centres, cultural facilities, community halls, quality open spaces, and outdoor sports facilities.</i></p> <p><i>Many schools, community facilities and other public service buildings are located within or adjacent to residential areas. As public services continue to modernise, new uses may be sought for some of these sites. In some instances another public service use may be sought, and this would be supported. However, there may be no requirement for the site to remain in community use and in such an instance alternative uses in keeping with the surrounding area will be supported.</i></p>

Page	Para/Policy/ Map/Schedule	Proposed Modification
		<p><i>It is also important to recognise that the Council has to ensure that other uses, not necessarily consider as community facilities, are identified and safeguarded for future use, for example, new cemeteries and extensions to existing cemeteries.</i></p> <p><u><i>Policy H5: Community Facilities</i></u></p> <p><i>Proposals which respond to the changing needs and demands for all community, educational, sporting, leisure, cultural and other facilities serving local communities throughout West Dunbartonshire will be supported. The development of new facilities associated with these uses should be appropriately located and be in accordance with the relevant policies of this Plan. The Council also support the upgrading, expansion and improvement of existing facilities to meet local needs."</i></p>