

## West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan

### List of 'Schedule 4s for Local Development Plan Examination

1. General/Miscellaneous
2. Alexandria Town Centre
3. Clydebank Town Centre
4. Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront
5. Queens, Quay Clydebank
6. Carless, Old Kilpatrick
7. Esso Bowling & Scott's Yard
8. Bowling Basin
9. The Lomond Canal
10. Lomondgate & Vale of Leven Industrial Estate
11. Young's Farm, Dumbarton (Dumbarton FC)
12. The Green Network
13. Kilpatrick Hills
14. Developing Sustainably
15. Growing Our Economy
16. Building Our Communities – Meeting Housing Requirements
17. Building Our Communities – Duntiglennan Fields, Duntocher
18. Building Our Communities – Clydebank issues
19. Building Our Communities – Dumbarton & Milton issues
20. Building Our Communities – Stirling Road, Bonhill
21. Building Our Communities – Vale of Leven issues
22. Supporting Our Centres
23. Protecting Our Centres
24. Supporting Development – Kilbowie Roundabout
25. Supporting Development

<b>Issue 1</b>	<b>GENERAL/MISCELLANEOUS</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Diagram on p6 Glossary Appendix 2	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
SEPA (128) SNH (129) James Graham (170)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Various	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Water Framework Directive/Climate Change</u></p> <p><b>SEPA (128)</b> are disappointed to note there is no mention of either '<i>Impacts of Climate Change and/or 'Resilience Measures to address Climate Change'</i>' and <i>The Water Framework Directive/The Water Environment'</i> in the spider diagram on page 6 of Chapter 2 'Outcomes of the Local Development Plan Figure.</p> <p><u>Supplementary Guidance</u></p> <p><b>SNH (129)</b> recommend that following each policy, a sentence should be added to provide a hook to relevant Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p><u>Glossary</u></p> <p><b>SNH (129)</b> suggest that any Plan users looking up terms relating to European sites will need clearer definitions that reflect the strictness of the provisions of the Habitats Regulations.</p> <p><u>Appendix 2</u></p> <p><b>James Graham (170)</b> states that Appendix 2 contains no reference to the policies, proposals or views contained in the local development plan which relate to the River Leven.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		

### Water Framework Directive/Climate Change

**SEPA (128)** seek for the spider diagram on page 6 of the Plan to make reference to climate change/resilience measures and the Water Framework Directive/water environment.

### Supplementary Guidance

**SNH (129)** seek for a sentence after each policy stating “Development proposals must accord with appropriate Supplementary Guidance [or in some cases, as appropriate, the name of the relevant SG].”

### Glossary

**SNH (129)** recommend for the following as terminology in the Glossary:  
Appropriate assessment - see Habitats Regulations Appraisal.  
Habitats Regulations Appraisal – the process, or the written record, of assessing a plan or project that might have implications for a Natura site against the strict tests in the Habitats Regulations. Where a plan or project (e.g. built development) is assessed as “likely to have a significant effect”, an appropriate assessment must be undertaken of whether it would “adversely affect the integrity” of the Natura site.

### Appendix 2

**James Graham (170)** seeks for the reference to the River Leven in Appendix 2 to contain reference to the policies, proposals or views of the Plan that affect it.

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

### Water Framework Directive/Climate Change

The diagram on page 6 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) (CD19) illustrates the national, regional and local policy and strategy documents that influence the content of the Local Development Plan. It would not be possible to include every such document in the diagram. There are references to climate change throughout the Proposed Plan (as modified), including the third outcome in Table 1, p7. The Proposed Plan (as modified) includes a water environment policy (GN6) (CD19, p81) which, including the preamble, makes reference to the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plans.

The modification by **SEPA (128)** is not required.

### Supplementary Guidance

It is not the intention of the Council to prepare Supplementary Guidance in respect of all policies. Where it is intended to prepare Supplementary Guidance over the lifetime of this Plan, it is stated.

The modification by **SNH (129)** is not required.

Glossary

The Reporter is invited to recommend the modification suggested by **SNH (129)**.

Appendix 2

Appendix 2 (CD19, p92) identifies the 'Our Changing Places – The Lomond Canal' section of the Proposed Plan (as modified) as one which could affect land adjacent to the River Leven.

The modification by **James Graham (170)** is not required.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 2</b>	<b>ALEXANDRIA TOWN CENTRE</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.2, Pgs 10-12 & Map 3	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Scottish Natural Heritage (129)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Chapter 3.2 sets out the Strategy for Alexandria Town Centre which is to: strengthen its retail offer; increase the population of the town centre; support redevelopment along Bank Street; and improve the attractiveness of the town centre.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><b>Scottish Natural Heritage (129)</b> consider that the mixed use opportunity extending from Mitchell Way to the railway (SC1(1) and BC1(44)) has good potential for new habitat creation alongside the railway, to enhance the function of this Wildlife Corridor.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><b>Scottish Natural Heritage (129)</b> seek a modification requiring the creation of a new green space south of the housing site and through the layout of the housing itself.</p>		
<b>Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:</b>		
<p>The Mitchell Way Redevelopment Opportunity was marketed by the Council in 2013 (CD37: Redevelopment Opportunity: Alexandria Town Centre, 2013). The brief refers to the Alexandria Town Centre Masterplan 2008 (CD36), the adopted Local Plan (CD22), and the preferred option for Alexandria town centre set out in the Main Issues Report (CD12), which was carried forward into the Proposed Plan, (CD19). A preferred bidder has now been identified for the site following a tendering exercise. Because of this it is considered that it would not be appropriate at this stage to introduce new elements into the Local Development Plan. However, the Council will seek green network enhancements as part of any future applications through the Development Management process, and as supported by Policy GN2 and any green network supplementary guidance that might be in place at the time.</p> <p>The modification by <b>SNH (129)</b> is not accepted.</p>		

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 3</b>	<b>CLYDEBANK TOWN CENTRE</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.3, Pgs 13-15 & Map 4	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p>Asda Stores Limited (74)          Royal Mail Group (94)          Clydeside Regeneration and Dawn Group (103)          Chester Properties (107)          Scottish Canals (127)          Scottish Environment Protection Agency (128)          Clydebank East and Central Community Council (183)</p>		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	<p>Chapter 3.3 sets out the Strategy for Clydebank Town Centre which is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintain the Clyde Shopping Centre as an attractive retail core;</li> <li>• support modernisation of the Shopping Centre (south);</li> <li>• support a new superstore on the existing Playdrome site;</li> <li>• support the evening economy and leisure offer;</li> <li>• protect setting of the Canal;</li> <li>• and improve public transport/accessibility.</li> </ul> <p>The chapter also includes Map 4 which identifies these Strategy areas.</p>	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Playdrome Site (SC1(3))</u></p> <p><b>Asda Stores Limited (74)</b> does not support a new superstore on this site.</p> <p><u>Town Centre Boundary</u></p> <p><b>Asda Stores Limited (74)</b> support the town centre boundary being maintained as is and not extended to include Queens Quay site.</p> <p><b>Clydeside Regeneration and Dawn Group (103)</b> consider that the town centre should be extended to include part of the Queens Quay site to assist with kick-starting the regeneration of the wider Queens Quay site and opening up the river frontage to the town centre.</p> <p><b>Chester Properties (107)</b> indicate that the Clyde Retail Park was historically</p>		

identified as part of the town centre in Clydebank. This should be reinstated. This will provide the Council with a much stronger town centre through providing opportunities for all types of retailers to locate in Clydebank. In amending the town centre boundary to include the Clyde Retail Park the Council can ensure flexibility in the delivery of retail provision within Clydebank Town Centre. By including the retail park within the town centre boundary the Council will ensure that such retailers can be retained and attracted to the retail park, and through the good connectivity with the Clyde Shopping Centre bring positive benefits to the whole town centre.

**Clydebank East and Central Community Council (183)** consider that the term 'town centre' should not be applied to the Clyde Shopping Centre. The town hall, library and old baths should be the focal point. The former John Brown's shipyard site (which is within the Queens Quay site) and the new leisure centre next to the College, along with the town hall should be retained as the town centre.

#### Clydebank Delivery Office

The **Royal Mail Group (94)** indicates that the Clydebank Delivery Office is fully operational. It must be protected from development that may adversely affect services delivered from it.

#### Forth & Clyde Canal

**Scottish Canals (127)** consider that ground floor uses must integrate better with the canal-side and the proposed 'Events Area'. The canal has an important role to play in adding value to the retail, residential and visitor offer of the town centre but the uses opening out onto the canal-side must promote activity and there must be as many doors and windows from these uses opening onto the canal as possible. There is an opportunity to develop the car park to the north of the canal at Clyde Shopping centre for other uses and that the Dunnes Stores unit could also through time be changed to allow windows and doors opening onto the canal-side public realm and create canal-side activity. In addition the plan should support the requirement for canal-side developments to make contributions towards the further improvement to the canal. The canal can also play a role in terms of receiving surface water discharge and providing heating/cooling solutions for adjoining developments.

**Scottish Environment Protection Agency (128)** advise that developments proposed in this area will require to take account of the proximity of the Forth & Clyde Canal. There is potential need for the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment and to encourage high quality SUDS and a buffer strip between development zone and the water body.

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

##### Playdrome Site

It is assumed that **Asda Stores Limited (74)** seeks the deletion of the reference to superstore opportunity SC1(3)(requires changes to para 3.3.2, 3.3.7, Map 4 and Schedule 7).



### Town Centre Boundary

**Clydeside Regeneration and Dawn Group (103)** seek the following amendments:

- Page 13, Paragraph 3.3.2. - in this section a further bullet point should be added as follows: “The town centre should be extended to include part of the Queens Quay site. This will assist in kick-starting the regeneration of the wider Queens Quay site and open up the river frontage to the existing town centre.”
- Page 14, Paragraph 3.3.8. - the Proposed Plan should have a sentence added to the end of the paragraph as follows: “Integrating the town centre with Queens Quay and extending the centre onto the our client’s site will improve the evening and leisure economy in Clydebank.”
- Page 15, the Proposals Map 4: Clydebank Town Centre should be altered to include part of Queens Quay (see Appendix 3). The town centre boundary should be extended to include reference to the retail opportunity on the Queens Quay site.

**Chester Properties (107)** seek to amend the town centre boundary to include the Clyde Retail Park.

**Clydebank East and Central Community Council (183)** seek to amend the town centre boundary to exclude the Clyde Shopping Centre and include the town hall and library, and former John Brown’s shipyard including the college and proposed leisure centre.

### Clydebank Delivery Office

No specific change has been requested by the **Royal Mail Group (94)**.

### Forth and Clyde Canal

**Scottish Canals (127)** seek to strengthen the text reference in para 3.3.9 to say “All proposals adjacent to the canal should provide for the opportunity for interaction with the canal and make use of the canal for heating / cooling and SUDS and make a contribution, where appropriate, towards canal-side improvements.”

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

### Playdrome Site

There is only one superstore operator in the town and the Playdrome site will offer increased choice in the food-shopping sector, introduce competition and draw additional trade to the town centre. The Clydebank Retail Strategy (2003), (CD38), identified the need to maintain investment in the town centre and recommended a second superstore in the town centre which would act as an anchor to the southern half of the town centre, broaden the range and quality of convenience provision and promote linked shopping trips. The retail strategy was updated by The Clydebank Town Centre: Retail Strategy Update (2012), (CD39)

which sought to review the retail policy position and market findings of the 2003 retail strategy and bring forward an updated Strategy. It identifies a new superstore on the Playdrome site as a key requirement to anchor the town centre, enhance quantitative and qualitative retail provision, promote linked trips and maximise the town centre retail catchment (CD39:Table 5, page 28). It identifies that there is sufficient expenditure capacity to support a second superstore in the town centre (CD39: Appendix 2, page 36).

The modification proposed by **Asda Stores Limited (74)** to delete reference to a superstore opportunity is therefore not supported.

### Town Centre Boundary

Three modifications to the town centre boundary are proposed by different interests:

- the extension of the boundary to incorporate part of the Queens Quay site;
- the extension to incorporate the Clyde Retail Park; and
- the exclusion of the Clyde Shopping Centre from the town centre and redefinition of the town centre as the town hall, library, the former John Brown's shipyard site and the leisure opportunity site (both of which are within the Queens Quay site).

Paragraph 54 of SPP (CD03) defines the make-up and role of town centres and it is against this definition that the town centre boundary location should be assessed. Town centres should have "a diverse mix of uses and attributes, including a high level of accessibility". Clydebank is different to many Scottish towns in that it doesn't have a traditional high street and the Clyde Shopping Centre (including the enclosed shopping mall and pedestrianised Sylvania Way South) fulfills this role. However, outside of the Clyde Shopping Centre, there is a concentration of other uses within the town centre boundary such as traditional retail, leisure, commercial and residential uses all well-served by the public transport network. The town centre boundary in the proposed Plan would therefore accord with SPP policy.

Redefining the town centre boundary to include the Queens Quay site would have an adverse impact on Clydebank town centre and the Plan's strategy for it as set out in paragraph 3.3.2. The strategy includes the maintenance of the Clyde Shopping Centre as an attractive retail core and modernisation of the southern part of the shopping centre. It is considered that inclusion of part of the Queens Quay site in the town centre would take investment and shoppers away from the town centre. There are already a number of long-term vacant units (CD41: Vacancy Survey 2014 – Clydebank Map).

The strategy for Clydebank town centre also includes the identification of a superstore opportunity on the Playdrome site. The rationale for extending the town centre into Queens Quay is believed to support proposals for a supermarket on that site. It is the Council's position, supported by a capacity assessment undertaken in 2012 (CD39: Clydebank Town Centre Retail Strategy Update 2012), that there is not capacity for two new large supermarkets in Clydebank. The Playdrome opportunity is the preferred site because it is in the existing town

centre and would complement existing shops there by encouraging linked trips. A superstore on the Queens Quay site is more likely to take shoppers away from the town centre and attract those who will only use the superstore. At present Dumbarton Road offers a strong town centre boundary. The extension of the town centre into the Queens Quay site would weaken the boundary and lead to much of the Queens Quay site being defined as edge-of-centre, which would give it sequential approach status further threatening the town centre strategy.

Additional matters concerning the Queens Quay site are included under Issue 5, and should be referred to.

The modification proposed by **Clydeside Regeneration and Dawn Group (103)** is not accepted.

In respect of the proposal to include the Clyde Retail Park in the town centre, it is accepted that the Clyde Retail Park was historically identified as part of the town centre in the Clydebank Local Plan (2004), (CD27: Clydebank Local Plan Proposals Map). Further to the publication of SPP8 Town Centres and Retailing in 2006, (CD04) which distinguished between town centres and commercial centres (paras 10-11), the Clyde Retail Park was redefined as a commercial centre in the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (2010),(CD22). Paragraph 54 of Scottish Planning Policy (CD03) continues to define commercial centres as being “distinct from town centres as their range of uses and physical structure makes them different in character and sense of place” with a “more specific focus on retailing”. The Clyde Retail Park meets the terms of what is defined as a commercial centre in SPP. In practical terms, the definition of the Clyde Shopping Centre as a commercial centre provides the Council with a degree of control over development there, in terms of the sequential retail strategy in Policy SC1 and Table 5, which could otherwise impact on the vitality and viability of the core retail area of the town centre. Further, it continues to safeguard retail warehouse format shopping in a location accessible to the town centre.

For these reasons, the modification to Clydebank town centre’s boundaries proposed by **Chester Properties (107)** is not supported.

The final modification seeks to exclude the Clyde Shopping Centre from the town centre boundary. As discussed above, Clydebank doesn’t have a traditional high street and the Clyde Shopping Centre fulfills this role providing units occupied by national multiples, local retailers, banks, restaurants and cafes. It is therefore appropriate that the Shopping Centre - identified by the Plan as the Core Retail Area - remains at the heart of the defined town centre. The town hall, library and old baths have important civic and cultural functions which are not affected by their exclusion from the town centre and, along with Dumbarton Road, currently contribute to a strong defining edge to the town centre.

The modifications to Clydebank town centre’s boundary proposed by **Clydebank East and Central Community Council (183)** are not supported.

Clydebank Delivery Office

The Plan has no specific proposals that affect the delivery office and Policy DS1

will ensure that any development will have regard to the existing context and use of the site. No modification in respect of the representation by the **Royal Mail Group (94)** is required.

#### Forth & Clyde Canal

The LDP identifies the canal in the town centre as an asset with the opportunity to increase interaction and contribute to the economy and offer of the town centre. The proposed modification by **Scottish Canals (127)** would strengthen the requirement for “all” proposals (rather than “any”) to interact with the canal. However, the approach of the Plan is proportionate and allows for developments to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Policies DS1 (page 47) and GN7 (page 82) will be used to ensure that developments create successful places and enhance built and natural assets such as the canal.

The inclusion of encouraging the canal to be used for heating / cooling and SUDS would form a consideration under Policy GN2 and GN6 and would be a consideration for supplementary guidance.

**Scottish Canals (127)** also propose that developments make a contribution towards canal-side improvements. Contributions need to be proportionate to the development proposal and the wording in para 3.3.9 allows this to be considered on a case-by-case basis taking the requirements of Policy GN7 (page 82) into account.

The modifications proposed by **Scottish Canals (127)** are not accepted.

No specific change has been requested by **Scottish Environment Protection Agency (128)** however, it should be noted that their advice forms part of Policy DS6, p53.

#### **Reporter’s conclusions:**

--

#### **Reporter’s recommendations:**

--

<b>Issue 4</b>	<b>DUMBARTON TOWN CENTRE &amp; WATERFRONT</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.4, Pgs 16-20 & Map 5	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p>Dumbarton East &amp; Central Community Council (56)  Silvertown and Overtown Community Council (57)  British Land Retail Warehouses Ltd (represented by Montagu Evans LLP) (86)  The Royal Mail Group (represented by DTZ) (94)  Scottish Environment Protection Agency (128)  Scottish Natural Heritage (129)</p>		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	<p>Chapter 3.4 sets out the Strategy for Dumbarton Town Centre and waterfront which covers a wide and diverse area. The Strategy focuses on creating an attractive retail core, supporting a mix of uses throughout the town centre and identifies a number of opportunity sites adjacent to the river and retail core.</p> <p>The chapter includes Map 5 which identifies the key characteristics of the town centre and opportunity areas.</p>	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Retention of Old Academy Building Façade</u></p> <p><b>Dumbarton East &amp; Central Community Council (56)</b> have indicated that the building is in urgent need of work and requires more than the retention of the façade. It detracts from the appearance of the town.</p> <p><u>Tidal Basin</u></p> <p><b>Silvertown and Overtown Community Council (57)</b> seek assurances that the tidal basin will not be infilled as part of the redevelopment of land to the south of Castle Street (para 3.4.11). It has historical importance to Dumbarton as one of the last physical remains of Denny's shipyard and has considerable regeneration and tourist potential, as well as links to the Scottish Maritime Museum's Denny Tank Museum adjacent.</p> <p><u>St James Retail Park</u></p> <p><b>British Land Retail Warehouses Ltd (86)</b> comment that the retail park continues to be a major employer locally and its success ensures that a significant amount of retail expenditure is retained within the town. British Land has invested</p>		

significantly in the retail park in recent years, including a major refurbishment and the addition of new units. Market research shows that there continues to be demand from retail park operators to open stores in Dumbarton. They support investment in the St James Retail Park, however are aware of issues relating to the town centre and are keen to work with the Council and town centre stakeholders to ensure that the town centre and retail park co-exist to improve the prosperity of the town as a whole.

The development of a second phase of the St James Retail Park provides significant opportunity to focus investment in Dumbarton, provide a catalyst to development in the town centre and claw back expenditure being leaked outwith the catchment. A well considered format of retail floorspace has the potential to retain both expenditure and custom within the Dumbarton area benefiting the town centre and area as a whole.

#### Dumbarton Delivery Office

DTZ representing **The Royal Mail Group (94)** indicates that the Dumbarton Delivery Office is fully operational. It must be protected from development that may adversely affect services delivered from it.

#### Site Allocations

**Scottish Environment Protection Agency (128)** comment that, although the regeneration plans are in principle supported, various allocations included in the town centre and waterfront area will require detailed FRA's to confirm the developable footprints of some of the allocations. Any engineering works (flood protection measures) proposed along the riverside will be subject to discussion with SEPA, including the construction of the new footbridge. In accordance with the terms of Policy DS6, development in the functional floodplain will not be supported & encourage high quality SUDS and buffer strip.

#### The Strategy for Dumbarton

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** look forward to contributing to strategic planning of this Changing Place as a partner in the Action Programme (CD21) and wish to clarify the nature and scope of the proposed strategy by making two modifications.

#### Waterfront Path

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** has concerns the line of this path around the south-west side of Dumbarton Rock (Map 5) has implications for the nationally important geological interest of Dumbarton Rock SSSI. Affixing path structures to the currently inaccessible rock faces could enable study and appreciation of the geology, but could also hinder it by obscuring the rock.

#### Waterfront

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** recognises that the Council may intend parts of the waterfront to be hard-surfaced civic space. However there is great potential

for new green space creation to make the waterfront a significant multifunctional Green Network asset, in particular beside the River Leven at Castle Road (para 3.4.13), for site(s) south of Castle Street (para 3.4.11) and at Sandpoint (para 3.4.16).

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

##### Retention of Old Academy Building Façade

**Dumbarton East & Central Community Council (56)** have not presented a modification to para 3.4.10 but their comments imply a change to the text to state that the building is in urgent need of work which should consist of more than the retention of the facade.

##### Tidal Basin

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)** have not presented a specific modification to para 3.4.11 but it is inferred that the text should mention that the tidal basin will not be infilled as part of the redevelopment of land to the south of Castle Street due to its historical importance to Dumbarton and its regeneration and tourist potential.

##### St James Retail Park

**British Land Retail Warehouses Ltd (86)** do not set out specific wording but propose that para 3.4.12:

- Continues to identify and promote land to the east of St James Retail Park for the development of a second phase of the retail park reflecting the existing planning permission in principle and the significant potential benefits this will bring including in relation to employment opportunities, investment, retention of expenditure and town centre prospects; making explicit references to the granting of planning permission in principle for its extension.
- Continues to support proposals for retail and / or leisure developments in an identified Commercial Centre where their function complements that of other centres within the network of centres, having particular care not to undermine town centres.

##### Dumbarton Delivery Office

No specific change has been requested by the **Royal Mail Group (94)**.

##### Site Allocations

No specific change has been requested by **Scottish Environment Protection Agency (128)**.

##### The Strategy for Dumbarton

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** seek to:

- add the following text to paragraph 3.4.4: “*The strategy will include a mapped development framework which will be taken forward by more detailed site-specific masterplans*”; and
- amend the mapped boundary of the Town Centre & Waterfront to include the proposed bridge and the waterfront path west of Sandpoint.

#### Waterfront Path

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** recommend that the text at para 3.4.9 and/or Map 5 should include an appropriate caveat such as:

*“This section of path is subject to avoiding net impacts on Dumbarton Rock SSSI.”*

#### Waterfront

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** suggest three modifications:

- at para 3.4.13 “attractive frontage” should be replaced by “green space creation”;
- “green space creation” should feature in the requirements for sites south of Castle Road at para 3.4.11; and
- at Table 4 the following text should be added to the Sandpoint Marina entry at “continual waterfront path around site”: “with significant new open space located at key points of interest along the waterfront path.”

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

#### Retention of Old Academy Building Façade

The condition of the building is such that only the facade can reasonably be incorporated into any future development and it is important that the redevelopment of the wider site ensures an appropriately designed and active frontage which incorporates the facade and this is clearly stated by the Plan on p17, para 3.4.10.

The modification proposed by **Dumbarton East & Central Community Council (56)** is not accepted.

#### Tidal Basin

Paragraph 3.4.11 of the Plan requires the stabilisation of the basin and harbour walls. This, in effect, requires their retention. However, there is a need to clarify this and the modification proposed by **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)** is accepted.

The Reporter is invited to modify the second last sentence of para 3.4.11 by inserting “retention and” in front of “stabilisation of the basin and harbour walls.”

#### St James Retail Park

The general strategy for the St James Retail Park outlined in paras 3.4.12 reflects the policy details set out for the Network of Centres Retail Strategy under Policy



SC1 and Table 5 (pages 73, 75). Town centres are the preferred location for new retail development. A fundamental role of the Network of Centres Retail Strategy is to protect existing town centres by restricting new smaller units on commercial centres like St James Retail Park. Whilst there is planning consent for a phase 2 development, it is appropriate that consents for significant retail developments in less preferred locations are kept under review. Where Plan allocations reflect historical out-of-town centre retail developments the possibility to carry out reviews is reduced.

For the reasons above it is not appropriate to modify para 3.4.12 and the modification from **British Land Retail Warehouses Ltd (86)** is not accepted.

#### Dumbarton Delivery Office

The plan has no specific proposals that affect the delivery office and Policy DS1 will ensure that any development which have regard to the existing context and use of the site.

No modification to the representation by the **Royal Mail Group (94)** is required.

#### Site Allocations

**Scottish Environment Protection Agency's (128)** advice forms part of Policy DS6. No modification is necessary.

#### The Strategy for Dumbarton

The supplementary guidance for the Dumbarton town centre and waterfront will include a mapped framework but since the area is under multiple ownership it will require the agreement of individual owners to prepare site-specific masterplans. The requirements of Policy DS1 will be encouraged to be presented in plan form by prospective developers and the supplementary guidance referred to in para 3.4.4 will be a material consideration in any application. There is therefore no requirement to refer to site-specific masterplans in the text.

The modification from **Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** is not accepted.

The boundary of the Town Centre & Waterfront is drawn to reflect the retail, civic and commercial boundaries of the town. Map 5 shows the proposed location of the new footbridge. The Dumbarton Proposals Map shows that a core path extends westwards from Sandpoint Marina along the waterfront. There is no need for Map 5 to replicate this.

The modification from **Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** makes no material change to the Plan so is not accepted.

#### Waterfront Path

It is accepted the line of the path around the south-west side of Dumbarton Rock (Map 5) is around currently inaccessible rock faces and that access may only be achieved by affixing path structures to the geologically important Dumbarton Rock

SSSI.

The Reporter is invited to modify the line of the Harbourside path shown in yellow on Map 5 (p20), to stop at the north base of the Castle before the path turns south, to reflect the inaccessibility of the west and south-west side of the Rock.

#### Waterfront

It is anticipated that the waterfront area will be a combination of hard and soft civic space although it is recognised that there are opportunities to create a linear green network which follows the contours of the River Leven. Policy GN2 will require all development to follow the Integrating Green Infrastructure approach in accordance with supplementary guidance and this will ensure that these opportunities are considered.

The three modifications from **Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** are not accepted.

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

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

<b>Issue 5</b>	<b>QUEENS QUAY, CLYDEBANK</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.5, Pgs 21-24 & Map 6	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p>Jigsaw Planning representing Asda Stores Ltd (74)  GVA James Barr representing Clydeside Regeneration &amp; Dawn Group (103)  Scottish Canals (127)  Scottish Environment Protection Agency (128)  Scottish Natural Heritage (129)  Clydebelt (169)</p>		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	<p>Chapter 3.5 sets out the Strategy for Queens Quay, a 41 hectare former shipyard (John Browns) of historical importance located on the River Clyde. The Strategy is for housing-led regeneration with support for other uses, green network enhancements and a reservation of the Fastlink route if required.</p> <p>The chapter includes Map 6 which sets out the development opportunities for the site.</p>	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Large Scale Retail Development</u></p> <p><b>Asda Stores Ltd (74)</b>, represented by Jigsaw Planning, supported the MIR option for Queens Quay which seeks to maintain the site as an opportunity for housing-led regeneration with ancillary retail, office and tourism/leisure. Asda is therefore pleased to see that the Proposed Plan does not support a significant retail opportunity on the site (para 3.5.7). However the Proposed Plan continues to say that future proposals <i>“must be based upon a comprehensive masterplan and be supported by evidence of a funding model demonstrating how the development of the entire site is to be achieved.”</i> Asda highlight that, as acknowledged in the LDP text the development of this site for significant retail development could have an adverse impact on Clydebank Town Centre through diversion of expenditure.</p> <p>GVA James Barr representing <b>Clydeside Regeneration &amp; Dawn Group (103)</b> seek to promote the site as a mixed use development to include a large format superstore (up to 8,000 sq.m (gross) with petrol filling station). Their representation includes a summary of the retail capacity issues in Clydebank. They conclude that there is sufficient expenditure available for a supermarket on the site, without impacting on the vitality or viability of the existing ASDA store or proposed site in the town centre (the “Playdrome” site identified in para 3.3.7).</p>		

They consider that the site is of national importance and as development on the site has stalled the Council should take a more proactive approach to promoting development on the site. They state that para 3.5.7 appears to be the only indication from the Council that consideration will still be given to large scale retail in terms of the “impetus required” to kick start the regeneration of the site. In their view the Proposed Plan has to go further than this for the Council to realise the vision for Queens Quay.

**Clydebelt (169)** are against any large scale retail development on the site which would conflict with the town centre, bring too much traffic and could destroy the more peaceful ambience they would like for the riverside and adjacent areas.

#### Simplified Planning Zone

**Clydeside Regeneration & Dawn Group (103)** wish the Queens Quay site to be identified as a Simplified Planning Zone through the Proposed Plan (or a separate Council exercise) to encourage regeneration on the site.

#### Fastlink Proposal

**Clydeside Regeneration & Dawn Group (103)** consider that as the Fastlink proposal is not planned to come out to Clydebank, it is inappropriate to include this in the Proposed Plan.

#### Changing Places

**Scottish Canals (127)** supports the identification of Queens Quay as a ‘Changing Place’. Links between the site and Clydebank Town Centre and the Forth & Clyde Canal should be improved and funded through its development. This will help the regeneration efforts within the town centre and will ensure that the many people eventually living at Queens Quay walk / cycle to the town centre and the canal i.e. both Clydebank’s waterways would be joined up.

#### Flood Risk

**Scottish Environment Protection Agency (128)** indicate that further detailed flood risk information will be required to define the developable footprint of the site which may include flood management measures and repairs to the existing flood defences/quay walls and encourage high quality SUDS and buffer strip. There are no specific modifications proposed to the text.

#### Green Network

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** looks forward to contributing to strategic planning of this Changing Place, as a partner in the West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan Action Programme (CD21, item 4.1). They acknowledge that demolition of the disused railway bridge and the embankment immediately adjacent could positively contribute to place-making here. Further west however, the embankment is an attractive green space with an informal path. Its trees not only provide a landscape setting to the Glasgow Road area but could also provide

advance greening to the north-west edge of this Changing Place. SNH recommend that the text should encourage partial retention of the embankment as a Green Network asset, providing a path/cycle route and connectivity for wildlife with the nearby railway and Canal corridors.

#### Residential Development at Queens Quay

**Clydebelt (169)** state that the Queens Quay site should not just be a new residential area but attract others to the riverside for leisure etc (para 3.5.4). There should be less houses and more open space provision. A waterfront park could incorporate the Titan crane with a children's adventure play area or similar, with street sculptures and furniture.

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

##### Large Scale Retail Development

**Asda Stores Ltd (74)** consider that para 3.5.7 should be amended to refer in the text that any future significant retail proposals on the site would need to meet the other policies of the LDP in particular SC1.

**Clydeside Regeneration & Dawn Group (103)** propose several amendments to the text of section 3.5 as follows:

- At para 3.5.2 there should be further bullet points: "supermarket of up to 8,000 sq.m gross of floor space";
- At para 3.5.4 delete ""predominantly for houses and flats" and insert "predominantly for residential use". In the next line also delete "proximity" and insert "opportunity to integrate with the town centre";
- At para 3.5.7 delete the first two sentences and "However" at the start of the third sentence. Then insert at the end of the paragraph, "However, the council will support an 8,000 sq.m (gross) supermarket as part of the proposal to kick start the regeneration of the site." (Note: it should be deletion of first three sentences).
- At para 3.5.9 add after the first sentence, "The expansion of the town centre into Queens Quay will assist in linking Clydebank to the waterfront."

In addition, they wish Map 6 to be altered to extend the town centre south into the eastern side of the Queens Quay site (see appendix 4 of their submission) and specific reference should be made to the 8,000 sq.m (gross) supermarket on the map.

**Clydebelt (169)** have not suggested any specific modifications to the text.

##### Simplified Planning Zone

**Clydeside Regeneration & Dawn Group (103)** propose an additional bullet point at para 3.5.2 which states "consider the creation of a simplified planning zone on part or the entire site."

##### Fastlink Proposal

**Clydeside Regeneration & Dawn Group (103)** state that paragraph 3.5.11 should be deleted and reference to Fastlink in Map 6 be removed.

#### Changing Places

**Scottish Canals (127)** have not proposed any modifications.

#### Flood Risk

**Scottish Environment Protection Agency (128)** have not proposed any modifications.

#### Green Network

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** recommends that the text at para 3.5.8 should encourage partial retention of the embankment as a Green Network asset, providing a path/cycle route and connectivity for wildlife with the nearby railway and canal corridors.

#### Residential Development at Queens Quay

**Clydebelt (169)** suggest that a new section be added to chapter 3.5 which suggests “provision for parking from Hall Street to service Town Hall and Library, provision of parking near basin for access to Titan crane, riverside walkway and any marine development based in the basin”.

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

#### Large Scale Retail Development

Any significant retail development would require to meet Policy SC1 and Table 5 which sets out a network of centres strategy and it is not considered that there is need to have specific reference to it or other policies in the text of para 3.5.7.

The modification by **Asda Stores Ltd (74)** is not accepted.

The Council recognises the national, regional and local significance of the Queens Quay site and the Clyde Waterfront and is supportive of the SDP strategy. The SDP spatial development strategy sets out indicative forms of development in line with the strategy for the Clyde Waterfront and this does not include retail (CD09: Diagram 3: Spatial Development Strategy and Indicative Compatible Development, page 5). Retail development is supported in the Network of Strategic Centres including Clydebank Town Centre.

The Council considers that a significant retail development on the Queens Quay site, and specifically an 8,000 sq.m superstore, would have adverse impacts on Clydebank town centre. It would draw trade from the town centre, which already has vacancies (CD41: Vacancy Survey 2014 – Clydebank Map) and more significantly would threaten the LDP’s strategy for the town centre which includes a strong retail core and a new superstore on the Playdrome site, which would complement the existing retail offer. The retail capacity assessment undertaken

for the Retail Strategy Update 2012 (CD39), prepared for Clydebank Rebuilt, concludes that there is capacity for one further large superstore in the Clydebank town centre convenience catchment, and the LDP identifies the opportunity for this on the Playdrome site, within the town centre. The Retail Strategy Update also states that an additional store on the Queens Quay site “would be expected to substantially displace trade from the town centre” (CD39, para 4.12, pg 23).

The Council has been working in partnership with the site owners of Queens Quay and has recently appointed a consultant specifically tasked with progressing the site towards development through the preparation of a Masterplan which is in line with the LDP’s housing-led strategy for the site. Good progress is being made in this exercise (CD40:WDC Infrastructure, Regeneration and Economic Development Committee: 18 June 2014 – Queens Quay, Clydebank).

The modifications to the text at section 3.5 by **Clydeside Regeneration & Dawn Group (103)** are not supported.

Matters relating to amending the Clydebank town centre boundary (including amendments to Map 6 and para 3.5.9) to include part of Queens Quay are dealt with under Issue 3 and should be referred to.

#### Simplified Planning Zone

Enterprise zones (also known as simplified planning zones) were first introduced in the 1980s and Statutory Instrument 1995 No.2043 (CD07) sets out the requirements for them under the 1972 Planning Act. Although this regulation has not been revoked the idea behind enterprise zones has been superseded by Enterprise Areas when the Scottish Government announced in 2012 that four Enterprise Areas were to be designated (CD08: Financial Scrutiny Unit Briefing: Enterprise Areas). These four areas are growth sectors rather than specific sites, i.e. life sciences, renewable, creative industries and aerospace, although 14 sites have been identified across Scotland to promote these growth sectors. Enterprise Areas use business incentives to encourage development and a streamlined approach to planning whereby local authorities sign up to a planning protocol which facilitates and enables development. No sites in West Dunbartonshire have been identified as an Enterprise Area.

The Strategic Development Plan identifies “Clydebank Riverside” as a Strategic Economic Investment Location for the Business and Financial Services and Life Sciences sectors (CD09: Schedule 2, pg24) and it is acknowledged that life sciences is one of the growth sectors identified by Scottish Government for Enterprise Areas.

However, the Local Development Plan identifies the more tightly defined Queens Quay site as a housing-led regeneration project with support for other uses. None of these are in the growth sectors identified for Enterprise Areas. In addition, the Council considers that the way forward for Queens Quay is through a masterplan approach and working with the developers to achieve a development which meets the Council’s design aspirations for the site.

The use of a simplified planning zone for the Queens Quay site is not appropriate

and the amendment by **Clydeside Regeneration & Dawn Group (103)** is not supported.

#### Fastlink Proposal

The Fastlink core route, currently being constructed, will provide a public transport route from Glasgow city centre running along the Clydeside and serving the Financial Services District in Glasgow, the SECC, Govan and the new South Glasgow Hospitals campus. There are no committed proposals to route Fastlink out to Clydebank. However, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport have indicated that there is the potential to expand the scheme in the future (CD56: Email from SPT). Paragraph 3.5.11 is worded to reflect the longer term aspirations of the site to ensure that at the masterplanning stage of Queens Quay consideration is given to the proposals at that time. The illustration in Map 6 reflects this aspiration. Other options for the Fastlink route have also been identified, including running along Dumbarton Road and through Clydebank town centre.

The amendment by **Clydeside Regeneration and Dawn Group (103)** is not accepted.

#### Flood Risk

**SEPA's (128)** advice forms part of Policy DS6 and will be secured through the development management process.

#### Green Network

The Council's preference is for the removal of the embankment at Cable Depot Road to enable a more comprehensive redevelopment although the text at para 3.5.8 does acknowledge an alternative may be a management regime to prevent the railway bridge and the embankment becoming overgrown. It is accepted that the embankment does provide a green network opportunity and to reflect this it is suggested that the last sentence of para 3.5.8 is amended to state "and, along with the embankment, contribute to the green network of the site, offering a path and wildlife connectivity."

The Reporter is invited to make the modification in response to the representation by **Scottish Natural Heritage (129)**.

#### Residential Development at Queens Quay

**Clydebelt (169)** state that the site should not just be a new residential area but attract others to the riverside for leisure uses with more open space provision. The modification seeks provision of parking at certain parts of the site, presumably to encourage users to the river. The Council considers that the strategy for the site, in para 3.5.2, does support uses other than housing on the site which will all assist in attracting people to the riverside. The level and nature of parking provision within the masterplan for access to features within the site such as the Titan Crane, riverside walkway and any other development within the basin will be dependent on a number of factors including the proposed density of use and layout. The town hall and library are close to good public transport and it



is not considered necessary to reserve parking provision on the masterplan for these existing uses. Open space provision is a requirement of the site as identified in para 3.5.10 and it is expected that the masterplan will demonstrate that the site will make a significant contribution to the green network within West Dunbartonshire.

The amendments by **Clydebelt (169)** are not supported.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 6</b>	<b>CARLESS, OLD KILPATRICK</b>															
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.6, Pgs 25-27, Map 7	<b>Reporter:</b>														
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>																
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>sportscotland (20)</td> <td>G. Dick (96)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Susan Dick (75)</td> <td>Scottish Canals (127)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Graham Parton (76)</td> <td>SEPA (128)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hazel McFarlane (81)</td> <td>SNH (129)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elaine Dick (82)</td> <td>Jackie Wintersgill (166)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lesley McEwan (83)</td> <td>Clydebelt (169)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Robbie McEwan (84)</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			sportscotland (20)	G. Dick (96)	Susan Dick (75)	Scottish Canals (127)	Graham Parton (76)	SEPA (128)	Hazel McFarlane (81)	SNH (129)	Elaine Dick (82)	Jackie Wintersgill (166)	Lesley McEwan (83)	Clydebelt (169)	Robbie McEwan (84)	
sportscotland (20)	G. Dick (96)															
Susan Dick (75)	Scottish Canals (127)															
Graham Parton (76)	SEPA (128)															
Hazel McFarlane (81)	SNH (129)															
Elaine Dick (82)	Jackie Wintersgill (166)															
Lesley McEwan (83)	Clydebelt (169)															
Robbie McEwan (84)																
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	The spatial strategy for the Carless site, Old Kilpatrick which makes provision for new mixed-use development resulting in the remediation of the site; green network enhancements; and access improvements, including a new access to the side from Dumbarton Road (crossing the Forth & Clyde Canal).															
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>																
<p>Objections to the proposed development of Carless have been submitted by: <b>Susan Dick (75), Graham Parton (76), Hazel McFarlane (81), Elaine Dick (82), Lesley McEwan (83), Robbie McEwan (84), G. Dick (96), and Jackie Wintersgill (166)</b>. The objections raise the following issues:</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Site is in a flood area.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Site is contaminated and also partly within an HSE Consultation Zone.</p> <p><u>Biodiversity</u> Site is an important coastal habitat for estuary birds, including redshank, and habitat for other wildlife. Development of the site cannot ensure the protection of wildlife.</p> <p>The canal and disused railway lines are wildlife corridors, the crossing of which would have a huge impact as they would effectively be blocked. Development of the site would lead to fragmentation of the green network and affect the movement of wildlife.</p> <p><u>Open space</u></p>																

Locals value the use of the area for dog walking, exercise and horse riding as it has returned to nature with usable tracks and paths. It is an asset to the area and a valuable amenity space, only requiring tidying up.

Policy GN1 of the Proposed Plan states development which results in loss of an open space will not be permitted unless provision of an open space of equal or enhanced quality and value is provided – the loss of such a sizeable site as Carless could not be compensated for in any way.

#### Forth & Clyde Canal

Policy GN7 of the Proposed Plan states development alongside the Forth & Clyde Canal should enhance it as a green network asset and that development which would have an adverse impact on the canal or its setting will not be permitted. Development at Carless would not adhere to this policy.

Another road crossing over the canal would impede users of the canal and canal towpath.

Other representations received regarding Carless:

**Sportscotland** (20) note that in Map 7 (p.27) the triangular area of land within this site to the north of the Forth & Clyde Canal is identified as open space and appears to include a playing field but also incorporates an indicative route of site access. They would seek appropriate compensation for the loss of any playing field, in accordance with SPP.

**Scottish Canals** (127) support the identification of the Carless site for development and green network enhancements. They note any proposals affecting the canal would need to be agreed with Scottish Canals' third party works engineer and the new bridge crossing would need Scottish Canals' approval and input at an early stage to ensure the crossing is designed in line with the navigational and access requirements of the canal.

Scottish Canals also raise their support for draining surface water discharge from the site into the canal, an approach currently being pioneered by the Metropolitan Glasgow Strategic Drainage Partnership. It is further considered there should be a requirement to upgrade the canal-side area and provide improved mooring facilities adjoining the site where appropriate.

**SEPA** (128) acknowledge that a comprehensive masterplan will require to be prepared for the site and that to address SEPA's concerns this should include details on flood risk, land remediation and green network improvements and encourage high quality SUDS and buffer strip.

**SNH** (129) welcome the proposed support for temporary greening, but believe this should be matched by support for advance greening, if possible.

**Clydebelt** (169) support the development of the site; in particular, the enhancements to the green network referred to in paragraph 3.6.8, but have some reservations. The representation states that the area has become valuable as an informal nature reserve: fish species can be found in the ponds which once

held oil tanks; the site is used by wildfowl from the Inner Clyde estuary and it is host to a large variety of insects. It is considered that an Environmental Impact Assessment is required to ascertain the wildlife value of the site.

It is suggested that a larger area is left alongside the River Clyde for wildfowl to use, and the ground between the canal and disused railway and at the east end of the site, near the bonded warehouses, should be used to form worthwhile wildlife corridors.

The potential for a footpath link/enhanced green corridor to the south of the bonded warehouses to the Duntocher Burn is highlighted.

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

**Susan Dick (75), Graham Parton (76), Hazel McFarlane (81), Elaine Dick (82), Lesley McEwan (83), Robbie McEwan (84), G. Dick (96), Jackie Wintersgill (166)** wish to see: no residential development on the site; no loss of green space, including no development of any sort on the grassed area(s) situated next to the disused railway line near where the large anchoring pylon is sited; no construction or buildings or any crossings/structures of any type over the canal, its towpath or the disused railway line; no additional access road(s), specifically from Freeland's Place over the canal and disused railway line.

#### **sportscotland (20)**

Reference made to the need for appropriate compensation for the loss of any sports pitch, playing field or outdoor sports facility as part of any redevelopment proposals.

#### **Scottish Canals (127)**

Reference to the opportunity to take surface water from the site into the canal, that the bridge should meet Scottish Canals' navigation and access requirements and that there should be a developer contribution towards canal-related improvement.

#### **SNH (129)**

*Paragraph 3.6.8 – the following wording should be inserted at the end of the paragraph: once the site is remediated, planting to provide greening in advance of development will be supported and encouraged.*

**Clydebelt (169)** do not articulate specific modifications to the Plan, but state there should be a full environmental study, enhancement to wildlife sites and a restriction of the development site area, with areas along the Clyde, between the canal and disused railway and to the east of the site left undeveloped.

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

The former Carless oil refinery site in Old Kilpatrick was identified as a development opportunity (GD1(11) – Residential/Industry/Business/Leisure/Mixed Use) in the Clydebank Local Plan (CD27), adopted in September 2004 and the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (LE1 (17)) (CD22), adopted in March 2010. As the only site in West Dunbartonshire designated as contaminated under Part II of

the Environmental Protection Act 1990, there is strong environmental and economic justification for this derelict site's continued identification as a development opportunity. Redevelopment would remediate the contamination arising from the site's previous use, bring about green network enhancements and provide new housing and/or opportunities for employment. National, regional and local planning policy seeks to direct development to urban areas and in particular vacant and derelict brownfield sites such as Carless.

The Proposed Plan (as modified) requires at paragraph 3.6.3 that a comprehensive masterplan is agreed to guide development of the site. Through this process, an appropriate form of development can be established that takes account of the biodiversity interests of the site, flood risk and other matters including the HSE Consultation Zone. Paragraph 3.6.5 states that development at Carless must not have an adverse effect on redshank (the qualifying interest of the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area). The masterplanning and detailed design phases can also ensure that there are no adverse impacts on the Forth & Clyde Canal and it is noted that **Scottish Canals** (127) support the identification of the Carless site for development and green network enhancements. Furthermore, Policy GN7 (p.82) states that all development alongside the Forth & Clyde Canal will be expected to enhance the canal.

The strategy for the development of Carless set out in section 3.6 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) places green network enhancements as integral to the development of the site. This will entail protecting and enhancing the disused railway corridor; upgrading existing open space and providing new spaces; and ensuring green infrastructure is central to proposals for new buildings and infrastructure. This approach will ensure that development proposals take account of habitat networks and create opportunities for recreation. Currently, there is no formal access to the main part of the site, south of the canal, albeit it is used for informal recreation via a gap in existing fencing.

The modifications proposed by **Susan Dick** (75), **Graham Parton** (76), **Hazel McFarlane** (81), **Elaine Dick** (82), **Lesley McEwan** (83), **Robbie McEwan** (84), **G. Dick** (96) and **Jackie Wintersgill** (166) are therefore not supported.

The Council notes the modification proposed by **sportscotland** (20) regarding the need for appropriate compensation for the loss of any sports pitch, playing field or outdoor sports facility as part of the redevelopment proposals. Paragraph 3.6.7 addresses this requirement but it is proposed that the third sentence is amended as follows to clarify the point: 'The provision of open space within the Carless site will compensate for any loss resulting from *the creation of the access road, including, if required, a sports pitch or playing field in accordance with Policy GN1.*'

The Reporter is invited to make the modification proposed by **sportscotland** (20).

**Scottish Canals** (127) have advised that any proposals affecting the canal would need to be agreed with Scottish Canals' works engineer; the new bridge crossing would need their approval; and that Scottish Canals should have input at an early stage to ensure the crossing is designed in line with the navigational and access requirements of the canal. A change to the Proposed Plan (as modified) is sought

to make reference to this. This safeguard would ensure that use of the canal and canal towpath is not impeded by a new crossing.

The Council accepts this proposed modification and the Reporter is invited add the following sentence after the second sentence of paragraph 3.6.7: *‘Scottish Canal’s input at an early stage will be required to ensure the crossing is designed in line with the navigational and access requirements of the canal.’*

On the matter of requiring developer contributions for canal-related improvements, it is considered that costs arising from decontamination of the site and providing adequate access through the provision of a new bridge over the canal would make further requirements for developer contribution difficult in respect to the deliverability and viability of the site. Policy GN7 will require development alongside the canal to enhance it as a green network asset and development that would have an adverse impact on the canal or its setting will not be permitted.

This modification by **Scottish Canals** (127) is therefore not supported.

Also proposed as a modification by **Scottish Canals** (127) is the inclusion of a statement on the potential to drain surface water from the Carless site into the Forth & Clyde Canal. While the Council notes this potential, in the context of the strategy set out for Carless in the Proposed Plan (as modified), it is considered a statement to this effect is too detailed to be included with in the Plan.

This modification by **Scottish Canals** (127) is not accepted.

Additional reference to ‘advanced greening’ as proposed by **SNH** (129) is supported. It is suggested the following wording is added to the end of paragraph 3.6.8: *‘...and once the site is remediated, planting to provide greening in advance of development will be supported and encouraged.’*

**Reporter’s conclusions:**

--

**Reporter’s recommendations:**

--

<b>Issue 7</b>	<b>ESSO BOWLING AND SCOTT'S YARD</b>															
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.7, Pgs 28-31, Map 8 Schedule 1 – GE1(19)	<b>Reporter:</b>														
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>																
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Lefarge Tarmac Ltd. (22)</td> <td>Lesley McEwan (83)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)</td> <td>Robbie McEwan (84)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)</td> <td>RSPB Scotland (122)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Susan Dick (75)</td> <td>SNH (129)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Graham Parton (76)</td> <td>Magdelaine Blair Dick (134)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hazel McFarlane (81)</td> <td>Jackie Wintersgill (166)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Clydebelt (169)</td> </tr> </table>			Lefarge Tarmac Ltd. (22)	Lesley McEwan (83)	Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)	Robbie McEwan (84)	Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)	RSPB Scotland (122)	Susan Dick (75)	SNH (129)	Graham Parton (76)	Magdelaine Blair Dick (134)	Hazel McFarlane (81)	Jackie Wintersgill (166)		Clydebelt (169)
Lefarge Tarmac Ltd. (22)	Lesley McEwan (83)															
Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)	Robbie McEwan (84)															
Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)	RSPB Scotland (122)															
Susan Dick (75)	SNH (129)															
Graham Parton (76)	Magdelaine Blair Dick (134)															
Hazel McFarlane (81)	Jackie Wintersgill (166)															
	Clydebelt (169)															
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	The strategy for Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard supports: the development of the Esso Bowling site to increase business and industry opportunities; residential development on Scott's Yard; enhancements to the Green Network; and the provision of a road linking the A814 and providing access to the site.															
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>																
<p><u>Development Strategy</u></p> <p><b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)</b> accept the argument for part of the land to be used for a diversionary route for the A82 between Dumbuck Junction and the Dunglass roundabout but otherwise consider the remainder of the site should be retained as green open space, with a nature reserve created. The land is already part of the Green Network and Green Belt and any substantial development on the site would have a negative environmental impact on existing biodiversity, particularly over-wintering birds on the shore. Retaining open green space would take cognisance of the value of the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area and B-Listed Dunglass Castle. Woodland planting would have a positive impact on air quality and carbon emissions.</p> <p>Objections to the spatial strategy for the Esso Bowling &amp; Scott's Yard site been submitted by: <b>Susan Dick (75)</b>, <b>Graham Parton (76)</b>, <b>Hazel McFarlane (81)</b>, <b>Lesley McEwan (83)</b>, <b>Robbie McEwan (84)</b>, <b>Magdelaine Blair Dick (134)</b>, <b>Jackie Wintersgill (166)</b>. The objections concern the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Green Belt – object to the release of green belt land.</li> <li>▪ Landownership – the landowner is unwilling to allow development on their land. Development would adversely affect the owner's use of their land.</li> </ul>																

- Biodiversity – the area is a natural habitat and part of the green network. It should be left to nature as an area where wildlife is enhanced and protected.
- Flooding – the area is at risk of flooding.

### Scott's Yard

**Lefarge Tarmac Ltd. (22)** object to the inclusion of Scott's Yard as a housing opportunity in the Proposed Proposed Plan (as modified), noting contamination, flooding, noise, access, habitat and environmental concerns and the distance to convenience facilities. It is suggested that land in Milton owned by them is a more suitable site for development.

**Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)** support the identification of the Scott's Yard for residential purposes and are committed to bringing forward residential development on the site. Support is also extended to the identification of the wider Esso Bowling site as a business and industry opportunity. It is additionally submitted that, given the level of investment required to bring the site forward for development, the Scott's Yard site should not be required to provide an element of affordable housing. Any affordable housing requirement would render development of the site unviable due to the upfront costs required to prepare the site.

### Green Belt and Green Network (inc. biodiversity)

**RSPB Scotland (122)** The area of green belt to the west of the development site is referred to in the Draft Habitat Regulations Appraisal as a compensation area for the loss of intertidal habitat through climate change effects, highlighted as being virtually unique in West Dunbartonshire. This information should be transferred to the Proposed Plan (as modified) to ensure developers are aware of its importance in avoiding adverse impacts on the integrity of the Special Protection Area and the objectives for the site into the future.

It would be beneficial if provision was made for the management of this compensation area through developer contributions from the Esso Bowling & Scott's Yard site, or across all the sites that may impact on the Special Protection Area as identified in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal, to ensure that it does become intertidal habitat.

**SNH (129)** support the mapping of proposed Green Network enhancements at this site's western end and the reasons given and note the site's southern waterfront presents a no less significant opportunity: for biodiversity, landscape character, and recreational access along the Clyde linking to Bowling station.

**Clydebelt (169)** support retaining the green belt to the west of the site, which, via the burn, links the tidal zone and River Clyde to the Kilpatrick Hills and promises of wildlife enhancement. Clydebelt state they would like the cycle way to be enhanced and form part a green corridor through any developed part of the site and additionally note that the area to the east of the basin has potential for leisure/heritage use due to Bell Monument, Dunglass Castle and Housing, including its McIntosh connection.



**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

Development Strategy

Built development upon the site should be limited to the provision of a new road, linking the A814 between Dumbuck Junction and the Dunglass roundabout.

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)**

The objections submitted to the strategy for the Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard Site state there should be no new road, particularly on or near land in the ownership of Susan Dick; no green belt release or extension of the site towards Dumbuck Junction; and no residential, retail or any form of built development  
**Susan Dick (75), Graham Parton (76), Hazel McFarlane (81), Lesley McEwan (83), Robbie McEwan (84), Magdelaine Blair Dick (134), Jackie Wintersgill (166).**

Scott's Yard

Inclusion of land west of Lennox Road & Colquhoun Road, Milton for private and affordable housing instead of the proposed private housing at Scott's Boat Yard, Bowling. **Lefarge Tarmac Ltd. (22)**

Green Belt and Green Network (inc. biodiversity)

The need for the compensation area [area defined as green belt within the Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard site] should be highlighted by the Proposed Plan (as modified) to ensure developers are aware of its importance in avoiding adverse impacts on the integrity of the SPA and the objectives for this into the future.

**RSPB Scotland (122)**

Provision for the management of the compensation area through developer contributions from the Esso Bowling & Scott's Yard site, or across all the sites that may impact on the Special Protection Area as identified in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal, to ensure that it does become intertidal habitat. **RSPB Scotland (122)**

Green Network enhancement along the waterfront should be a requirement in both the map and the text, ideally as a new paragraph after 3.7.8, in line with paragraph 3.5.9 regarding Queens Quay. **SNH (129)**

Reference to the potential of leisure, tourist and heritage uses at Dunglass Castle. **Clydebelt (169).**

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

Development Strategy

Esso Bowling, a former fuel distribution terminal between Milton and Bowling and Scott's Yard, a former shipyard at Bowling Harbour together represent a redevelopment opportunity which could significantly increase investment and employment in West Dunbartonshire. The West Dunbartonshire Local Plan

(CD22) identifies Esso Bowling as a 'Specialist Economic Development Site' (Schedule LE1 and Policy LE4) and Scott's Yard as Redevelopment Opportunity Site for residential or leisure uses (Schedule GD2, site GD2 (11)). The Proposed Plan (as modified) seeks to restate that these sites are development opportunities and provides a strategy for both sites which allows for a range of uses.

There is strong environmental and economic justification for this derelict sites continued identification as a development opportunity. Redevelopment would remediate the contamination arising from the site's previous use, bring about green network enhancements and provide new opportunities for employment and, potentially, new housing. National, regional and local planning policy seeks to direct development to urban areas and in particular vacant and derelict brownfield sites such as Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard, which represents a unique opportunity for maritime-related uses linked to the Duglass Basin and available deep-water access, or for other business, industry, storage and distribution or leisure and tourism uses. The site falls within the Clyde Waterfront, identified as a sustainable development location by the Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan (CD09, Diagram 3 & 9) and development of the site fits with the Strategic Development Plan's Spatial Vision to 2035, which states in respect to urban fabric, recycled brownfield land will be used as the development priority and environmental priority and will be central to developing a quality of life needed to attract economic activity, talented people and key investors (CD09, Diagram 7).

The Proposed Plan (as modified) requires that a comprehensive masterplan is agreed to guide development of Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard (paragraph 3.7.3). Through this process, an appropriate form of development can be established that takes account of the biodiversity interests of the whole site, flood risk and other relevant matters. Paragraph 3.7.6 states that development at Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard must not have an adverse effect on redshank (the qualifying interest of the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area).

Paragraph 3.7.12 states that it is the Council's aspiration to create a road through the Esso site to link the A814 at the Dumbuck junction to the west and at the Duglass Roundabout to the east. The indicative route of the road is shown on the Dumbarton Proposals Map and Map 8 on page 31 of the Proposed Plan (as modified). Paragraphs 2.2.12 – 2.2.19 of the Local Transport Strategy (CD30) outline the problems with the road network at this location and the benefits that could be derived from a new western access and link road through the former Esso site, enabling development to take place and acting as a diversionary route to the A82. The Local Transport Strategy identifies congestion at Dumbuck junction, the lack of a diversionary route to the A82 between Dumbuck and Duglass and poor accessibility to the former Esso site at Bowling as Tier 1 problems: primary problems with significant impacts and/or in need of resolution at the earliest possible opportunity. Further technical work has been undertaken in the form of a study looking at options to improve access to the Esso Bowling Site (CD65). The study concludes that it is feasible to deliver enhanced access to the former ESSO site at both its eastern and western ends. The study noted at the time (December 2011) there was no clear preferred option for the access and recommended that a further appraisal should be undertaken to identify the most appropriate scheme taking into account potential operational impacts on the

existing constrained road network. Any landownership issues will also be required to be taken into account when deciding upon the final solution.

### Scott's Yard

In respect to the Scott's Yard site, the Proposed Plan (as modified) strategy states that, in addition to the uses noted in paragraph 3.7.4, there is potential for residential use at Scott's Yard, reflecting the designation in the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22, site GD2 (11)). This is supported by the owners of the site, **Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)**. The Proposed Plan (as modified) is clear at paragraph 3.7.5 that support for residential development of the site is subject to acceptable access being achieved and the remediation of contamination. The Council considers that the Scott's Yard site and the site at Lennox Road/Colquhoun Road, Milton proposed by **Lefarge Tarmac Ltd. (22)** should be considered on their own merits. Issue 19 addresses the Lennox Road/Colquhoun Road site.

In response to **Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)**'s submission regarding the need for affordable housing, the Plan's Affordable Housing approach, set out in section 6.4, would not require the provision of affordable housing on the site as it is not identified as an opportunity for affordable housing and there is not an affordable housing quota policy.

For the reasons stated under the two headings above, the modifications proposed seeking no development at Scott's Yard; development only of the proposed link road; or no development of the entire Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard site, are not supported.

### Green Belt and Green Network (inc. biodiversity)

Paragraph 3.7.11 explains that the western part of the wider Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard site is to be retained as green belt due to the area's sensitivity in terms of flood risk and proximity to the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area. It also noted that the site may be important in enabling coastal realignment as mitigation of sea level rise and flooding. The Plan does not repeat the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (CD20, section 5.10) in stating that the area has long-term potential to allow the 'migration' of Inner Clyde habitats in response to sea-level rise to occur and it is accepted that it could usefully do so.

It is suggested that the second-last sentence of paragraph 3.7.11 is replaced with the following wording: *It may also 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.*

The proposal to modify the plan to require developer contributions for funding management work for the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area habitat is, however, not supported. It is expected that costs arising from decontamination of the site and providing adequate access through the provision of a new link road would make further requirements for developer contribution difficult in respect to the deliverability and viability of the site. This view is supported by **Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)** representation in respect to the provision of affordable

housing on the Scott's Yard site. There is scope, however, to achieve habitat improvements through enhancements to the Green Network, which forms part of the strategy for the site and through the masterplanning and development management process. This proposed modification is therefore not supported.

Furthermore, the Council agrees with **SNH (129)** that green network enhancements along the Esso Bowling and Scott's Yard sites' southern waterfront should also be identified as part of the Proposed Plan (as modified)'s strategy for this area, as they are at Carless and Queen's Quay.

It is suggested that the following paragraph is added after 3.7.8: *Proposals for development should take into consideration the site's waterfront location and ensure that built development interacts with the riverside. Green network enhancements along the waterfront should enhance recreational access, biodiversity and the landscape character of the site.* Map 8 should also be revised to highlight that green network enhancements along the southern waterfront of the site form part of the development strategy in a similar manner for the Queen's Quay (Map 6) and Carless (Map 7) strategy maps.

Paragraph 3.7.9 refers to Dunglass Castle, stating that any development should ensure the castle and its setting are protected and enhanced and that the restoration of the castle is supported by the Plan. The Council sees merit in expanding on this statement to reference the potential for leisure, tourist and heritage uses.

It is therefore suggested that the final sentence of paragraph 3.7.9 is amended as follows: The restoration of the Castle, *including for leisure and tourism uses*, is supported by the Plan.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 8</b>	<b>BOWLING BASIN</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.8, Pgs 32-34 & Map 9	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Susan Dick (75) Graham Parton (76) Hazel McFarlane (81) Elaine Dick (82) Lesley McEwan (83) Robbie McEwan (84) The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)	Elizabeth Pitts (117) Bowling & Milton Community Council (119) Scottish Canals (127) SEPA (128) SNH (129) Clydebelt (169)	
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Chapter 3.8 of the Plan sets out the Plan’s strategy for the Bowling basin site which is for mixed used development including housing, commercial and leisure and green network enhancements.	
<b>Planning authority’s summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><b>Susan Dick (75), Graham Parton (76), Hazel McFarlane (81), Elaine Dick (82), Lesley McEwan (83), Robbie McEwan (84), Elizabeth Pitts (117), Bowling &amp; Milton Community Council (119) and Clydebelt (169)</b> object to housing development on the Bowling Basins site for the following reasons.</p> <p><u>Nature conservation</u>  The site is an important wildlife corridor extending to the Saltings. Development would break up/block the corridor. The site should be enhanced and designated for nature conservation. Some objectors request that an EIA be undertaken for the site. There is reference to bats and the Inner Clyde SSSI and SPA. Reference to Scottish Wildlife Trust report (SD04/1). Reference to SPP para 39, 77 and 126 (CDX).</p> <p><u>Trees and woodland</u>  Development would result in the loss of trees and woodland. Reference to SPP para 148 (CD03), Scottish Government’s Control of Woodland Removal Policy (CD61) and Scottish Wildlife Trust report (SD04/1). <b>The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)</b> do not support housing within the Bowling Basin woodland.</p> <p><u>Coalescence</u>  Development would lead to the coalescence of Bowling and Old Kilpatrick.</p> <p><u>Access</u>  Bowling Basin is an important site for walkers, dog walkers and horse riders.</p>		

Access should be retained and improved.

Flooding

The area is subject to flooding so not suitable for housing.

Strategic Development Plan

Development is contrary to the Spatial Development Strategy of the SDP (CD09).

Green belt

Objection to the amendment of green belt boundary with reference to Scottish Wildlife Trust MIR (SD04/1) response.

**Scottish Canals (127)** supports the identification of the Bowling Basin area as a 'Changing Place'. Scottish Canals supports the potential uses highlighted on Page 34 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) (CD19), and intends to bring this site forward as a development in line with the identified uses. Scottish Canals will hold a masterplan engagement exercise in 2014 with local stakeholders to define the detail of the proposals for the Bowling Basin area using the Proposed Plan as the starting point.

**SEPA (128)** acknowledge that a comprehensive masterplan will require to be prepared for the site and that to address SEPA's concerns this will include details on flood risk, land remediation and green network improvements & encourage high quality SUDS and buffer strip.

**SNH (129)** is concerned that development in the 'woodland housing' area might leave space only for scattered trees. Upraising of land to avoid flood risk would remove the existing function of this area for attenuating coastal flooding, and the loss of habitat would again be incompatible with paragraph 3.8.4 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) (CD19, pg32).

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**Susan Dick (75), Graham Parton (76), Hazel McFarlane (81), Elaine Dick (82), Lesley McEwan (83), Robbie McEwan (84), Elizabeth Pitts (117), Bowling & Milton Community Council (126) and Clydebelt (169)** request the removal of Bowling Basin as a housing opportunity.

**Susan Dick (75), Graham Parton (76), Hazel McFarlane (81), Elaine Dick (82), Lesley McEwan (83) and Robbie McEwan (84)** additionally request that the site should be added to the Saltings LNR and be subject to enhancement.

**Graham Parton (76), Hazel McFarlane (81), Elaine Dick (82), Lesley McEwan (83) and Robbie McEwan (84)** additionally request that horse rider access should be added and that nothing should be developed to prevent existing access.

**Bowling & Milton Community Council (126)** request that reference be made in paragraph 3.8.6 to the Nature Conservation Scotland Act 2004.

**Bowling & Milton Community Council (126)** request that reference be made to

flood prevention measures do not undermine areas of natural habitat on the site.

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** recommends that the part of the woodland site that would require upraising is not allocated for development.

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

Bowling Basins has been identified for mixed use development in the Dumbarton District Local Plan (1999) (CD28, Bowling & Milton Proposals Map, Schedule H1 on Pg66 and Schedule LR1 on Pg110) and the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (2010) (CD22, Clydebank Proposals Map, Policy GD2, Para 4.6.3 and Schedule GD2 on Pgs 36-37). The identification of the site as a redevelopment opportunity was considered at the last Local Plan Inquiry (CD23, Pgs74-81). The Local Development Plan carries forward the strategy for mixed use development, providing more detailed framework for development there.

The Council and Scottish Canals consider the following are drivers for change at Bowling Basins:

- Iconic location where Canal network meets the Clyde.
- Potential to increase visitors and improve contribution to local economy.
- Potential to increase green network value and contribution to healthier lifestyles.
- Potential to contribute to West Dunbartonshire being a place of choice to reside.

Addressing each of these in turn. Bowling Basins is an understated gateway to the Forth and Clyde Canal in comparison to its eastern gateway, the Helix. The Council consider that more should be made of this special and iconic location and have worked in partnership with Scottish Canals to develop a strategy to create a more active location. Bowling Basin has the potential to become a more attractive location for leisure visits. This can in part be achieved through green network enhancements such as the new linear park. It can also be achieved through increasing commercial attractions on the site. Scottish Canals are currently renovating railway arches for occupation and marketing for occupants has been undertaken (CD52), which has resulted in strong interest being expressed for occupying of the arches. More visitors and commercial activity on the site will be of benefit to the local economy. The Council and Scottish Canals consider that Bowling Basin has the potential to contribute towards the range and choice of housing available in West Dunbartonshire by offering a product unique to the area. The site has been identified for housing development since the 1999 Dumbarton District Local Plan (CD28, Bowling & Milton Proposals Map, Schedule H1 on Pg66) was adopted. The site is considered effective and makes an important contribution towards the private sector housing requirement. Further, it enhances housing choice in Bowling itself, providing an opportunity for family housing in a village that is predominantly flats, and thus an opportunity for families to remain, return to, or locate within the village.

A charrette was held in Bowling in February and March 2014, sponsored by the Scottish Government through the Local Development Plan stream of the Mainstreaming Charrettes programme. The event was well attended by the local community and it was clear at the Charrette that there is support in the community for change at Bowling Basin. Different options for the future of the site emerged

and are included in the charrette report (CD51). One feature common to all options is a restriction on housing development to the south of the former railway line, which is identified for 'Woodland Housing' in the Proposed Plan (as Modified) (CD19, P34, Map 9), although some of the development options continue to show a road passing through this area in order to provide access to the commercial/leisure hub at the arches. Restriction of development within this area is considered by the Council and Scottish Canals to address many of the concerns raised with regard to loss of woodland, recreational access, flooding and the impact on nature conservation, particularly the SSSI/SPA.

#### Nature conservation

The Bowling Basin site is not covered by a nature conservation designation, although its coastline is designated as part of the Inner Clyde SPA and SSSI, as reflected in paragraphs 3.8.5 and 3.8.6 of the Proposed Plan (as Modified) (CD19, Pg32), which requires development to take account of these designations and be informed by a project level Habitat Regulations Appraisal.

It is recognised that the wider site is of nature conservation value. However, it is considered that the most valuable nature conservation resource is the Canal itself and the woodland to the south of the former railway line. The Canal will remain an integral feature of the developed site, and following the charrette Scottish Canals do not intend to propose housing to the south of the former railway line, the area that was identified for 'Woodland Housing'. Habitat connectivity will therefore be maintained along the Canal, and along the foreshore and adjacent woodland, in line with SPP paragraph 39 (CD03, Pg8).

Reference is made in representations to the Scottish Wildlife Trust submission on the Main Issues Report (SD04/1). It is considered that this document fails to recognise the distinct difference in character between land to the north of the former railway line and land to the south, wherein Scottish Canals are no longer proposing development.

To assist brevity and make the Plan more accessible, the Plan has avoided mentioning other documents and legislation. Reference to the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 is not considered necessary.

#### Trees and woodland

The main area of woodland on the site lies to the south of the former railway line. Scottish Canals do not intend to propose housing within this area, recognising its value as woodland, for nature conservation and the flooding constraint. Development of the wider site is more likely to result in this area being more actively managed as a woodland.

Tree cover in the area proposed for canal side housing (CD19, P34, Map 9) is much more sparse. Whilst some trees would be lost as a result of development here, the Council would seek compensatory planting, and it is considered that no woodland would be lost.

#### Coalescence

The Reporter at the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan Inquiry concluded that the development of the site would not give rise to any adverse environmental



consequences from the coalescence of Bowling and Old Kilpatrick (CD23, Pg77, Para 15.17). This matter of coalescence was raised at the charrette and the Council would expect any masterplan for the site to take account of these local concerns. There is already an area of open space to the west of the westernmost house in Old Kilpatrick and existing trees west of it which would contribute to preventing physical coalescence.

#### Access

Access will remain along both banks of the Canal following development. Paragraph 3.89 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) (CD19, Pg33) recognises the towpath as an important part of the green network. Access through the site will be enhanced by the creation of the linear park.

There is informal access taken to the area to the south of the former railway line. As development is no longer proposed by Scottish Canals for this area, access to this area will not be prevented or fragmented. There is no need to specify equestrian access. There were discussions at the charrette regarding improving access to this area and proposals for this would be supported by the Council subject to SNH agreement.

#### Flooding

The area to the south of the former railway line is, in part, within the 1:200 year flood area. Following the charrette, Scottish Canals do not intend to propose housing in this area. The Proposed Plan (as modified) (CD19, Pg33, Para 3.8.10), acknowledges the risk of flooding in the area. Any development proposals would require to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.

#### Strategic Development Plan

Economic activity, housing, tourism, green infrastructure, culture and leisure are indicative forms of development in line with the SDPs Spatial Development Strategy for the Clyde Waterfront, and the Integrating Green Infrastructure approach promoted for the site is in line with the promotion of the green network (CD09, Pg5, Diagram 3). The site is not within the green belt and development would not have a significant adverse impact on woodland.

#### Green belt

The Bowling Basins site is not in the green belt and has not been identified as green belt in relevant local plans as far back as 1984. The Reporter at the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan Inquiry concluded that the site is not green belt (CD23, Pg77, Para 15.16). A green belt boundary review was undertaken in advance of the Main Issues Report for the Local Development Plan. This found that the existing boundary at Bowling which is formed in part by the A82 and in part by the railway line to be 'very robust' (CD14, sections 37-39). A small change was suggested to the green belt boundary as it moves from the A82 to the railway line and this is included in the Proposed Plan (CD14, section 38). Paragraph 162 of SPP (CD03, Pg33) states that 'Green belt boundaries identified in local development plans should reflect the long term settlement strategy and ensure that settlements are able to accommodate planned growth' and 'Green belt boundaries should be clearly identifiable on the ground, using strong visual or physical landscape features such as rivers, tree belts, railways or main roads.' This is the approach taken in the Local Development Plan.

In conclusion, it is considered that the strategy for mixed use development at Bowling Basin is appropriate in order to enhance this gateway location on the Canal network, increase visitors and economic activity, enhance the green network, and provide a range and choice of housing in West Dunbartonshire.

The modifications proposed are not accepted.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 9</b>	<b>THE LOMOND CANAL</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.2, Pgs 35-36 & Map10	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p>sportscotland (20)  East Dunbartonshire Council (105)  Strathleven Regeneration Community Interest Company (106)  RSPB Scotland (122)  Scottish Canals (127)  SEPA (128)  Clydebelt (169)  James Graham (170)</p>		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Chapter 3.9 of the Plan covers proposals for a new canal running alongside the River Leven from the Firth of Clyde to Loch Lomond. The Plan supports the further investigation of the Lomond Canal proposal and protects the route of the proposed Canal from development that would prevent it from being developed.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p><b>RSPB Scotland (122)</b> has serious reservations about the Lomond Canal so do not support the inclusion of the proposal within the LDP. The Council's statement in paragraph 3.9.4, acknowledging that the environmental impacts would need to be carefully explored, is welcomed.</p> <p><b>Clydebelt (169)</b> oppose the whole concept of the Lomond Canal which seems to be solely being promoted by Scottish Canals to enhance their image. The River Leven was navigable until the barrier was built. A lock in the barrier, dredging and bouyage would make it easily navigable again. The whole concept is an excuse to spend money on construction with no other benefit than perhaps to Scottish Canals who might gain by selling canal-side property. It would be cheaper to transport every boat by road. The canal would ruin the River Leven and its environment. There must be cheaper and less damaging ways to provide flood prevention. Has the possibility of a large tunnel between Tarbet and Arrochar been examined? The statements in 3.9.2 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) (CD19, pg35) are mostly suppositions, are hypothetical and cannot be proven. The National Park's main aim is to preserve natural aspects of the area. Does Loch Lomond need or want more boats? How much carbon will be released in the making of such a monstrosity?</p>		

**James Graham (170)** comments that this has been a pipe dream since it was first announced. The River Leven has never been closed to navigation. A navigable link already exists. It would be a white elephant. Only small low powered boats are allowed to use the Forth and Clyde Canal. Power boats would destroy its lining and the water would leak out. Boating people are not interested in canals. The demand for the Lomond Canal comes from civil engineers. £200 million+ would be spent for no earthly use whatsoever. Most of the time it would lie unused.

#### Support/Qualified Support

**sportscotland (20)** support the canal proposal but consider it important that any impacts it has on sport and recreation interests on or beside the River Leven are considered.

**East Dunbartonshire Council (105)** is supportive of the inclusion of the Lomond Canal in the proposed LDP as it would improve the current Central Scotland waterway network and could increase patronage on the Forth and Clyde Canal. This would bring economic and recreational benefits to East Dunbartonshire. However East Dunbartonshire Council is only supportive of the Lomond Canal on the basis that any wider and cross boundary environmental impacts of the proposal are given full consideration and assessment in proceeding with the proposal.

**Strathleven Regeneration CIC (106)** supports the Plan's support for the further investigation of the Lomond Canal proposal and the protection from development of the route of the canal.

**Scottish Canals (127)** supports the protection of the route of the Lomond Canal project in the Plan and the project concept itself, which was referenced in the National Planning Framework. The project needs to be taken forward in partnership with West Dunbartonshire Council with the Council taking lead as Scottish Canals has no land ownership or locus in the area. The justification for the project should highlight more strongly the potential flood alleviation benefits and refer to the additional benefits of hydro, so that the canal link is not seen as the primary justification.

#### Water Framework Directive

**SEPA (128)** has no objection in principle to the Plan's approach, however would highlight that the project may potentially have significant implications in terms of the aims of the Water Framework Directive and reserve the right to comment further on these matters in due course.

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

##### Objection

**RSPB Scotland (122)** does not support the inclusion of the proposal within the LDP.

**Clydebelt (169)** suggest scrapping any suggestions for a Lomond Canal and upgrade the River Leven back to being a fully navigable river.

**James Graham's response (170)** does not specify a modification but is clearly opposed to the inclusion of the Lomond Canal proposal in the Plan.

#### Support/Qualified Support

**sportscotland (20)** suggest that reference is made to the need consider any impact of the canal proposal on sport and recreation interests on or beside the River Leven.

**Scottish Canals (127)** state that the justification for the project (3.9.1 and 3.9.2) should highlight more strongly the potential flood alleviation role of the project and refer to the additional benefits of hydro and the tourism / leisure aspects of the canal link so that the canal link is not seen as the primary justification.

The representations of **East Dunbartonshire Council (105)**, **Strathleven Regeneration CIC (106)** and **SEPA (128)** did not specify any modifications to the Plan.

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

##### Objection

The Lomond Canal was referenced in Scotland's Canals: an asset for the future (CD49, Scottish Executive, pg16, para 3.12) and more recently in Making the Most of Scotland's Canals (CD50, Scottish Government, pg 10). It is also referenced in the Strategic Development Plan (CD09, pg20, para 4.17). It is therefore appropriate for the Local Development Plan to encourage the further investigation of this proposed canal link between the Firth of Clyde and Loch Lomond, two of Scotland's most iconic water bodies.

Given the scale of the proposed Lomond Canal project, much work is still to be done to demonstrate that the project is financially and technically viable and environmentally acceptable. The evidence is not available to justify full support of the proposal by the Plan. However, it is an ambitious project of regional, if not national significance, and it is appropriate for the Local Development Plan to reflect and protect this proposal.

The Plan adopts an appropriate position on the Lomond Canal by encouraging further investigation of the proposal, whilst recognising possible associated environmental issues, and for this reason the modification by **RSPB Scotland (122)**, **Clydebelt (169)** and **James Graham (170)** to remove the Canal proposal from the Plan is not supported.

##### Support/Qualified Support

Sport and recreation interests along the proposed route of the Canal would be protected by the relevant policies of the Plan (CD19, GN1 and GN8, pgs 76 & 82).

The modification by **Sportscotland (20)** is not necessary.

Paragraph 3.9.2 makes sufficient reference to the proposed Canal's potential flood alleviation role, hydro-energy and leisure/tourism benefits. These are matters that should feature in the further investigation of the Canal proposal.

The modification by **Scottish Canals (127)** is not necessary.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 10</b>	<b>LOMONDGATE AND THE VALE OF LEVEN INDUSTRIAL ESTATE</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.10, Pgs 37-39 & Map 11	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p>Mr &amp; Mrs F Bunch (31)  David Mason (79)  The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)  Strathleven Regeneration Community Interest Company (CIC) (106)  Walker Group (125)  SEPA (128)  SNH (129)  Clydebelt (169)</p>		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Chapter 3.10 of the Plan sets out the strategy for the mixed use Lomondgate area and the adjoining Vale of Leven Industrial Estate. This includes support for business and industrial development, roadside services, residential development, and green network enhancements.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><b>Strathleven Regeneration CIC (106)</b> supports the inclusion of Lomondgate and Vale of Leven Industrial Estate as one of 'Our Changing Places' and supports the Lomondgate Strategic Economic Investment Location (SEIL) being identified as Lomondgate and the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate, without restriction of key industry sectors.</p> <p><u>Vale of Leven Industrial Estate</u></p> <p><b>Mr &amp; Mrs F Bunch (31)</b> state in relation to the boundaries of the Strathleven Estate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lomondgate has not been developed yet</li> <li>2. Strathleven Industrial Estate is not running at full capacity, it is a disaster area, ground maintenance/cutting of grass/litter and the old Polaroid building empty</li> <li>3. Strathleven House - the money was spent to develop the area at the back of my home, the pond was re-established and now it is a disaster, another waste of money</li> <li>4. The houses that have been built in the last 30 years - where are the facilities</li> <li>5. No ice rink/Dry Ski Run/Cinema/Ten Pin Bowling the list is never ending it's a disgrace!! I have been asked by tourist in Balloch where are the shops!!!</li> <li>6. Gateway to the Highlands but nothing else. Plenty expensive signs/</li> </ol>		

roundabouts.

7. Has there to be no green belt!! On that note what about the environment: down at Strathleven Industrial Estate the fumes of Diamond Power plant from paint are overwhelming. What would it have been like if Aggreko had been allowed to build down at the back of Strathleven Houses.
8. We need balance. Yes, build small outlets as the area does need work for young people but we do need a life balance so we do object to you changing the land grading. We need healthy living.

**David Mason (79)** states that the Strathleven housing estate has over 300 houses but no play areas for children or convenient dog walking areas. Area GE1(2) is a safe and accessible area for residents to make use of. It has never been built on beyond the fence line of the old Burroughs factory and there are archaeological interests in the area, which is undisturbed greenfield.

**The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** is concerned about woodland maintenance next to the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate. If maintenance must occur, the Trust recommends a biodiversity survey before any work occurs. Establishing the biodiversity of this patch will help direct what type of maintenance could occur, if it must occur.

**Clydebelt (169)** support improvements to the habitat of the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate and the enhancement of its green network role. New specimen trees are needed to replace aging ones in the parkland and more general improvement to surrounding and screening woodland. A new pathway/cycleway should be provided within the Estate to link Lomondgate and Dumbarton and Bonhill alongside the Stirling Road.

#### Lomondgate Area 5 BC1(72)

**The Walker Group/Strathleven Regeneration (125)** supports and endorses the allocation of Lomondgate Area 5, and are committed to making every reasonable effort to ensure bus services for the Lomondgate development. There is concern at the specific requirement which is stated as an absolute, namely; "Requirement to ensure bus services for Lomondgate development". WG/SRC have engaged with local bus operators and will make exhaustive efforts to ensure a bus service but cannot guarantee that an operator will provide or divert services to the site. It is difficult to see what a developer of the site could do to ensure or compel local operators to provide services for the Lomondgate development.

**SEPA (128)** state that additional flood risk information is needed to confirm the developable footprint of Area 5 (BC1(72)).

**SNH (129)** seek clarity with regard to which land surrounding Area 5 is to be subject to habitat improvement and management.



**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

Vale of Leven Industrial Estate

**Mr & Mrs Bunch (31)** do not specify what modifications they want made to the Plan. With regard to Vale of Leven Industrial Estate it is understood to relate to the loss of land to industrial development. Other comments are understood to relate to the lack of facilities throughout Dumbarton/Vale of Leven rather than any specific modification required to the Plan.

**David Mason (79)** seeks for site GE1(2) to be made available for dog walking and children's recreational purposes.

**The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** does not specify changes it wants made but clearly states concerns about the impact that the maintenance of woodland suggested by the Plan could have on the woodland.

**Clydebelt (169)** request an additional paragraph seeking to provide a safer walking and cycling route connecting Dumbarton, Lomondgate through Strathleven Estate to Renton and Bonhill.

Lomondgate Area 5 BC1(72)

**The Walker Group/Strathleven Regeneration (125)** seek the following:

Amend the requirement in Table 4 (p70) by deleting:

- “Requirement to ensure bus services for Lomondgate development”.
- and replacing with;
- ”Requirement to engage with local bus operators and make all reasonable efforts to ensure bus services for Lomondgate development”

**SNH (129)** state that with regard to the land to subject to habitat improvement and management, this should be identified as land to the “north, west and south” of Lomondgate Area 5 rather than “non-developable area”.

**SEPA (128)** do not specify any modifications in their representations on this section of the Plan.

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

Vale of Leven Industrial Estate

It is acknowledged that site GE1(2) has been used informally by residents of the Strathleven housing estate for recreational purposes. However, the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate has been identified and operated as an industrial estate, long preceding the development of adjacent houses. Site GE1(2) was identified as an industrial/business opportunity in the 1999 (CD28, Proposals Map site lo3 & Schedule EMP1, pg78) and 2010 (CD22, Proposals Map site LE1(6) & Schedule LE1) local plans for the area, and in the 1984 local plan the site was in and zoned for industrial use (CD29, extract).

The loss of site GE1(2) as an business and industry opportunity would have a

significant impact on business and industry land supply, both within the estate and across West Dunbartonshire. Site GE1(2) is part of West Dunbartonshire's marketable land supply. Extending to 4.2 hectares, it forms 11.6% of the area's marketable land supply and 28.2% of the land supply within the industrial estate. Relatively flat and regularly shaped, it is one of the most attractive opportunities within the estate.

The impact of industrial/business development on site GE1(2) on the adjoining houses would be a development management consideration. Policy BC3 of the Plan states that development that would harm the residential amenity, character or appearance of existing neighbourhoods will not be permitted. Policy DS1 requires development to avoid unacceptable impacts on adjoining uses.

The Council recognises the green network value of the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate, and has had a green network enhancement study of the estate prepared. The Council has recently implemented path and interpretation improvements funded by the Central Scotland Green Network Development Fund. Paths and open space will remain available throughout the estate providing recreational access and opportunities to nearby residents.

In conclusion, site GE1(2) offers an important industrial/business opportunity within an established industrial area. The impact of any development on adjoining uses will be controlled through the development management process and the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate will continue to offer recreational opportunities if site GE1(2) is developed. The modification sought by **David Mason (79)** is not supported.

In response to **The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** comments, any significant management or maintenance of the woodland within the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate would be preceded by a survey.

The Council has no current proposals to provide a footpath from Dumbarton/Lomondgate through the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate to Bonhill and Renton. As such it would not be appropriate to include within the Plan, as there is no other means of implementation. This modification by **Clydebelt (169)** is not supported.

#### Lomondgate BC1(72)

In order to support sustainable development and reduce carbon emissions it is important that all new development should be accessible by public transport. However, the Council acknowledge the difficulty in ensuring that a commercial bus service can be secured for the development.

The Reporter is invited to accept the modification proposed to Table 4 by **The Walker Group/Strathleven Regeneration (125)**.

The modification proposed by **Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** to Table 4 is to provide clarification. The whole of the area is within the ownership of the developer and the principle of the requirement in Table 4 regarding habitat improvement and enhancement has been accepted by them. In order to provide complete clarification it is suggested that the sentence 'Habitat improvement and

management on non-developable area' in Table 4 is replaced by 'Habitat improvement and management on land to the north, west and south of the site as identified for open space and green network enhancements on Map 11'.

The Reporter is invited to make this modification to Table 4.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

--

**Reporter's recommendations:**

--

<b>Issue 11</b>	<b>YOUNG'S FARM (DUMBARTON FC), DUMBARTON</b>																									
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.11, Pgs 40-41, Map 12	<b>Reporter:</b>																								
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>																										
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Andrew Muir (55)</td> <td>David McDonald (193)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)</td> <td>Margaret Hughes (194)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEPA (128)</td> <td>Hazel Burke (195)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SNH (129)</td> <td>Margaret McDonald (196)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dumbarton Football Club (130)</td> <td>M. Burke (197)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edith McDonald (187)</td> <td>A. Sutherland (198)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maureen Lindsay (188)</td> <td>Clementine Brown (199)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>G. Gilhaney (189)</td> <td>N. Williamson (200)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Isobel McDonald (190)</td> <td>A. Sutherland (201)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mary Burk (191)</td> <td>Kathleen Cameron (202)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Francis Stewart (192)</td> <td>Mrs Brown (203)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Amanda Cameron (204)</td> </tr> </table>			Andrew Muir (55)	David McDonald (193)	Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)	Margaret Hughes (194)	SEPA (128)	Hazel Burke (195)	SNH (129)	Margaret McDonald (196)	Dumbarton Football Club (130)	M. Burke (197)	Edith McDonald (187)	A. Sutherland (198)	Maureen Lindsay (188)	Clementine Brown (199)	G. Gilhaney (189)	N. Williamson (200)	Isobel McDonald (190)	A. Sutherland (201)	Mary Burk (191)	Kathleen Cameron (202)	Francis Stewart (192)	Mrs Brown (203)		Amanda Cameron (204)
Andrew Muir (55)	David McDonald (193)																									
Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)	Margaret Hughes (194)																									
SEPA (128)	Hazel Burke (195)																									
SNH (129)	Margaret McDonald (196)																									
Dumbarton Football Club (130)	M. Burke (197)																									
Edith McDonald (187)	A. Sutherland (198)																									
Maureen Lindsay (188)	Clementine Brown (199)																									
G. Gilhaney (189)	N. Williamson (200)																									
Isobel McDonald (190)	A. Sutherland (201)																									
Mary Burk (191)	Kathleen Cameron (202)																									
Francis Stewart (192)	Mrs Brown (203)																									
	Amanda Cameron (204)																									
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	The Local Development Plan identifies Young's Farm as the possible location for a new football stadium and associated and enabling development within the green belt and states that the Council "is supportive of Dumbarton FC investigating the suitability of the site further".																									
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>																										
<p><u>Status of Allocation</u></p> <p><b>Dumbarton Football Club (130)</b> support the allocation of the site at Young's Farm for a football stadium and enabling development. However, the football club's representation requests that the Local Development Plan goes further and provides more certain allocation of the site for the relocation of the Club. Furthermore, the identification of the entire Young's Farm site is sought to allow flexibility to define an appropriate site layout at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The football club have submitted a number of studies (SD11.1, SD11.2, SD11.3 &amp; SD11.4) that consider the technical considerations identified by the Proposed Plan (as modified) in order to support their case for a more certain allocation. It is maintained that the studies provide a strong evidence base which demonstrates the suitability of Young's Farm for the development of a new community stadium together with associated enabling development and remove any doubt that the technical issues identified in the Proposed Plan (as modified) are capable of being accommodated in any future relocation proposals.</p>																										

## Objection to Allocation

Objections to the relocation of Dumbarton FC to Young's Farm have been submitted by **Andrew Muir (55)** and **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)**. A further eighteen objections to the development of a football stadium at Young's Farm were received during the period for making representations on the Proposed Plan (as modified) from residents of the Dennystoun Forge gypsy traveller site: **Edith McDonald (187)**, **Maureen Lindsay (188)**, **G. Gilhane (189)**, **Isobel McDonald (190)**, **Mary Burk (191)**, **Francis Stewart (192)**, **David McDonald (193)**, **Margaret Hughes (194)**, **Hazel Burke (195)**, **Margaret McDonald (196)**, **M. Burke (197)**, **A. Sutherland (198)**, **Clementine Brown (199)**, **N. Williamson (200)**, **A. Sutherland (201)**, **Kathleen Cameron (202)**, **Mrs Brown (203)**, **Amanda Cameron (204)** – referred to below as **Dennystoun Forge Residents**.

The matters raised in the objections received on Young's Farm (including the football club's position where stated) are as follows:

### Green Belt

The site is in the Green Belt.

### Accessibility

The location is not central and has poor transport links. Supporters would be faced with increased travel costs and would no longer be able to walk to the stadium from the town centre. Significant traffic congestion would be caused along an extremely narrow and dangerous road.

The Transport Statement (SDX11.1) submitted by **Dumbarton Football Club (130)** addresses public transport, pedestrian and cycle accessibility and vehicular access. It finds that the Young's Farm site has good accessibility by a variety of transport modes and that a feasible access strategy can be provided. Vehicular access would be provided via a new priority junction created onto the A82 off ramp.

### Flooding

**SEPA (128)** do not object to the allocation being included in the Local Development Plan subject to compliance with relevant policy and the findings of a detailed Flood Risk Assessment. It is noted that reference to 'managing flood risk' at paragraph 3.11.4 is potentially misleading to the aspirations of potential developers.

A Flood Risk Assessment (SD11.2) has been prepared and submitted in support of the club's representations. The Flood Risk Assessment states that while areas, generally to the north-eastern corner of the site, are likely to be at high risk of fluvial and coastal flooding, there are areas to the west within the site where the risk is low and where development could take place. Furthermore, the Flood Risk Assessment establishes that areas at risk of flooding within the site may be

suitable for limited development, such as appropriate recreational uses.

### Design

**Dumbarton Football Club's (130)** ambition is to create an 'inspirational community sports hub' at Young's Farm 'that incorporates state of the art facilities within an attractive parkland setting'. An indicative development block plan (SD11.4, page 5) divides the site into distinct zones, informed by the key access, flood risk and ecological issues identified by the Council in the Proposed Plan (as modified) and assessed by the Football Club's consultant project team.

### Residential amenity

The **Dennystoun Forge Residents (187-204)** raise a number of concerns about the development of Young's Farm and the impact this would have on the gypsy traveller site. These can be summarised as: safety, security and health concerns arising from an increase in the number of people passing by – and potentially through – the site; the potential for anti-social behaviour, disturbance and noise; traffic; and impacts on landscape and wildlife.

### Biodiversity

The site is adjacent to the River Leven, the whole of which is a Local Nature Conservation Site and regular habitat of wildlife. Objectors have stated the potential for noise and pollution is unacceptable.

An Ecological Assessment (SD11.3) carried out for the site submitted by **Dumbarton Football Club (130)** and highlights the potential to pollute and impact upon the River Leven.

**SNH (129)** advise additional wording at paragraph 3.11.4 to transpose the findings of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal with reference to the integrity of the interests of the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation.

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

### Status of Allocation

**Dumbarton Football Club (130):** Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.11.4 from: "The Council is supportive of Dumbarton FC investigating the suitability of this site further" to: "*The Council is supportive of Dumbarton FC relocating to this site*".

Extension of the hatched area shown on Map 12 (identifying the possible location of the stadium, playing fields and enabling development) to incorporate the entirety of the Young's Farm site.

### Objection to Allocation

**Andrew Muir (55), Silvertown and Overtown Community Council (57)** and **Dennystoun Forge Residents (187-204)** do not specify modifications but it can be inferred that they consider Young's Farm should not be identified as a

'Changing Place' in the Local Development Plan. **Andrew Muir (55)** notes that ground on the east side of Castle Road, Dumbarton (near the existing stadium) should be used instead.

#### Biodiversity

**SNH (129)** suggest that to transpose the finding of the Habitats Regulation Appraisal, the following sentence is advised to be included at the end of paragraph 3.11.4: *"Planning permission will not be granted unless it can be ascertained that the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the interests of the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation"*.

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

#### Status of Allocation

**Dumbarton Football Club (130)** has engaged with the process of preparing the West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan, making submissions at pre-Main Issues Report (SD11.5, SD11.6, SD11.7) and Main Issues stages (SD11.8), setting out its future vision. The football club considers that in order to achieve this vision it requires a larger stadium that has improved facilities and that it is not possible to achieve this vision at its current site.

A site assessment exercise carried out by the football club (SD11.5, section 3.0 and Appendix 1) considered seven potential development sites for a new stadium. The three preferred sites were put forward as part of the Main Issues Report (CD12 – Issue 29), alongside the option that none of these three sites were suitable. Taking account of representations received following consultation on the Main Issues Report, including from Dumbarton FC (SD11.8), Young's Farm is identified as the football club's preferred location and the Proposed Plan (as modified) is supportive of Dumbarton FC investigating the suitability of the site in further detail. It does not go as far as identifying the Young's Farm site for development and retains the site within the green belt. The reason for this approach is threefold: firstly, the Council acknowledges the unique requirements of the football club but would not wish the site to be developed for any other purpose than a new community football stadium (and appropriate ancillary and enabling development); secondly, it is considered there still remains a degree of uncertainty surrounding the technical and financial viability of the scheme, which means it is premature to allocate the site in the Local Development Plan as a development opportunity; and thirdly, the football club is proposing enabling development, the full nature of which is currently unknown.

Paragraph 3.11.7 states should the football club's investigation of the site demonstrate it to be viable for a new stadium, a comprehensive masterplan should be developed prior to the submission of a planning application. The Young's Farm site is defined as the wider site delineated by the black line within Map 12 and upon the Dumbarton Proposals Map. While an indicative location for the stadium, playing fields and enabling development, reflecting the key constraints of the site is shown in Map 12, it should not be considered as definitive. Taking account of Dumbarton FC's representation the Council now considers that, rather than being expanded, this hatched area should be deleted

from Map 12.

The Reporters is therefore invited to make this change to Map 12.

### Objection to Allocation

#### Green Belt

The Local Development Plan does not remove the green belt designation from the Young's Farm site. Any development of the site would be assessed against Policy DS2, but the Council's support for the further investigation of the suitability of the site for a football stadium would be a material consideration.

#### Accessibility

Transport Scotland advise (CD55) that the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges TD22/06 states at paragraph 5.30 that "Private means of access and junctions on connector roads are not permitted." Given the mandatory nature of the statement, Transport Scotland recommended that alternative means of access should be investigated. The Transport Statement (SD11.1) submitted by Dumbarton Football Club makes no mention of alternatives and therefore on the information provided to date, Transport Scotland could not support the land use proposal as presented. Transport Scotland provided further comments expressing concerns regarding accessibility by sustainable modes of walking, cycling and public transport, stating that further discussion on such issues seems premature prior to an agreed access strategy being developed.

#### Flooding

On reviewing the Flood Risk Assessment (SD11.2) submitted by Dumbarton FC, SEPA advise (CD58), they have no objection to the site being promoted as a preferred location in the emerging local development plan. SEPA note that all parties accept that at the planning application stage, further technical information will require to be submitted, including further Flood Risk Assessment modelling works and that this additional information will be required to further define the developable footprint of the site, within the overall site allocation. Policy DS6 is also clear that development will not be supported on the functional flood plain or where it would have a significant probability of being affected by flooding or increasing the probability of flooding elsewhere.

#### Biodiversity

Ecological surveys forming the Ecological Assessment (SD11.3) submitted by Dumbarton Football Club highlight the presence of locally important habitats and statutory protected species. The assessment considers that following best practice guidelines during proposed works would minimise the potential for a pollution incident to occur and therefore considered it unlikely that there will be any significant effect arising from development upon with the Inner Clyde Special Protection Area or Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation. The Ecological Assessment highlights a number of ecological interests across the site following a detailed Phase 1 survey. Mitigation measures and the need for further



assessment are highlighted. SNH has offered comment on the Ecological Assessment (CD54).

The Council agrees with the modification proposed by **SNH (129)** to transpose the findings of the Habitats Regulation Appraisal but considers that the wording should be consistent with other Changing Places within the plan (e.g. paragraphs 3.4.19, 3.5.13, 3.5.6). The following wording is therefore proposed: *‘Development at Young’s Farm must not have an adverse effect on the qualifying interests of the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation’* at the end of paragraph 3.11.4 and the Reporter is invited to make this modification.

Further to this explicit statement on the requirement that development of Young’s Farm does not adversely affect the integrity of the interests of the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation, future development proposals will be assessed against Policy GN3. This policy states that development that harms sites designated for nature conservation or protected species will not be permitted excepted in specific circumstances.

In conclusion, Young’s Farm is considered by Dumbarton FC to be the most suitable site within Dumbarton for the development of a new football stadium. However, it is argued by the Council that the technical and viability issues identified by the Plan as affecting the site are still to be resolved to a level at which the site could be allocated with confidence that development there would be acceptable.

Therefore, the Council does not support the modification proposed by Dumbarton FC to provide a more certain allocation of Young’s Farm for the relocation of Dumbarton FC, or the modification sought by the objectors to remove the site from the Local Development Plan.

Modifications to the strategy map (Map 12) in respect to the location of development within the wider site boundary and concerning the requirement to demonstrate no adverse effect on the qualifying interests of the Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation are supported.

**Reporter’s conclusions:**

--

**Reporter’s recommendations:**

--

<b>Issue 12</b>	<b>ENHANCING OUR GREEN NETWORK</b>											
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.12, Pgs 42-43 & Map 13  Chapter 8 – Enhancing Our Green Network, Pgs 76-82	<b>Reporter:</b>										
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>												
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (48)</td> <td>Forestry Commission Scotland (124)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>National Waiting Times Centre (64)</td> <td>SNH (129)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hugh Kinloch (73)</td> <td>Clydebelt (169)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)</td> <td>James Graham (170)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RSPB Scotland (122)</td> <td>Patterson Quarries Ltd. (182)</td> </tr> </table>			Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (48)	Forestry Commission Scotland (124)	National Waiting Times Centre (64)	SNH (129)	Hugh Kinloch (73)	Clydebelt (169)	The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)	James Graham (170)	RSPB Scotland (122)	Patterson Quarries Ltd. (182)
Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (48)	Forestry Commission Scotland (124)											
National Waiting Times Centre (64)	SNH (129)											
Hugh Kinloch (73)	Clydebelt (169)											
The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)	James Graham (170)											
RSPB Scotland (122)	Patterson Quarries Ltd. (182)											
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Section 3.12 sets out the Local Development Plans' strategy for the Green Network and the policies included within Chapter 8 seek to protect and enhance specific elements of the Green Network.											
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>												
<p><u>General</u></p> <p><b>Clydebelt (169)</b> found Section 3.12 to be vague, although acknowledge that an indication is given, at paragraph 3.12.7, that further detail will be provided within Supplementary Guidance. Support is expressed for Chapter 8, and in particular Policies GN1, 2 and 3.</p> <p><u>Open Space and Playing Fields</u></p> <p>The <b>National Waiting Times Centre (64)</b> object to the re-designation of the western part of the Golden Jubilee National Hospital site as open space. Concern is expressed that this will impede the potential for future healthcare development within the site.</p> <p><b>Hugh Kinloch (73)</b> seeks a change in respect to land between Auchincarroch Road and Steadings Drive, Dalmonach, west of Napierston Farm. The site has been identified as open space where previously in the West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan it formed part of the Existing Residential Area. It is suggested that identifying the area as open space will encourage the public to enter an agricultural field in which cattle are grazing.</p> <p><b>SNH (129)</b> consider that there should be a stated intention to define in</p>												

Supplementary Guidance an appropriate threshold of 'quality and quantity', through reference to the Open Space Strategy.

### The Habitat Network and Geodiversity

**Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (48)** welcome the inclusion of geodiversity and the identification of sites. They would appreciate a statement indicating a willingness to further enhance the identification of geological Local Nature Conservation Sites through the identification of boundaries for each site.

The **Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** state the Local Development Plan should acknowledge the great diversity of species, including flora that are present in the area. It is considered that great emphasis is placed on only a few fauna within West Dunbartonshire but there are also a number of floral species unique to Dunbartonshire, such as the Greater Butterfly Orchid, Bog Rosemary and the Bluebell. The preservation and conservation of areas for flora is just as important as for fauna. The Trust would like to see the inclusion of flora into the LDP to ensure that ecosystems where unique fauna are present are not considered suitable for development. It is also important to the Trust that the Council looks to ensure sites identified for conservation encompass the diversity of ecosystems found within West Dunbartonshire.

**RSPB Scotland (122)** suggest the first sentence of Policy GN3 could be made stronger and use the recognised terms from the corresponding legislation and that the wording of part a) is incomplete and should mention the need for compensatory measures to ensure the overall coherence of the Natura 2000 network is not affected.

Also, RSBP Scotland considered that the last paragraph of Policy GN3 appears weak. They would wish a commitment from West Dunbartonshire Council to seek no net biodiversity loss (regardless of whether a site is designated) and that enhancement should be encouraged.

**SNH (129)** advise that the wording of Policy GN3, part b) applies only to European Protected Species and that different legal provisions apply to other species with specific protection. Furthermore, that Local Nature Reserves are legally designated for their importance in involving communities with high-quality natural heritage. It is recommended that Policy GN3 should provide protection to LNRs.

**Clydebelt (169)** propose wording to further protect species and help the spread of biodiversity along wildlife corridors.

### Landscape

**Paterson's Quarries Limited (182)** consider that, because the Policy GN4 applies to the whole Proposed Plan area, the Local Development Plan fails to acknowledge that, in accordance with SPP, different landscapes have a different capacity to accommodate new development and that new development should be

informed by local landscape character. It is stressed that land out with a landscape designation should not be afforded the same degree of protection as local, national or international designations and consideration requires to be given to facilitating temporary or short term significant adverse impacts, where impacts could be mitigated through progressive restoration.

#### Forestry, woodlands and trees

**Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** is concerned that the Local Development Plan makes limited mention of woodland development (beyond protecting existing woodland), particularly urban planting around new or exiting developments.

The Trust would additionally wish to see a list of ancient woodlands and maps clearly demarking these areas upon which planning permission will not be granted. Ancient woodland should be clearly excluded from the definition of brownfield.

**RSPB Scotland (122)** state Policy GH5 seems only to refer to native trees and infers that commercial conifer plantations in the Kilpatrick Hills will not be supported. It is suggested that the wording of the policy is clarified to make more explicit what woodland types would and would not be supported.

**Forestry Commission Scotland (124)** request that reference is made to the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal.

#### The Water Environment

**James Graham (170)** states that the definition of fishing as a recreational use at paragraph 8.7.2 is illegal and that the River Leven salmon and fresh water fisheries are registered interests in land. Mr Graham considers that part h) of Policy GN6 is incorrect as the salmon and freshwater fisheries include legal rights of access.

#### Temporary Greening

**SNH (129)** welcome the mention of advance greening, but advise that this is not 'another form of temporary greening'.

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

#### General

Provision of definite maps showing the existing and potential wildlife corridors and green networks. **Clydebelt (169)**

#### Open Space and Playing Fields

No modification has been specified by the **National Waiting Times Centre (64)**, however, their objection would be resolved by the designation of the western part of the Golden Jubilee National Hospital site as part of the 'Existing Neighbourhood'.

Designation of land between Auchincarroch Road and Steadings Drive, Dalmonach, west of Napierston Farm as forming part of the 'Existing Neighbourhood' and not 'Open Space'. **Hugh Kinloch (73)**

*Policy GN1 – insert in brackets after 'quality and value': (as defined in Supplementary Guidance). **SNH (129)***

#### The Habitat Network and Geodiversity

Inclusion of a statement indicating a willingness to improve the identification of geological Local Nature Conservation Sites through the identification of boundaries for each site. **Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (48).**

Greater recognition of flora within the Local Development Plan. **The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)**

*Policy GN3 – replace first sentence with: **Development that adversely affects the integrity of sites designated for nature conservation or protected species will not be permitted except...** Part a) should mention the need for compensatory measures to ensure the overall coherence of the Natura 2000 network is not affected. **RSPB Scotland (122)***

Policy GN3 – in place of the final sentence, a commitment seeking no net biodiversity loss (regardless of whether site is designated) and encouragement of enhancement. **RSPB Scotland (122)**

*Policy GN3 – amend wording of part b) to: **for protected species, where relevant licensing tests or other legal provisions are met.** Include new part: e) **for Local Nature Reserves, where impacts are offset or compensated in a way that maintains the integrity of the interests affected and maintains the involvement of people. **SNH (129)*****

*Section 8.4 – additional paragraph stating: **The Council or developers will provide, wherever possible, a cattle creep/tunnel or similar under roads and bridges that cross a recognised wildlife corridor to allow passage of badgers, deers, otters, hedgehogs, amphibians etc. to protect species and help the spread of biodiversity along these corridors. Where this is not possible roadside boundaries should have gaps and hedging if necessary and not be occlusive like walls and certain types of fencing. **Clydebelt (169)*****

#### Landscape

*Policy GN4 – the policy should be redrafted to require: development proposals to relate to the specific landscape and visual characteristics of the local area (identified in the Landscape Character Assessment of the area in which they are proposed), ensuring that the overall integrity of landscape character is maintained; and development proposals to be assessed in terms of their appropriate scale, form, pattern and duration of impact. **Paterson Quarries Ltd. (182)***

### Forestry, woodlands and trees

A list should be included of ancient woodlands, alongside maps clearly demarcating these areas. Ancient woodland should be clearly excluded from the definition of brownfield. **The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)**

*Policy GN5* - the wording of this policy should be clarified to make it more explicit what woodland types would and would not be supported. **RSPB Scotland (122)**

*Policy GN5* – include reference to the Scottish Government’s Policy on Control of Woodland Removal. **Forestry Commission Scotland (124)**

### The Water Environment

*Policy GN6 – Clydebelt (169)* state a similar change to that proposed at Section 8.4 (noted above) could also be made to Policy GN6.

No specific changes have been sought by the representations submitted by **James Graham (170)**.

### Temporary Greening

*Section 8.10* – rename *Advance greening and temporary greening*

*Paragraph 8.10.2* – Replace first sentence with following text: *This Plan strongly supports and encourages green infrastructure components of future development being put in before construction begins – known as advance greening.* **SNH (129)**

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

#### General

In response to comments submitted by **Clydebelt (169)** on mapping the green network, including wildlife corridors, it is the intention that this will form part of the forthcoming Green Network Supplementary Guidance. The Council is working with SNH to carry out green network mapping for the plan area. No modifications are therefore proposed.

#### Open Space and Playing Fields

In response to the representation by **National Waiting Times Centre (64)** the Proposals Maps identify open spaces which are greater than 1 hectare. Planning Advice Note 65: Planning and Open Space (CD05) provides a definition (at paragraph 10) and typology (at Table 1 and Annex 1) for open spaces, which includes amenity greenspace and institutional grounds. In accordance with PAN 65, the western part of the Golden Jubilee National Hospital is defined as open space in the Open Space Audit (CD35 – site 80) and therefore in the Proposed Plan (as modified).

Policy GN1 states that development which would result in the loss of any open space which is, or has the potential to be, of quality and value will not be permitted unless provision of an open space of equal or enhanced quality within

the development or its vicinity. It is intended that 'quality' and 'value' will be defined in further detail in Supplementary Guidance. It is not considered that this policy impedes the potential for future healthcare development or extension of the Golden Jubilee National Hospital site, but rather seeks to ensure that any development retains open space of quality and value as an important component of the wider green network.

The Open Space Audit scores the Golden Jubilee National Hospital site 74 (out of 100) in terms of quality and 27.9 (out of 68) in terms of value. The adjacent Clydeside Community Park scores poorly: 32.3 (out of 130) in terms of quality and 30 (out of 70) for quality (NB: this scoring forms part of a GIS dataset and is not included in the Open Space Audit). A green network strategy (CD59) prepared for the area focuses on Clydeside Community Park and the Golden Jubilee National Hospital site. It proposes forming missing links in the green network and redefining and bringing into active use the expansive under used area of the existing park and hospital grounds. The proposals seek to deliver a coherent, legible network that realises continuous access along the Clyde waterfront and links to the Forth and Clyde canal route and further north to Dalmuir Park. The strategy highlights the importance – and potential – of the open space at the Golden Jubilee National Hospital to the green network.

For these reasons, it is appropriate to define the western part of the Golden Jubilee National Hospital site as open space, in accordance with PAN 65, and the modification proposed by the **National Waiting Times Centre (64)** is not supported.

With regard to the land between Auchincarroch Road and Steadings Drive, west of Napierston Farm, this site is not identified in the Open Space Audit, however, it is has been included as open space in the Proposed Plan (as modified) after green space mapping compiled by Greenspace Scotland in 2011 (see: <http://www.greenspacescotland.org.uk/1scotlands-greenspace-map.aspx>) was used to refine the Open Space Audit data. This mapping incorporates the site with land beyond the settlement boundary and has been classed as open space for the purposes of the Proposed Plan (as modified). The section of the polygon that lies out with the settlement boundary is designated as green belt (CD60).

The site in question has a small watercourse running through it east to west. Land to the south of the watercourse is mainly wooded, forming a tree belt to the northern boundary of Steadings Drive referred to in **Hugh Kinloch's (73)** objection. The land to the north of the watercourse, running adjacent to Auchincarroch Road, is semi-improved pasture. Taken as a whole, the site meets the definition of green space set out in PAN 65, falling within the 'natural/semi-natural greenspaces' typology.

Including the site within the existing neighbourhood, to which Policy BC3 applies, would indicate that development would be appropriate providing it would not significantly harm the residential amenity, character or appearance of existing neighbourhoods. The area, particularly the woodland, provides an attractive setting for the urban area and, with the habitat value of the woodland, any development should be resisted.

Furthermore, it is not considered that identification of the area as open space will encourage the public to enter the agricultural field any more than if the area was identified part of the existing residential area. Under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003, access rights are granted to the public to cross land responsibly.

For these reasons, it is considered appropriate to define land between Auchincarroch Road and Steadings Drive as open space and the modification proposed by the **Hugh Kinloch (73)** is not supported.

The Council sees merit in noting within Policy GN1 that 'quality and value' will be defined in Supplementary Guidance. Paragraph 8.3.6 outlines the intention to produce Supplementary Guidance in support of Policies GN1 and GN2 and the Council is in the process of drafting this guidance. The modification proposed by **SNH (129)** would strengthen the hook within the Policy GN1 to the Supplementary Guidance.

The Reporter is invited to make this modification proposed by **SNH (129)**.

#### The Habitat Network and Geodiversity

The Council is willing to refine the designated geological Local Nature Conservation Sites identified on the Proposed Plan (as modified) Proposals Maps by working with the **Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (48)** to identify boundaries for these sites. Currently the location of the geological Local Nature Conservation Sites is marked on the Proposals Map but not their extent. However, it is considered that instead of making a statement in the Local Development Plan to this effect, it would be more appropriate to include this undertaking within the Action Programme (CD21). Action no. 35.1 is to prepare a consolidated record of Local Nature Conservation Sites which encompasses geological Local Nature Conservation Sites.

Therefore, the modification proposed by **Strathclyde Geoconservation Group (48)** is not considered necessary.

In response to **The Woodland Trust Scotland's (93)** representation on flora, the Proposed Plan (as modified) states at paragraph 8.4.4 that biodiversity interests – both habitats and species – should be taken account of across the whole plan area and in designating an extensive network of protected areas seeks to prevent to the loss, fragmentation and isolation of habitats which harms biodiversity and the ability of ecosystems and natural processes to adapt to climate change.

It is therefore considered that, while individual species of flora are not mentioned by name, there is adequate protection for both flora and fauna set out in the policy approach of the Local Development Plan and there is no requirement to modify the Plan.

The Council sees merit in the modification proposed by **RSPB Scotland (122)** to amend the first sentence of Policy GN3, replacing '*Development that harms the sites designated for nature conservation or protected species*' with '*Development that adversely affects the integrity of sites designated for nature conservation or harms protected species...*'. This provides greater clarity as to what is meant by



harm and reflects the terminology used in relevant legislation associated with Natura 2000 sites. This is notwithstanding the fact that the policy also applies to SSSIs, to which different legislation and terminology applies, protected species and Local Nature Conservation Sites, which are protected primarily by the planning system.

Regarding making reference to the need for compensatory measures to ensure the overall coherence of the Natura 2000 network is not affected, paragraphs 134 and 135 of SPP (CD03) cover sites classified as Special Protection Areas (SPA) under the Birds Directive and designated as Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) under the Habitats Directive, which form an EU-wide network of protected areas known as Natura 2000. In general terms, Policy GN3 follows SPP in stating that development that would harm a Natura 2000 site will not be permitted except where there are no alternative solutions and there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest. There is no requirement to provide compensatory measures to ensure the overall coherence of the Natura 2000 network, as the legislation and policy framework is predicated on development having no adverse effect on the integrity of any Natura 2000 site, including cumulatively, as demonstrated via an appropriate assessment. Compensatory measures may be identified as mitigation in order to be able to conclude no adverse effect, but this would be determined through a Habitats Regulations Appraisal. Paragraph 8.4.4. notes the requirement for such an appraisal where development proposals may impact upon a Natura 2000 site.

It is therefore considered that no modification to part a) of Policy GN3 is required.

With regard to the final sentence of Policy GN3, it is accepted that stating development which would harm non-designated habitats identified in the Dunbartonshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan (CD26) will be assessed against the benefits of the development could be considered to provide weak policy protection for such habitats. The Council also agrees that biodiversity enhancements should be sought. However, requiring that all development have not net biodiversity loss would be too onerous a test and would go beyond the duty to further the conservation of biodiversity set out in the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 and referred to in paragraph 129 of SPP.

In response to **RSPB Scotland (122)** proposed modification it is therefore suggested that the final sentence of Policy GN3 is reworded as follows: Development that harms non-designated habitats identified in the ~~West~~ Dunbartonshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan will be *assessed against the level of net impacts. New development should seek to enhance biodiversity as part of the green network.* SNH have previously advised, in commenting on a draft of the Proposed Plan, that the wording of the first sentence would deliver on paragraph 129 of SPP (CD03).

The modifications proposed by **SNH (129)** in respect to Policy GN3 are supported by the Council namely, amending the wording of part b of the policy to: *for protected species, where relevant licensing tests or other legal provisions are met* and including a new part: *e) for Local Nature Reserves, where impacts are offset or compensated in a way that maintains the integrity of the interests affected and maintains the involvement of people.*

The Proposed Plan (as modified) seeks to protect open spaces, including green corridors, as the building blocks of the Green Network (Policy GN1) and important habitats and protected species (Policy GN3). The modification proposed by **Clydebelt (169)** is considered to be overly prescriptive and detailed to be included within the Local Development Plan which Planning Circular 6/2013 (CD06), paragraph 79, notes Scottish Ministers expect to be concise. No modification is therefore supported to Section 8.4 or Policy GN6.

### Landscape

Policy GN4 states that “development that would have a significant adverse impact on landscape character will not be permitted” and applies across the whole plan area. Within the Kilpatrick Hills, designated as a Local Landscape Area by the Proposed Plan (as modified), Policy GN4 further states that development affecting the Kilpatrick Hills will be required to protect and, where possible enhance, the special qualities of the Hills. It is considered appropriate that, as a minimum, development within West Dunbartonshire does not have a significant adverse impact on the landscape, unless other factors – determined through the development management process and in accordance with other relative policies of the Local Development Plan – indicate otherwise.

The duration of any impacts, where they could be mitigated through progressive restoration, is one such factor that would be taken into account in the development management process.

This approach does not contradict SPP (CD03), which states different landscapes will have a different capacity to accommodate new development, and that the siting and design of development should be informed by local landscape character. On contrary, the policy implies that landscape character will be the determining factor in whether any landscape impact is acceptable.

For these reasons it is not considered necessary to make the modification to Policy GN4 as proposed by **Paterson Quarries Ltd. (182)**.

### Forestry, woodlands and trees

The Proposed Plan (as modified) – through an extensive network of Local Nature Conservation Sites, Policy GN3 and Policy GN5 – provides a robust framework for the protection of woodlands, including ancient woodlands. For this reason, it is not considered necessary to augment the Local Development Plan with a list and maps of ancient woodlands within the plan area, as proposed by **The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)**. It is intended, as stated at paragraph 8.6.3, 8.6.5 and within the Action Programme (CD21) (Action 37.1) to prepare Supplementary Guidance for Forestry, Woodland and Trees and this document can be used to identify and highlight the importance of Ancient Woodland.

‘Brownfield’ is defined within the Glossary of the Proposed Plan (as modified) (page 94) as land which has been previously development. This would preclude areas of ancient woodland.

The modifications proposed by **The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** are therefore not accepted.

Policy GN5 states that the expansion and enhancement of woodland involving the planting and management of native trees will be supported subject to assessment against Supplementary Guidance (to be prepared) for the Kilpatrick Hills and on Forestry, Woodland and Trees. It is not intended that this statement infer that commercial conifer plantations in the Kilpatrick Hills will not be supported. To clarify this statement and in response to the modification sought by **RSBP Scotland (122)** it is suggested that the following deletion be made from the first sentence of Policy GN5: *The expansion and enhancement of woodland involving the planting and management of native trees will be supported subject to assessment against the Kilpatrick Hills and Forestry, Woodland and Trees Supplementary Guidance.* It is not considered appropriate that the Local Development Plan should dictate the woodland types to be planted, particularly ahead of a forthcoming Forest Design Plan for the Kilpatrick Hills.

The modification proposed by **Forestry Commission Scotland (124)** to make reference to the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal Policy within Policy GN5 is not supported; however, reference to this document would be appropriate within Supplementary Guidance to be prepared as noted at the end of paragraph 8.6.3. In general terms, the Proposed Plan (as modified) avoids referencing policy statements, plans and strategies published by the Scottish Government and other external agencies as such documents may be replaced over the lifetime of the Plan. It is considered the readability of the Plan is also improved through this approach.

#### The Water Environment

In response to the representation submitted by **James Graham (170)**, it is acknowledged that freshwater fishing rights are an incident to property rights. The purpose of Policy GN6, part h) is to encourage physical access to waterways for a range of recreational activities, including fishing. It does not in anyway infer a right to fish or that the salmon and freshwater fisheries don't include their own legal rights of access, which is a separate issue.

As stated above, the modification proposed by **Clydebelt (169)** is considered to be overly prescriptive and detailed to be included within the Local Development Plan.

No modifications to Policy GN6 are therefore supported by the Council.

#### Temporary Greening

The Council agrees with the modifications proposed by **SNH (129)** to Section 8.10 on Temporary Greening, namely, re-titling the section *Advance and temporary greening* and replacing the first sentence or paragraph 8.10.2 with following text: *This Plan strongly supports and encourages green infrastructure components of future development being put in before construction begins – known as advance greening.*

The Reporter is therefore invited to make the modifications proposed by **SNH (129)**.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 13</b>	<b>KILPATRICK HILLS</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 3 – Our Changing Places Section 3.13, Pgs 44-45 (also Map 13, p43)	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Tommy Lusk (113) Kilmarnock Community Council (120) RSPB (122) Forestry Commission Scotland (124)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	A spatial strategy for the Kilpatrick Hills which seeks to protect and enhance the landscape character of the Kilpatrick Hill; the integrated network of habitats and important geological features; and to improve access to the Hills.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Bellsmyre</u></p> <p><b>Tommy Lusk (113):</b> Bellsmyre should be identified as an important gateway to the Kilpatrick Hills. The representation states Bellsmyre is a local settlement that has better public transport links and less steep access to the Kilpatrick Hills than Overtoun. Bellsmyre Grasslands, a Local Nature Conservation Site owned by the Council, is a natural access point to the Kilpatrick Hills, adjacent to two schools and bus stops. The grasslands link Bellsmyre to land owned by Woodland Trust Scotland.</p> <p><u>Historical monuments and geology</u></p> <p><b>Kilmarnock Community Council (120):</b> Mention should be made of the important historical monuments within the Kilpatrick Hills. Historical and geological features should be protected.</p> <p><u>Peatland resource</u></p> <p><b>RSPB Scotland (122):</b> Suggest wording in this section that highlights the important peatland (blanket bog) resource that exists in this area. Fully functioning peatlands can lock up large amounts of carbon to an even greater extent than woodland.</p> <p><u>Kilpatrick Hills as a strategic resource</u></p>		

**Forestry Commission Scotland (124):** Believe that the Kilpatrick Hills provide a significant, strategic resource for West Dunbartonshire and surrounding local authority areas and support its inclusion within the broader Green Network. Consider that there is significant potential to further contribute as a strategic timber reserve, of regional importance for landscape and heritage, of great environmental value and vital for the health and wellbeing of local communities and the broader region.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

Bellsmyre

**Tommy Lusk (113)**

*Paragraph 3.13.6 – Amend the second sentence as follows: “The fringes of the Kilpatrick Hills are on the doorstep of our settlements and locations such as Overtoun, Bellsmyre and Edinbarnet are important gateways.”*

Identify Bellsmyre on *Map 13: The Green Network*.

Historical monuments and geology

**Kilmarnock Community Council (120)**

*Paragraph 3.13.2 – add following as second bullet point: Historical features relating to heritage, including scheduled monuments;*

*Paragraph 3.13.5 – add additional sentence at end as follows: Protection of historical and geological features including the Lang Cairn, and other scheduled monuments, and the terminal moraine of the Loch Lomond glaciation will be ensured, including the avoidance of planting of Sitka species*

Peatland resource

**RSPB Scotland (122)**

Wording that highlights the important peatland (blanket bog) resource that exists in the Kilpatrick Hills.

Kilpatrick Hills as a strategic resource

**Forestry Commission Scotland (124)**

*Paragraph 3.13.2 – Addition of following two bullet points:*

- to protect and enhance the Hills as an accessible recreational resource;*
- to provide a strategic timber resource.*

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

Bellsmyre

The Council acknowledges that Bellsmyre is well placed to be considered as a gateway to the Kilpatrick Hills, particularly given its transport links, local amenities and population. Furthermore, improving access to the Kilpatrick Hills from public

transport nodes, including at Bellsmyre, is one of a number of actions included in the Kilpatrick Hills Green Network Study (CD42). Implementing the actions included in the study is included in the Action Programme (CD21) (reference 12.3).

The Council therefore, has no objection to the inclusion of Bellsmyre as one of the gateways to the Kilpatrick Hills as identified by **Tommy Lusk (113)** and suggests a modification at paragraph 3.13.6 (second sentence): “The fringes of the Kilpatrick Hills are on the doorstep of our settlements and locations such as Overtoun, *Bellsmyre* and Edinbarnet are important gateways”. The Reporter is therefore invited to make this modification.

With regard to Map 13: The Green Network, the map indicates the key green network assets, access routes (based on the core path network) and opportunities. Settlements and ‘gateways’ are not marked upon the map and therefore it would be incongruous to specifically identify Bellsmyre.

The modification proposed is not accepted.

#### Historical monuments and geology

Two scheduled monuments can be found within the Kilpatrick Hills, Lang Cairn – a chambered cairn at Gallangad Muir and a cairn close to Gallangad Burn. Chapter 9 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) seeks to protect the historic environment and scheduled monuments are specifically addressed in section 9.3 and by Policy BH2. In order to ensure the Plan’s strategy for the Kilpatrick Hills is focused and concise, it is not considered necessary to specifically reiterate the plan’s protection for historical features at paragraph 3.13.2 or 3.13.5 but it is something that could be usefully covered in the proposed Supplementary Guidance for the Kilpatrick Hills.

The geological features of the Kilpatrick Hills, such as the terminal moraine of the Loch Lomond glaciation referred to in the representation made by **Kilmarnock Community Council (120)** are intrinsic to their landscape qualities described at paragraph 3.13.3 and the Kilpatrick Hills Proposed Local Landscape Area Draft Statement of Importance (CD43). The Proposed Plan (as modified)’s strategy for the Kilpatrick Hills stated in paragraph 3.13.2 includes protecting and enhancing landscape character and for this reason it is considered that the proposed modification to paragraph 3.13.5 is not required.

It is also considered that it would not be appropriate to include a statement preventing the planting of Sitka species. The Proposed Plan (as modified) states at paragraph 8.6.3 that forestry proposals must demonstrate the sensitive siting of new woodland and the restructuring of existing conifer plantations so as to improve the landscape, ecological and recreational value. This represents a more reasoned approach, taking into account that the Kilpatrick Hills will remain a location for timber production.

The modifications proposed by **Kilmarnock Community Council (120)** are not accepted.

### Peatland resource

The importance of the Kilpatrick Hill's blanket bog habitat is recognised in its designation as a number of Local Nature Conservation Sites. Paragraph 4.11.1 highlights the importance of soils, including peatlands and it is not considered necessary to repeat this with section 3.13. There is merit in ensuring proposed Supplementary Guidance for the Kilpatrick Hills outlines how the peatland resource will be protected and enhanced.

The modification proposed by **RSPB Scotland (122)** is not accepted.

### Kilpatrick Hills as a strategic resource

The modification proposed by **Forestry Commission Scotland (124)** requesting the Proposed Plan (as modified)'s strategy for the Kilpatrick Hills (paragraph 3.13.2) includes: *to protect and enhance the Hills as an accessible recreational resource*, is along similar lines to the third bullet point: *to improve access to the hills*. The Council sees merit in replacing the existing third bullet point at paragraph 3.13.2 with the proposed modification to encompass both access and recreation.

The Council acknowledges that timber production will remain an important activity within the Kilpatrick Hills during the plan period. This will form a major part of the Forest Design Plan for the Kilpatrick Hills being prepared by Forestry Commission Scotland. It is considered that there is merit in referring to the Kilpatrick Hill's role as a timber resource within the Section 3.13 of the Proposed Plan (as modified), but not that it should specifically form part of the Local Development Plan's strategy for the Kilpatrick Hills, as the plan and the planning system will not directly determine future forestry operations. It is proposed a sentence could be inserted within paragraph 3.13.5 by updating the fourth sentence as follows: 'Other sites will see new native woodlands created *and areas of commercial forestry producing timber will also remain*'.

The Reporter is invited to accept the modifications proposed by **Forestry Commission Scotland (124)** as amended above.

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

--

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

--





renewables and that micro-renewables have many problems.

**Scottish Government (111)** have identified two problems with the response to Section 3F of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 set out in Appendix 1:

- 1) It would add a condition on all permissions for non-exempt buildings instead of providing a set of thresholds which a proposal could meet from the outset instead of being met after approval, which could lead to technical difficulties;
- 2) The condition proposed requires a building consented and constructed before 2016 to have fewer greenhouse gas emissions after 2016. It is not clear how this would be demonstrated by the applicant or enforced. This is particularly the case as the emissions savings should be the result of the installation and use of low and zero-carbon generating technology. Presumably an over specification of technology would be required in order to meet the post 2016 requirement for buildings constructed before 2016. Otherwise additional technology would need to be installed, which may or may not require a further planning application.

The Scottish Government therefore consider Appendix 1 should be re-drafted to provide a policy (rather than permission condition) which identifies the proportion of greenhouse gas emissions to be avoided through the installation and use of low and zero-carbon generating technologies, and at least one increase in the proportion, and highlights the approach taken by Perth and Kinross Council.

**RSPB Scotland (122)** suggests Policy DS1 could be vastly simplified by requesting that all new development should be designed in a way to attain a minimum BREEAM rating. It seems unrealistic that every development could meet all or most of the points under the six qualities of a successful place.

**SEPA (128)** recommend inclusion within Policy DS1 a statement on flood risk in order to strengthen and support the aims of delivering 'Successful Places and Sustainable Design'

#### Settlement Strategy

**Persimmon Homes (West Scotland) (101)** consider, in relation to housing land supply, that additional releases of land outwith the existing urban area may also present sustainable locations which, on a case by case basis, could be considered suitable to meet future identified development requirements. Furthermore, directing future development exclusively to the existing urban area does not promote a range and choice of potential housing sites, which is a key requirement as set out in Scottish Planning Policy.

**SEPA (128)** expressed support for this policy.

**SNH (129)** consider the penultimate sentence in paragraph 4.3.2 implies that green network potential only exists on sites where no built development exists and that instead virtually all sites have green network potential.

### Accessibility

**RSPB Scotland (122)** highlight that there is no mention of allocation of cycle parking, electric power points for cars at transport hubs, encouraging showers within the design of business development applications within this section. All these facilities would enhance the opportunities for users to use sustainable modes of transport and minimise carbon emissions.

**SEPA (128)** supports Policy DS3.

### Renewable Energy

**sportscotland (20)** In applying a criteria based policy it is important to be aware of paragraph 187 of Scottish Planning Policy which is clear that wind farm proposals should consider impacts on recreation interests. This is supported by paragraph 190 which identifies recreation interests as a potential constraint on wind farm development. Policy on wind farms should therefore include a criterion on impacts on sport and recreation interests

**Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority (112)** suggest that Policy DS5 could be reworded in order to reflect that all types of renewable energy should avoid significant adverse impact to on the setting and views to and from Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park and the Loch Lomond Scenic Area. Furthermore it is suggested that section 4.6 acknowledges the National Park as a designation and that renewable energy developments close to the boundary have the potential to have significant impacts on the Park area.

**Forestry Commission Scotland (124)** request that reference is made to the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal.

**SEPA (128)** Supports Policy DS5.

### Spatial Framework for Wind Energy

**Clydebelt (169)** state that any wind farm development within the Kilpatrick Hills Local Landscape Area would destroy the feeling of remoteness and contradict other opinions raised in the Draft Statement of Importance for the Proposed Kilpatrick Hills Local Landscape Area. Development would also be contrary to parts of Policy DS5.

**Stirling Council (68)** supports the identification of the Kilpatrick Hills as a constrained area for wind energy developments.

### Flooding

**SEPA (128)** object to Policy DS6. It is considered additional text emphasising the promotion of the avoidance principle and also of the responsibility of the Local Authority to reduce overall flood risk is necessary to improve the policy and assist in achieving the aims and outcomes of both Scottish Government and West Dunbartonshire Council policy.

## Contaminated Land

**SEPA (128)** supports Policy DS7 with the recommendation that it includes reference to PAN 33: Development and Contaminated Land for site investigation works.

## Soil

**RSPB Scotland (122)** suggest a specific policy is required addressing development proposals that would affect peat and carbon rich soils. In addition to minimising soil disturbance, the policy should also require enhancement of areas of peatland and other carbon rich soils. A policy specifically on peat would ensure that the Local Development Plan is consistent with the objectives set out in Scottish Planning Policy.

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

### Successful Places and Sustainable Design

**Homes for Scotland (110)** seek to delete all references to a requirement to incorporate low and zero-carbon micro-technologies in new buildings.

**Scottish Government (111)** propose a modification to Appendix 1: re-draft to provide a policy (rather than permission condition) which identifies the proportion of greenhouse gas emissions to be avoided through the installation and use of low and zero-carbon generating technologies, and at least one increase in the proportion. A change in line with the approach used by Perth and Kinross Council is proposed:

*Proposals for new buildings should confirm to the sustainability standards set out in the table below for the year in which they are submitted unless the proposal is considered to be an exception to the policy. The emissions savings should form a part of those emissions savings required by the Building Standards regulations in force in the given year.*

	Domestic	Non-domestic
2014	New buildings include a minimum 2% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.	New buildings include a minimum 2% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.
2015-2018	New buildings should include a minimum 3% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.	New buildings should include a minimum 3% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.
2019 onwards	New buildings should include a minimum 5% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.	New buildings should include a minimum 5% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.

**RSPB Scotland (122)** propose to modify Policy DS1. It is suggested that the policy could be simplified by requesting that all new development should be designed to a way to attain minimum BREEAM rating.

**SEPA (128)** propose to modify Policy DS1 to include the following wording under 'Resource efficient' and/or 'Safe and Pleasant': *Protection of people, property and infrastructure from flooding.*

#### Settlement Strategy

**Persimmon Homes (West Scotland) (101)** seek an amendment to Policy DS2: add the following wording: *Unallocated sites located on the edge of the existing urban area may require to come forward to supplement any deficiency in housing land supply. Sites of this nature will only be considered acceptable where the sustainability of these sites can be demonstrated.*

**SNH (129)** seek to amend para 4.3.2: change penultimate sentence to: *Virtually all sites have green network potential and for some this may be the main use.*

#### Accessibility

**RSBP Scotland (122)** do not specify a modification. The representations relates to facilities that would enhance the opportunities for users to use sustainable modes of transport and minimise carbon emissions.

#### Renewable Energy

**sportscotland (20)** seek to modify Policy DS5: add a further criterion under part 'a)' referring to sport and recreation interests.

**Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park (112)** seek to modify either *paragraph 4.6.1* or *4.6.2* to include acknowledgment of the National Park as a designation and that renewable energy development close to the boundary have the potential to have significant impacts on the Park area.

They also propose to modify Policy DS5: relocation of third bullet point under criterion 'f)' to form criterion in its own right For the bullet point starting "avoids significant adverse impact..." to be applicable to all renewable energy development. This could be done by listing it as its own criteria before 'f)' for wind energy.

**Forestry Commission Scotland (124)** propose to modify Policy DS5 to include reference to the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal.

#### Spatial Framework for Wind Energy

**Clydebelt (169)** propose to modify section 4.7, Maps 15 & 16: removal of sites within the Kilpatrick Hills Local Landscape Area.

#### Flooding

**SEPA (128)** propose to modify Policy DS6 by inclusion of the following text at the beginning of the policy: *The Proposed Plan will take a precautionary approach to managing flood risk as well as seeking to reduce overall flood risk flood risk by considering flooding from all sources and working towards sustainable flood*

*management, and a recognition that avoidance is the cornerstone of sustainable flood risk management. With regards to redevelopment proposals, land use vulnerability should be considered focusing on changes of use to the less or same vulnerability combined with use of flood resilient materials and design.*

Contaminated Land

**SEPA (128)** propose to modify Policy DS7 to include reference to PAN 33: Development and Contaminated Land for site investigation works.

Soil

**RSPB Scotland (122)** propose a new policy addressing development proposals that would affect peat and carbon rich soils. The policy should require new development to minimise soil disturbance and require enhancement of areas of peat land and other carbon rich soils.

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

Successful Places and Sustainable Design

Under section 72 of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 local development plans must require all new buildings to be designed to avoid a specified and rising proportion of the projected greenhouse gas emissions from their use through the installation and operation of low and zero carbon generating technologies. It would therefore not be possible to accommodate **Homes for Scotland's (110)** proposed modification that all references to a requirement to incorporate low and zero-carbon micro-technologies in new buildings be deleted. Similarly, **RSPB's (122)** suggested modification to require that all new development meet minimum BREEAM ratings would not fully satisfy the legislation. The Fourth Annual Report on the Operation of Section 72 of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (CD02) states the assessment required by Section 73(2) of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act does not clearly indicate that Section 3F is no longer required at this time. On that basis, the Scottish Government has concluded that the legislation should remain in force (paragraph 8.13).

The Council accepts the modification proposed by the **Scottish Government (111)**. The modification would see the second paragraph within Appendix 1 deleted and the following policy wording and table added at the start (NB: the dates in the table have been adjusted to reflect the likely adoption date of the Local Development Plan:

*Proposals for new buildings should conform to the sustainability standards set out in the table below for the year in which they are submitted unless the proposal is considered to be an exception to the policy. The emissions savings should form a part of those emissions savings required by the Building Standards regulations in force in the given year.*

	<i>Domestic</i>	<i>Non-domestic</i>
<i>2015-2016</i>	<i>New buildings include a minimum 2% carbon dioxide emissions abatement</i>	<i>New buildings include a minimum 2% carbon dioxide emissions abatement</i>

	<i>through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.</i>	<i>through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.</i>
2017-2019	<i>New buildings include a minimum 3% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.</i>	<i>New buildings include a minimum 3% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.</i>
2020 onwards	<i>New buildings include a minimum 5% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.</i>	<i>New buildings include a minimum 5% carbon dioxide emissions abatement through the use of low and zero carbon generating technology.</i>

The exceptions currently listed in the first paragraph of Appendix 1 should be retained. Additionally, the matrix included as part of Policy DS1 should refer to *Appendix 1* rather than *Annex 1*.

The Reporter is therefore invited to make these modifications.

The Council agrees with the recommendation that reference should be made to flood risk avoidance within Policy DS1 and sees merit in the modification proposed by **SEPA (128)**. It is considered the following wording: *Protects people, property and infrastructure from flooding* should be added as an additional criterion under the 'Safe and Pleasant' quality.

The Reporter is invited to make this modification.

### Settlement Strategy

Paragraph 40 of Scottish Planning Policy (CD03) states the settlement strategy set out in the development plan should promote a more sustainable pattern of growth, taking account of the scale and type of development pressure and the need for growth and regeneration. In line with national, strategic and local planning policy, the Proposed Plan (as modified) retains an emphasis on the regeneration of urban sites. These sites represent the most sustainable locations for new development. Paragraph 38 of Scottish Planning Policy states that decisions on the location of new development should promote regeneration and the re-use of previously developed land and reduce the need to travel. The development of previously used land within urban areas can furthermore have a positive impact upon the places in which they are located, by removing contamination and enabling green network enhancements. In order to direct new development to the urban area, development beyond the settlement boundary is restricted through its designation as green belt, in accordance with paragraph 159, bullet point 1 on Scottish Planning Policy.

The position regarding housing land supply in West Dunbartonshire is addressed by Issue 16. The Council's position is that the Proposed Plan (as modified) has allocated both a generous supply of land to meet the optimistic all-tenure housing supply target for both plan periods and a reasonable range and choice of housing land. Any shortfall in the private sector in the first period can be met by bringing forward from the 2020-25 period. In accordance with this position and the Plan's focus on the regeneration of more sustainable brownfield sites within the urban area, there would be no requirement to develop unallocated sites located on the edge of the existing urban area. Should any shortfall be identified the preference

should be to develop sites within the urban area which can contribute to range and choice.

The modification proposed by **Persimmon Homes (West Scotland) (101)** is therefore not supported.

The Council agrees with **SNH (129)** that all vacant and derelict land has the potential to contribute to the green network and with the proposed modification, namely changing the penultimate sentence of paragraph 4.3.2 to: *All sites have green network potential and for some this may be the main use.*

The Reporter is therefore invited to make this modification.

#### Accessibility

The role the provision of cycle parking, electric power points for cars at transport hubs and showers within business use development in encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport, as highlighted by **RSPB Scotland (122)**, is accepted and the Council sees merit in amending Section 4.4 accordingly.

The Reporter is invited to add the following wording to paragraph 4.4.3: *All development should seek to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport including active travel.*

#### Renewable Energy

The Council agrees with **sportscotland (20)** that specific reference should be made to sport and recreation interests under part 'a)' of Policy DS5 and suggests *sport and recreation interests* be added as a fifth bullet point.

The Reporter is therefore invited to make this modification.

It is considered that, within West Dunbartonshire, wind turbines are the renewable energy technology most likely to have an impact upon the Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park and Loch Lomond National Scenic Area. However, the Councils agrees with the **Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority (112)** that Policy DS5 should be rearranged so that that impact on the setting of and views to and from the National Park and National Scenic Area is specifically highlighted as a consideration for *all* renewable energy development. This would entail the final bullet point under part 'f)' becoming 'g)' and the current 'g)' becoming 'h)'.

The Reporter is therefore invited to make this modification by **Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority (112)**.

Revising paragraph 4.6.1 or 4.6.2 to reiterate the point that the National Park is a designation that renewable energy development close to the boundary with the Park could have the potential to have significant impacts upon, would cause an inconsistency as no other designations are mentioned, but this can be highlighted within the proposed Supplementary Guidance.



The modification is not accepted.

The modification proposed by **Forestry Commission Scotland (124)** to make reference to the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal Policy within Policy DS5 is not supported; however, reference to this and other relevant policies would be appropriate within Supplementary Guidance to be prepared as noted at the end of paragraph 4.6.2. In general terms, the Proposed Plan (as modified) avoids referencing policy statements, plans and strategies published by the Scottish Government and other external agencies as such documents may be replaced over the lifetime of the Plan. It is considered the readability of the Plan is also improved through this approach.

The modification proposed by **Forestry Commission Scotland (124)** is not accepted.

### Spatial Framework for Wind Energy

Scottish Planning Policy (CD03) requires that planning authorities set out in the development plan a spatial framework for onshore wind farms of over 20 megawatts generating capacity, and states that authorities may incorporate wind farms of less than 20 megawatts generating capacity if considered appropriate. The Proposed Plan (as modified) includes frameworks for wind farms above (Map 15) and below (Map 16) 20 megawatts. In each case, the Kilpatrick Hills are identified in the main as an 'area with potential constraint'.

The approach adopted to formulate the spatial framework for wind energy follows the guidance set out in Scottish Planning Policy, specifically paragraphs 189 – 191, and the advice note 'Process for preparing spatial frameworks for wind farms' (CD48), published by the Scottish Government. The guidance states that the spatial framework should identify areas requiring significant protection, including because they are designated for their national or international landscape or natural heritage value (Stage 1); areas with potential constraints (Stage 2); and areas of search (Stage 3). When identifying areas with potential constraints paragraph 190 of Scottish Planning Policy directs planning authorities to consider, amongst other things, areas designated for their regional and local landscape or natural heritage value.

The Kilpatrick Hills are identified in the Proposed Plan (as modified) as a Local Landscape Area and comprising of a number of Local Nature Conservation Sites. The representation submitted by **Clydebelt (169)** is against the development of wind farms within the Kilpatrick Hills, however, through following the guidance set out by the Scottish Government it is correct that sites within the Kilpatrick Hills are included within the spatial framework as an 'area with potential constraints'.

The modification by **Clydebelt (169)** is not accepted.

### Flooding

The Council accepts **SEPA's (128)** recommendation but considers the proposed wording would sit better as part of the text before Policy DS6, rather than forming part of the policy. The policies of the Proposed Plan (as modified) are intended to

be concise and to clearly direct development management decisions by stating what will and will not be supported. The text proposed by SEPA refers to the approach of the Proposed Plan (as modified). Based on the wording provided by SEPA, it is suggested that an additional paragraph is added before Policy DS6, which would read as follows:

*The Proposed Plan takes a precautionary approach to managing flood risk and seeks to reduce overall flood risk by considering flooding from all sources in accordance with the principles of sustainable flood management and in recognition that avoidance is the cornerstone of sustainable flood risk management. With regards to redevelopment proposals, land use vulnerability should be considered, focusing on changes of use to the less or same vulnerability combined with use of flood resilient materials and design.*

The Reporter is therefore invited to make the modification proposed by the Council.

#### Contaminated Land

The modification proposed by **SEPA (128)** to make reference to PAN 33: Development and Contaminated Land for site investigation works within the Local Development Plan is not supported. In general terms, the Proposed Plan (as modified) avoids referencing policy statements, plans and strategies published by the Scottish Government and other external agencies as such documents may be replaced over the lifetime of the Plan. It is considered the readability of the Plan is also improved through this approach.

The modification by **SEPA (128)** is not supported.

#### Soil

Paragraph 4.11.2 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) states that: *all development should seek to make sustainable use of soils and development proposals that would affect peat and carbon rich soils should include measures to minimise soil disturbance.* Taking account of **RSPB Scotland's (122)** representation, the Council sees merit in a policy on soils and considers the above noted text could form the basis of a new Policy DS8, adding additionally that development should seek to enhance areas of peatland and other carbon rich soils.

The first sentence of paragraph 4.11.2 would be added to the previous paragraph.

The Reporter is therefore invited to make the modifications proposed.

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

**Reporter's recommendations:**

--

<b>Issue 15</b>	<b>GROWING OUR ECONOMY</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 5 – Growing Our Economy Schedule 1: Business and industry opportunities – GE1(14) Main Street, Jamestown Policy GE4 – Tourism	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Hugh Kinloch (73) SNH (129)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	This Issue relates to the Growing our Economy section of the Plan, and specifically land at Jamestown designated for the expansion of an adjacent sawmill and the tourism policy.	
<b>Planning authority’s summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>GE1(14) Main Street, Jamestown</u></p> <p><b>Hugh Kinloch (73)</b> states that there is no justification for the continued reservation of such a large area for the expansion of the timber yard. The owners of the yard have reduced the workforce since the adoption of the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan. The timber yard is already larger than shown on the Proposals Map as the timber yard occupies most of the area wrongly shown as open space (allotment gardens).</p> <p>For over 5 years, the Local Development Plan outcome: “business and industrial areas are attracting investment” (Table 1) has not been successfully achieved by this allocation.</p> <p>Expanding the BC1(7) housing opportunity to match the reduction of the adjoining business and industry opportunity GE1(14) would allow better linkage of the two housing areas BC1(6) and BC1(7).</p> <p><u>Tourism</u></p> <p><b>SNH (129)</b> recommend an addition to Policy GE4 to refer to natural heritage.</p>		

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

GE1(14) Main Street, Jamestown

**Hugh Kinloch (73)** has proposed two amendments:

*Schedule 1, Site GE1(14)* – Reduce site area from 1.93ha to 1ha.

*Schedule 2, Site BC1(7)* – Increase site area by 0.93ha, by extending southwards into site GE1(14)

Tourism

**SNH (129)** suggest a modification to Policy GN4 – Insert the word ‘*natural*’ after ‘green network’: “New tourist accommodation, attractions and supporting infrastructure will be supported in appropriate locations which avoid adverse impact on the green network, *natural* and built heritage.”

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

GE1(14) Main Street, Jamestown

The Council does not support the reduction of site GE1(14) Main Street, Jamestown – reserved for the expansion of the adjacent sawmill – to allow the increase of the Private Housing Opportunity site BC1(7) Jamestown IE.

The proposed modification would increase the housing land supply by 0.98 ha or approximately 27 units. Site BC1(7) Jamestown IE is shown in Schedule 2 as having an existing indicative capacity of 60, while the adjacent BC1(6) Private Housing Opportunity site has an indicative capacity of 75. Both sites are currently deemed to be non-effective, and are scheduled to come forward in the period after 2019. Issue 21: Building our Communities - Vale of Leven sets out the Council's position in respect to housing land and concludes as there is no strategic requirement to release land in this housing market area, and the housing supply has already been augmented by two effective releases to ensure choice and generosity as required by SPP. An additional release in the Vale of Leven area is not required.

The Proposed Plan (as modified) 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 West Dunbartonshire attract new businesses to the area, retain existing businesses and encourage business starts-ups. In this context, the loss of land identified for industry and business use is resisted. Furthermore, the sawmill owners/operators have confirmed that they still wish the land to be identified for the sawmill's extension (CD53).

In response to Hugh Kinloch's representation stating the timber yard is larger than shown on the Proposals Map as it occupies most of the area wrongly shown as open space (allotment gardens), it is noted that the area shown as ‘open space’ on the Proposals Map south of site GE1(14) is in fact occupied by the sawmill. The site, marked as ‘Allot Gdns’ on the Ordnance Survey base map, is designated as ‘Existing industry and business’ in the adopted West

Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22) and has been changed in error. The Local Plan designation should be maintained in the Local Development Plan and the site designated as 'Existing industry and business'.

Tourism

The 'Green Network' term, in its broadest sense, has been used throughout the Proposed Plan (as modified) to refer to natural heritage, for example in the title to Chapter 8 and within Policy DS5. For consistency, the Council does not support the insertion of the word 'natural' into Policy GE4 as proposed by **SNH (129)**.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 16</b>	<b>MEETING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 6 – Building Our Communities Sections 6.2 and 6.3, pp 59-63	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p>Persimmon Homes (West Scotland) (101)  East Dunbartonshire Council (105)  Homes for Scotland (110)  Kilmarnock Community Council (120)</p>		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	This Issue relates to the sections of the Plan dealing with Meeting Housing Requirements (6.2) and New Land for Housing (6.3) and associated tables and schedules.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Brownfield Land Supply</u></p> <p><b>East Dunbartonshire Council (105)</b> supports the generous housing land supply allocated in the Proposed Plan. It is noted that the majority is brownfield land in key regeneration areas and that no significant Green Belt release has been required to provide this level of generosity. East Dunbartonshire Council are pleased that one of the sites highlighted in the Main Issues Report (CD12), Cochno Road East, which straddles the boundary between the two Councils, has not been carried forward into the Proposed Plan, as it would conflict with the Strategic Development Plan's (CD09) spatial vision of recycling brownfield land as a priority.</p> <p><b>Kilmarnock Community Council (120)</b> support the emphasis on regeneration and the redevelopment of the brownfield housing land supply. This should take precedence over the development of greenfield sites.</p> <p><u>Generosity of Land Supply*</u></p> <p><b>Homes for Scotland (110)</b> and <b>Persimmon Homes (101)</b> note that the Plan does not provide a generous supply of land for private housing, particularly in the 2009-2020 period. The draft Scottish Planning Policy suggests generosity might be defined as 10-20% above requirement, whereas Table 2 indicates a level of 0.6% above demand. Generosity is higher in the 2020-2025 period but that is predicated on assumptions about urban capacity. There is no testing of these post 2020 sites carried out in the audit process, and the scale of some of the sites raises doubts about their deliverability by 2025.</p> <p><u>Range and Choice of Housing Sites</u></p>		

Scottish Planning Policy (CD03) also requires a range and choice of sites in terms of location, size and type. The Council is relying on a small number of large sites to deliver the housing requirement. That does not provide a good range and choice of sites and risks failure to deliver if one or more of those sites suffer planning or market delays (**Homes for Scotland (110)** and **Persimmon Homes (101)**).

#### Five year effective supply

**Persimmon Homes (101)** note that SPP (CD03) requires the Council to demonstrate that it will maintain a 5-year effective housing land supply at all times. The Plan does not recognise this or state how it intends to manage or monitor the land supply to ensure this requirement is fulfilled.

\*Note: Homes for Scotland's figures relate to the Proposed Plan. No additional representation was received by them to the Proposed Plan (as modified).

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

**Homes for Scotland (110)** and **Persimmon Homes (101)** request the following modifications :

Schedules 1 and 2 should identify additional sites in order to increase generosity of supply and provide greater range and choice. An additional 500 units in 2009 – 2020 would ensure around 20% generosity. These should be smaller sites of up to c.50 units in a range of locations.

The assumptions on Urban Capacity sites in Schedules 1 and 2, particularly for the period post-2020, should be tested in consultation with the housing industry.

**Persimmon Homes (101)** request that Policy BC1 should have the following additional wording: *“The Council will maintain a five year effective supply of housing land at all times throughout the lifetime of the plan. This will be monitored and updated annually. Where a shortfall in the effective five year land supply emerges, actions should be taken to rectify this by approving planning applications on unallocated sites.”*

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

##### Generosity of Land Supply

Accordance with Strategic Development Plan: The Proposed Plan must be consistent with the Strategic Development Plan. The Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan May 2012 (CD09) provides the framework for strategic housing demand in the light of the evidence base in the Housing Need and Demand Assessment, which was assessed as robust and credible in June 2011. These assessments are considered to be generous in that the scenario adopted by the SDP assumed an optimistic growth scenario and higher household growth than that projected by the National Records of Scotland. In addition output from windfall sites are not included in the future supply therefore



allowing an additional element of generosity. In Schedules 8 and 9 of the SDP, the preliminary and indicative comparison of private sector supply and demand shows a surplus of housing supply to both 2020 and 2025 in the Greater Glasgow North and West sub market area (which includes Clydebank) and in the individual market area of Dumbarton and Vale of Leven. Schedule 10 indicates that there is no shortfall of affordable housing in West Dunbartonshire within these two periods either. The SDP assumes that there should be 4,000 net new private sector completions in West Dunbartonshire over the period 2009-25 (Schedule 7) (equivalent to 250 completions per annum), with no additional affordable housing required in this period.

Local Housing Strategy/Housing Supply Targets: West Dunbartonshire's Local Housing Strategy November 2011 (CD31) has set out optimistic housing supply targets in excess of the indicative all-tenure housing requirement in Schedule 11A of the Strategic Development Plan (paragraph 5.6.7). The private sector target has been set at 250 pa, meeting the SDP requirement in full, and an additional target of 70 affordable housing has also been set.

Local Development Plan/Meeting the Requirement – based on the Housing Supply Targets: Table 2 in the Proposed Plan (as modified) indicates that there is a requirement for 3,520 all-tenure houses up to 2020. The supply is 3,807, giving a generosity allowance of 8%. The level of generosity in the 2020-25 period is significantly higher at 27%. In the 2009-20 period the affordable supply is significantly more generous than the private supply, and the position is reversed in the latter period. This is explained by the fact that sites for affordable housing tend not to be identified so far in advance, and that recent completions and the effective supply in the private sector are still depressed due to financial constraints in the housing market. Tables 2 and 3 therefore show that the housing land supply identified in the Proposed Plan (as modified) can meet the all-tenure requirement and has the flexibility to allow sites to be brought forward or pushed back, or deliver a different tenure if needed.

It is acknowledged that the private sector housing land supply does not have any generosity in the period to 2009-2020. This does not reflect a lack of housing land, but rather a problem in delivery as a result of financial constraints in the housing market in recent years. For example, private sector completions 2009-2012, which address the first part of the requirement, averaged 118 pa, not the 250 pa housing supply target. This was due to difficulties in attaining both development finance, which halted sites coming forward, and mortgage finance, which depressed demand, and not a lack of developable land. The 2012 effective land supply, on which the Plan is based and which Homes for Scotland has been consulted on (set out in Row E of Table 2 and Schedule 2 of the Plan), is similarly constrained by an anticipated slower pace of development reflecting the continued impact of development and mortgage finance on housebuilding, not a lack of land (CD33). The shortfall in the land supply in Table 2 (row H) essentially reflects the low level of completions 2009-12. Schedule 4 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) indicates the new allocations that have been identified to address this shortfall, and the output which is anticipated in the first period to meet demand to 2020 is shown in Row I of Table 2. As the market improves it is anticipated that both completions and the level of the effective land supply will increase, as existing sites will be more optimistically programmed for

development.

Urban Capacity Study: The higher level of generosity in the private sector land supply position in the period 2020-25 shown in Table 3 reflects output from the 2009 Urban Capacity Study on which Homes for Scotland were consulted. The output assumed in Table 3 is, however, significantly reduced from the anticipated output shown for the 2020-25 period in the SDP Background Report 13 Urban Capacity Study (CD10). This is because it is acknowledged that the housing land position has changed since the 2009-based exercise was completed. Instead of revisiting all the sites and programming in the 2009 Urban Capacity Study, it was decided only to count output from sites which were already in the 2012 housing land audit and sites which were considered non-effective in 2012. As Homes for Scotland were consulted on the audit, they are aware of all the sites providing output from the Urban Capacity Study 2009 in Tables 2 and 3.

In conclusion, the Proposed Plan (as modified) has allocated a generous supply of land to meet the optimistic all-tenure housing supply target for both plan periods. The generosity level has been impacted upon by low levels of completions 2009-2012, rather than a shortage of land. Any emerging shortfall in the private sector supply in the first period can be met by bringing sites forward from the 2020-25 period, or the development of sites indicatively identified for affordable housing should the market require it. No modification is therefore proposed.

#### Range and Choice of Housing Sites

As part of the pre-MIR consultation, a 'call for sites' exercise was undertaken, asking for potential new housing sites to be identified. This resulted in nine sites being identified by developers/landowners. These potential sites were included in the MIR (CD12) and were assessed in the MIR Background Report: Potential New Housing Sites (CD13). Four were considered to be effective new development opportunities and have been included in Schedule 4 of the Proposed Plan (as modified): Stirling Road, Bonhill (capacity = 113 units), Lomondgate Area 5 (55), Sandpoint Marina (90) and Rothesay Dock (40). Another three sites proposed by the Council have also been included: Garshake Road (100), Rosebery Place (120) and Stanford Street (120), although none of these sites are expected to provide housing before 2020. The other sites suggested to the Council through the call for sites process have been deemed unacceptable on environmental grounds and/or are unlikely to be effective. Some of these rejected sites are considered in greater detail in the other 'Building Our Communities' Schedule 4s.

The Proposed Plan (as modified) has therefore brought forward all the additional sites for housing promoted during the MIR process which were considered as appropriate for development in terms of environmental impact and policy. These include two greenfield sites, which help to increase the range and choice in the housing land supply. In addition to these sites, the Council's emphasis is on encouraging the existing generous established housing land supply to become effective.

Notwithstanding the above, it is not accepted that the effective housing sites listed

in Schedule 2 and the new allocations listed in Schedule 4 do not provide a reasonable range and choice of sites. In terms of location, the sites are spread throughout West Dunbartonshire, and can be summarised as follows:

<b>Distribution</b>	<b>No. of sites</b>	<b>Capacity</b>
Vale of Leven	6	253
Dumbarton	12	639
Clydebank	11	599
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1,491*</b>

In terms of size (programmed output on sites of a certain size in the period up to 2019) the range is as follows:

<b>Size</b>	<b>No. of sites</b>	<b>Capacity</b>
0-10 units	8	32
11-50 units	5	167
51-100 units	9	581
100+ units	7	711
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1,491*</b>

It is acknowledged that a significant proportion of the total land supply occurs on one site, Queens Quay in Clydebank, but no output is assumed from this site until the end of the first period. Achieving development on this site is a strategic priority for the Council, which is currently being actively progressed.

In terms of type of site, the distribution is as follows:

<b>Type</b>	<b>No. of sites</b>	<b>Capacity</b>
Greenfield	3	208 (14%)
Large Brownfield (50+)	9	920
Infill/small brownfield	17	363
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1,491*</b>

\* Note these figures relate to private sector sites programmed in the period 2012-19 which have not yet started. (1,769-558 = 1,211 in Table 2 plus 280 in Schedule 4).

The distinction is made between large and small brownfield sites because of the ability to create a 'suburban' atmosphere within large brownfield sites for example at Lomondgate in Dumbarton.

In conclusion, it is argued that the effective land supply and new allocations together provide a reasonable range and choice of housing land across West Dunbartonshire. New allocations have been made on greenfield sites, but given the amount of vacant land within the Council area, the emphasis remains on the regeneration of urban sites in line with national, strategic and local planning policy. No modification is therefore proposed.

#### Five year effective land supply

The Plan clearly states annual Housing Supply Targets in Table 2 for both private and affordable housing. The housing land supply is updated annually through the

Housing Land Audit, and the annual targets can be compared for both tenures every year. As stated above, any shortfall can be met by bringing forward land currently programmed in the 2020-25 period.

The Council agrees that there is value in the Plan stating the requirement and the Council's commitment to maintaining a five year land supply. It is suggested to the Reporter that the following paragraph be introduced immediately after Policy BC1:

*“The Council recognises the need to maintain a five year supply of effective housing at all times. The housing land supply position will continue to be monitored annually via the Housing Land Audit. If a shortfall of housing land is identified, priority will be given to bringing existing Local Development Plan sites into the effective supply.”*

**Reporter's conclusions:**

--

**Reporter's recommendations:**

--

<b>Issue 17</b>	<b>DUNTIGLENNAN FIELDS, DUNTOCHER</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 6 – Building Our Communities Schedule 4 (p69) & Table 4 (p70) BC1 (78) Duntigleannan Fields, Duntocher	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p><b><u>Representations to Proposed Plan</u></b></p> <p>Martin Caban (1) Graham Spencer (2) Bill McKinnon (4) Anne Heron (5) Ann McGonigle (7) Harry Borthwick (9) John Mullen (10) Thelma Mullen (11) Stephen Ross (13) William Blair(14) Mr and Mrs Whitehill (15) Edward Pretty(16) James McLinton (19) Marion Henry (24) Douglas Bootland (26) Jigsaw Planning on behalf of Mr and Mrs Cox (34) Jigsaw Planning on behalf of Mr and Mrs McNab (35) Jonathan Muldoon (41) Lorraine Muldoon (42) Margaret and Fraser Smith (43) Irene O'Neill (44) James Arnot (45) Thomas McCran (46) John Greer (47) Clare Shiels (49) Ian Brand (50) John and Margaret Kelly (53) Bruce Hislop (54) Karen Crawford (58) Craig Denholm (59) George Kirkton and Mrs A Kirkton(60) Elsie Stevenson(61) Jigsaw Planning on behalf of Mr A Greer and Miss E Mireylees(62) Jigsaw Planning on behalf of Mr and</p>	<p>Christhel Mullen (104) Iain McAllister (109) Doris Mckay (114) Stephen Reilly (115) Kirsteen Wilson (116) Scottish Natural Heritage(129) Alexandra Cuthbertson (131) Allan Cuthbertson (132) David and Christine Tierney (137) Margaret Kelly (Farm Road) (138) Mr and Mrs Crawshaw (139) Thomas Allan (140) Kathleen McShane (141) Carol Margaret Boyd (142) Margaret Kelly (Mirren Drive) (143) Michael Mullen (144) James Mullen (145) John Mullen Snr (146) Margaret and Les MacKay (147) Christopher Laws (148) Colin Wilson Duncan (149) Raymond McGonigle (150) Graeme Latimer and Karen Sharp (151) William McColm (152) Sandra Annan (153) Alexander McCulloch (154) Isobel McCulloch (155) William Hamilton (156) James O'Brien (157) Genevieve O'Brien (158) Gail Frankland (159) Julie McFarlane (160) Gerard Reilly (161) Stephen Wilson (162) Ronald Smith (163) John McNab (164) Elder (165) Clydebelt (169)</p>	

<p>Mrs K McGinn (63)  Ronald Gray (65)  Thomas Wilkie (66)  Catherine Warden (67)  Natalie and Arnaud Schmidt (69)  Raymond Groves (70)  William Rooney (71)  Gillian Irvine (72)  Patrick Brown (78)  Amanda Jack (85)  Joanne Mullen (87)  Kathleen Mckay (88)  Desmond Clark (90)  Les Ryan(99)  Colin Thomson (100)  Cameron Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (102)</p>	<p>John and Mary McAllister(180)  Mr and Mrs Coll (185)</p> <p><b><u>Representations to Proposed Plan (as modified)</u></b>  Martin Caban (1)  John Mullen (10) (note the following names were attached to this representation – Thelma Mullen, Christhel Mullen, Joanne Mullen, John Mullen Senior, James Mullen, Michael Mullen and Carmen Mullen)  Edward Pretty (16)  Mr and Mrs Cox (34)  Cameron Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (102)  Clydebelt (169)</p>
<p><b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b></p>	<p>The Proposed Plan included the allocation of a site for housing at Duntiglennan Fields, Duntocher. The Proposed Plan (as modified) does not include this allocation.</p>
<p><b>Planning authority’s summary of the representation(s):</b></p>	
<p><b><u>The following is a summary of the representations to the Proposed Plan as originally published (September 2013)</u></b></p> <p>Objections to the inclusion of the Duntiglennan Fields site as a housing opportunity were received from <b>1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16,19, 24, 26, 34, 35, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 78, 85, 87, 88, 90, 99, 100, 104, 109, 114, 115, 116, 131, 132, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 169, 180, 185.</b></p> <p>Reasons included:</p> <p><u>Green Belt</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is in the Green Belt and should remain as Green Belt. Its release for development would not support the settlement strategy outlined in paragraph 4.3 of the Plan.</li> <li>• Nothing has changed since the previous Local Plan Inquiry to suggest that the land no longer meets the objectives of the green belt (Green Belt Boundary Review March 2012 (CD14) and MIR Background Report on Potential New Housing Sites (CD13) both cited) and there is no justification for removing it from the green belt in terms of a change of use since then.</li> <li>• There is a generous supply of brownfield land and this should be developed as a priority.</li> <li>• Release of greenfield sites would result in brownfield sites not being developed.</li> <li>• The fields are good arable/grazing land which is irreplaceable.</li> </ul>	

- West Dunbartonshire Council has already released land from the green belt.

#### Landscape Character

- There will be a loss of visual amenity particularly given that the proposed development is prominent, will affect the skyline and the landscape setting of Duntocher, especially as seen from the historic Roman site in Goldenhill Park.
- It would have a significant impact on the landscape character of the Local Landscape Area of the Kilpatrick Hills.
- **Clydebelt (169)** quotes the Kilpatrick Landscape Area Statement of Importance (CD43) and states that housing should be avoided as it affects views to and from the hills, and that the development would have a significant adverse impact as referred to in Policy GN4.
- **SNH (129)** do not object but state that development of parts of the site would have a significant adverse impact on the Local Landscape Area and the Rugged Moorland Hills landscape character area amounting to significant loss of landscape setting and countryside recreation.

#### Impact on Roads/Accessibility

- The development would result in additional traffic on local roads and junctions, including Mirren Drive, Craigielea Road, Breval Crescent, Hillend Crescent and Cochno Road, and could impact on the operation of Hardgate and Kilbowie roundabouts at busy times. However, Farm Road is highlighted as having particular problems which would be worsened by additional development. It is considered to be already congested, regularly restricted to single file traffic due to on-street parking and problems exacerbated by steepness, junctions and speed humps.
- **Clydebelt (169)** have referenced concerns of the Head of Roads concerning a proposal for 250 new houses on Cochno Road that was considered at the Clydebank Local Plan Inquiry 2003 (SD17.5)
- Congestion is currently exacerbated by school, football and church traffic, there is a concern that emergency vehicles may not be able to gain access when required and that the road is dangerous to pedestrians.
- Heavy construction vehicles would only exacerbate the current problems.
- There could be access difficulties for emergency vehicles.
- The proposed development site is not accessible to a train station or other public transport and services, and is therefore contrary to Proposed Policy DS3.
- Bus services have already been re-routed because of the congestion, and it seems unlikely that the new development could be served by public transport.

#### No change from previous position

- The site was rejected at the previous Local Plan Inquiry (CD23) and nothing has changed to suggest it should be designated for another use. The overall conclusion of the Reporter was that the site meets the objectives of the Green Belt and that development would have a significant and adverse impact on the landscape setting of the western edge of Duntocher. The adverse environmental impact significantly outweighs any contribution the site would make to the effective land supply.
- Ironside Farrar Landscape Assessment of Green Belt for WDLP March 2007 (CD25)

- The Main Issues Report background report on Potential New Housing Sites (CD13) highlights that development of the site would have an adverse environmental impact and that it is not well located in terms of accessibility to public transport and other services.

#### Water Supply, drainage and flooding

- The water pressure in the area is already low and likely to be reduced further by any new development.
- Major infrastructure may be required to resolve low water pressure at the higher elevation proposed for development which otherwise would have insufficient mains water pressure.
- Flood water ingress already suffered by residents on Mirren Drive will be exacerbated as a result of the new development.
- Storm water runoff from this development if discharged to the closest watercourse would exacerbate flooding further downstream. If it is to be discharged into the existing storm water system on Farm Road this would require major upgrading as there are already surface water and drainage problems here and further downstream.

#### Education and other facilities

- Local schools and nurseries are already at capacity. In particular St Marys Primary School is full and not able to expand on the current site.
- There would also be added pressure on health facilities and other local services and amenities.

#### Housing Land Supply position

- There is no strategic requirement to release any additional land for housing.
- There is a current surplus of land to provide both private and affordable housing.
- The Proposed Plan allocates land for 900 houses over the required supply so if Duntiglennan Fields were not designated for housing there would still be a generous surplus of land for housing.
- The designation of Green Belt land for housing is not appropriate when there is so much brownfield land available.
- There are plenty of alternative opportunities for housing development and new housing continues to be built in Clydebank.
- There is no market for private housing and there is a surplus of council housing.

#### Nature conservation and the environment

- Duntiglennan Fields support and protect the adjacent moorland habitat (Local Nature Conservation Site – Kilpatrick Braes) and provide habitat for animals and birds including red and amber list bird species such as skylark, linnets and snipe.
- Development on this site will have a negative impact on the environment in general with the loss of open countryside, biodiversity, the network of habitats and the green network and will increase our carbon footprint and pollution.
- Children will lose an opportunity to understand and appreciate nature.

#### Green Network



- This development would have an adverse impact on the Green Network. The area is valued as open space and used for recreation and as an access route (public right of way) to the Kilpatrick Hills.
- Construction and development would threaten trees currently protected by Tree Preservation Order No. 12.
- Development here would provide a good opportunity to link into the open space north of Craigmyle Road providing a circular path round the new green belt fringe.

#### Existing residential amenity

- The proposed development would cause overlooking and lack of privacy to existing residents contrary to Human Rights Act Protocol 1 Article 1
- Issues relating to overshadowing, loss of natural light, loss of view, increase in light pollution also mean the proposal would be contrary to Proposed Plan policies DS1 and BC3.
- There would be a loss of the 'village' atmosphere of Duntocher.
- The proposed development is not well related to the existing development with a poor layout and accessibility standards.

#### Overall benefit

- The development would be of benefit to the developer only and be of detriment to the local community.

#### Support for development

The development will provide more affordable and energy efficient housing and create sustainable employment which is what is needed **(138)**

**Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (102)** support the allocation of the site at Duntiglennan Fields as a new housing allocation identified to supplement the existing land supply and ensure a generous supply of land for housing. The site allocation necessitates a revision to the green belt boundary locally and Taylor Wimpey similarly support that revision. The Council has assessed the housing land supply for the periods 2009 – 2020 and 2020 – 2025 and concluded that there is a demand for further private housing land supply sites to be allocated; the inclusion of Duntiglennan with a capacity of 100 units contributes to a 'generous' supply to 2020 of 17 units. The importance of Duntiglennan as an effective housing land supply site consequently can not be underestimated given the extremely narrow margin of generosity exhibited with this site allocated, which equates to just 0.6% of private housing land, considerably short of the draft Scottish Planning Policy review definition of 10– 20%. Not allocating the site would lead to a shortfall in the effective private housing land supply. The proposed new housing allocation at Duntiglennan is the only private housing land release that can be delivered by 2020 within the Clydebank area, and is the only greenfield release site in Clydebank for the duration of the LDP. The site is considered effective with regard to PAN2/2010.

The release of the site would have a neutral impact on the strength of the green belt boundary, but would present the opportunity to make it more robust. The site specific requirements outlined in Table 4 are acceptable to Taylor Wimpey. The proposed development can be accommodated with no detrimental impact on the

existing road network and can integrate into the existing transportation network.

This representation is supported by the following documents - Transport Assessment (JMP Consultants;) (SD17.4) and Landscape Report and Concept Plan (Ann Nevett Landscape Architects Ltd)(SD17.2 and 17.3).

**The following is a summary of the representations to the Proposed Plan (as modified) (March 2014)**

Support for the deletion of the site

Support for the deletion of Duntiglennan Fields as a housing allocation and the retention of the site as Green Belt was expressed by **1, 10, 16, 34 & 169**.

Objection to the deletion of the site

Taylor Wimpey UK (Ltd) (**102**) object to the deletion of the site as a housing opportunity in the Proposed Plan (as modified). Taylor Wimpey has promoted the site at Duntiglennan Fields as a housing allocation site to contribute to the effective housing land supply in West Dunbartonshire throughout the progress of the new LDP. Inclusion of the site as a housing opportunity has had officer, management and Member support until the Planning Committee's decision to modify the Proposed Plan at their meeting on 26th February, 2014, when officers sought approval to submit the Proposed Plan to Scottish Ministers. No detailed reason has been provided for the proposed modification.

Taylor Wimpey object to the consequential revisions to the proposed green belt boundary. The revised green belt boundary as proposed in the Proposed Plan (prior to any proposed modification) would form a robust defensible green belt boundary and is supported by Scottish Natural Heritage. Scottish Natural Heritage has not objected to the Proposed Plan, the inclusion of site BC1(78) as a new housing allocation site, nor the original revisions to the green belt boundary to accommodate the allocation.

The modification will reduce the private housing land supply by 100 units and the previous marginal provision of a 'generous' housing supply of just 17 units will as a consequence be replaced by a deficit of -87 units for the period to 2020.

It is submitted that as the Council fails to meet its housing land supply target and also fails to provide a 'generous' supply of housing land and flexibility in that supply, and that the proposed modifications will render the Proposed Plan non-compliant with Scottish Planning Policy. The Proposed Plan as modified will also be in conflict with its stated aim (para 6.2.2) of providing sufficient developable and effective land to allow the Council's ambitious housing land supply target to be met.

Other matters are reiterated as per Taylor Wimpey's submission on the Proposed Plan as originally published.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**Modifications sought to the Proposed Plan as originally published (September 2013)**

The removal of the Duntiglennan Fields housing opportunity and/or retention of the site as Green Belt is sought by **(1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 24, 26, 34, 35, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 50, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 69, 70,**

71, 72, 78, 85, 87, 88, 90, 99, 100, 104, 109, 114, 115, 116, 131, 132, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 169, 180, 185)

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** recommend the following changes to the requirements associated with land release at Duntiglennan:

- “restrict development to areas that would have less impact on landscape” should be replaced by “to reduce landscape impacts, built development should avoid the north field, the upper third of the centre field, and the western third of the south-west field”.
- “structural planting etc.” and “retention... of trees and stone walls” should be replaced by “At the undeveloped field fringes, trees and stone walls should be retained, and landscape planting should retain key glimpsed views of the Kilpatricks and maintain a wide, largely semi-natural Green Belt edge”.
- “Provision of direct pedestrian access to Craigielea Road” should be followed by “together with contributions to landscape improvements to the open space”.
- “The layout and design of housing in the centre field should minimise impacts on the rural setting of the steadings off Farm Road”.

#### **Modifications sought to the Proposed Plan (as modified)**

The Proposed Modification and consequential modifications should be abandoned and the Proposed Plan progressed as previously intended with the inclusion of site reference BC1(78) Duntiglennan Fields as a new housing allocation site. **Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (102)**

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

##### Housing Land

It is accepted that there is a negative comparison of private supply with private housing supply targets in the period 2009-2020. However, as discussed in Issue 16 Meeting Housing Requirements, the Council believe that housing supply targets can still be met by the development of the land identified for housing in the Proposed Plan (as modified). This is because the housing land supply remains generous at the all-tenure level in the 2009-2020 period (see Table 2), and because the private sector land supply is generous in the 2020-2025 period (see Table 3). The Plan provides flexibility therefore, in that private sector sites are available to be brought forward if required, or sites indicatively identified for affordable housing could be developed for private sector housing.

In relation to paragraph 2.2.23 of Cameron Planning’s April 2014 representation, it is agreed that the SDP (CD09) advises there is no net shortfall of affordable housing in West Dunbartonshire. However, this in no way means that the generous affordable housing land supply is ‘questionable’. Schedule 3 and the Proposals Map clearly indicate all the sites identified for affordable housing, and the affordable housing supply target can be met even if some of the sites in Schedule 3 are developed for private housing instead. Indeed, in relation to a representation to the Plan, Issue 18 Building Our Communities: Clydebank has suggested that the new allocation at Rothesay Dock (see Schedule 4) could be

developed for private housing rather than affordable. There is also scope for other sites in Clydebank, such as the former school sites (BC1(37), BC1(38) & BC1(39)), to contribute more towards the supply of private housing than is shown in Schedule 2 of the Plan.

With regard to paragraph 2.2.26 of Cameron Planning's April 2014 representation on the modified Plan, in relation to the Housing Land Audit 2013 (SD17.1) the Council do not accept that sites with residential potential should be excluded from the effective land supply, and neither do Homes for Scotland seek this when they are consulted on the audit each year. In relation to 'disputed sites', Table 6 of the Housing Land Audit indicates the reason for dispute. Four of the sites have been disputed by Homes for Scotland because they have not been successfully marketed to a housebuilder. Planning Advice Note 2/2010 (CD63) states that a site will be considered effective if it is in the ownership or control of a party which can be expected to develop it or release it for development, and the Council believe that is the case for these disputed sites in Clydebank. Three of the sites – the former St Andrews, Braidfield and St Eunans schools as referenced above – are identified as Strategic Sites (capable of providing significant economic impact) in the Council's Property and Land Disposal Strategy (CD47) which was approved in 2013. Since its approval further work has been commissioned to undertake a market and technical appraisal of these sites. The Council is therefore active in bringing these sites to the market.

### Green belt

The purpose of the green belt is set out in paragraph 159 of Scottish Planning Policy. It is to:

- direct planned growth to the most appropriate locations and support regeneration,
- protect and enhance the quality, character, landscape setting and identity of towns and cities, and
- protect and give access to open space within and around towns and cities.

The Strategic Development Plan (CD09) reiterates these purposes, and calls for Local Development Plans to identify green belt boundaries (pg 34, para 4.48, SSM8). A Green Belt Boundary Review undertaken for the Local Development Plan Main Issues Report (CD14) 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. An alternative boundary was considered matching the boundaries of the proposed development site and this was not considered in its present state to offer a stronger boundary. 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. The Council is keen that there should be a strong focus on brownfield development in Clydebank, and consider that the release of the Duntiglennan Fields site would dilute this focus. The largest of the brownfield opportunities is the Queens Quay site (section 3.5 and Issue 5). The development and regeneration of this housing-led opportunity is a priority of the Council. Also

available are the three aforementioned former school sites that have been identified as strategic disposal opportunities by the Council. In their current state, these sites and other vacant and derelict sites detract from the appearance and perception of the town, whilst Duntiglennan Fields contributes to its appearance and setting. Development of the brownfield sites will contribute to the amenity of the communities living alongside them and the allocation of these sites has attracted limited objection. Development of the Duntiglennan Fields site does not bring amenity improvements and has attracted significant objections. The development of the Duntiglennan Fields site would dilute focus on the redevelopment of brownfield sites in Clydebank that would bring regeneration benefits.

The argument that green belt land should be released and developed in order to provide a more robust green belt boundary is flawed.

In conclusion, the Council considers that the boundary of the green belt is appropriately identified in the vicinity of Duntiglennan Fields. This boundary helps to direct growth to locations where it will support regeneration, in line with Scottish Planning Policy's purposes of the green belt.

### 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 (CD25). 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 Plan 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 (SD17.3). 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, SNH has 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 (CD64).

From the Council's perspective, the Duntiglennan Fields lie just outside the designated Kilpatrick Hills Local Landscape Area. The Draft Statement of Importance for the Proposed Kilpatrick Hills Local landscape Area (CD43) 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.

#### Impact on Roads/Accessibility

The Council's Roads and Transportation Service consider the Transportation Assessment (SD17.4) submitted in support of the allocation of the site to be acceptable and to demonstrate 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.

Much of the site is within 400 metres of bus services using Craigielea Road and Farm Road, which are detailed in paragraphs 2.7-2.10 of the Taylor Wimpey Transport Assessment.

#### No change from previous position

The Reporter at the previous Local Plan Inquiry (CD23) recommended that the site at Duntiglennan Farm should remain in the green belt and not be included as a housing opportunity. In doing so he concluded that the site 'meets the objectives of the green belt, and that housing development thereon would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape setting of the western edge of Duntocher This adverse environmental impact significantly outweighs any contribution that the site would make to the effective housing land supply.'

#### Water supply, drainage and flooding

Neither SEPA nor Scottish Water have raised concerns in relation to this site. It is considered that these are matters that could be resolved at design stage and do not form part of the Council's case against the release of the site.

#### Education and other facilities

The Council's Educational Services have no concerns about the impact of this development on the capacity of St Mary's Primary School or other facilities. Nor are there concerns about the impact the development of this site would have on other services. This matter does not form part of the Council's case against the release of the site.

#### Nature conservation and the environment

The Duntiglennan Fields are not covered by any nature conservation designation, but sit adjacent to the Kilpatrick Braes Local Nature Conservation Site (CD24). The Landscape Assessment of the Green Belt undertaken for the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (p26) (CD25) concluded the sites were of low biodiversity value due to their management and functions. That said, as a previously undeveloped greenfield site, it is assumed that it hosts a number of species and contributes to the green network as a habitat and wildlife corridor, points made by many of the objectors. Its development would therefore result in the loss of habitats and impact on species.

#### Green Network

Informal recreational access to the Duntiglennan Fields would be lost as a result of development. However, there are no Core Paths or asserted or vindicated rights of way through the site. There is a Tree Preservation Order in effect over the site and there is a risk that trees could be lost through development. Development of the site would increase the urban footprint of Clydebank.

#### Existing residential amenity

There would be a loss of amenity for existing residents. Existing houses would be overlooked and overshadowed by new development, which would be in an elevated position. Existing houses in the vicinity of the site would lose their rural outlook and immediate access to the rural area adversely affecting their amenity.

In conclusion, it is considered that there is sufficient alternative housing sites identified in the Plan to meet the Housing Supply Target and, as per the findings of the Reporter at the last Local Plan Inquiry, it is considered that the adverse environmental impact of the development of this site outweighs the contribution it would make to the effective land supply.

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

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



<b>Issue 18</b>	<b>BUILDING OUR COMMUNITIES: CLYDEBANK ISSUES</b>													
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	<p>Chapter 6 – Building Our Communities  Schedule 2 (p.67):  BC1(35) Former Transfer Station  BC1(39) St. Eunans PS  Schedule 3 (p.68):  BC1(59) Auld Street,  BC1(60) Beardmore Place East and  BC1(62) Caledonia Street  BC1(66) St. Eunans PS  Schedule 4 (p.69)  BC1(79) Rosebery Place  BC1(82) Rothesay Dock</p>	<b>Reporter:</b>												
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>														
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Philip Watt (6)</td> <td>Mr Robbie McEwan (84)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)</td> <td>Mrs Lesley White (133)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Susan Dick (75)</td> <td>Mrs Magdelaine Dick (134)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Graham Parton (76)</td> <td>Mrs Margaret Mearns (167)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hazel Mcfarlane (81)</td> <td>Mrs Jean Mercer (168)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mrs Lesley McEwan (83)</td> <td>Clydebelt (169)</td> </tr> </table>			Philip Watt (6)	Mr Robbie McEwan (84)	Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)	Mrs Lesley White (133)	Susan Dick (75)	Mrs Magdelaine Dick (134)	Graham Parton (76)	Mrs Margaret Mearns (167)	Hazel Mcfarlane (81)	Mrs Jean Mercer (168)	Mrs Lesley McEwan (83)	Clydebelt (169)
Philip Watt (6)	Mr Robbie McEwan (84)													
Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)	Mrs Lesley White (133)													
Susan Dick (75)	Mrs Magdelaine Dick (134)													
Graham Parton (76)	Mrs Margaret Mearns (167)													
Hazel Mcfarlane (81)	Mrs Jean Mercer (168)													
Mrs Lesley McEwan (83)	Clydebelt (169)													
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	<p>This Issue deals with matters arising in the Building Our Communities section of the Plan that affect the Clydebank area, including land proposed for housing in Dalmuir, the former St Eunans Primary School, Rosebery Place and Rothesay Dock.</p>													
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>														
<p><u>Dalmuir housing sites</u></p> <p>Representations have been received from <b>Susan Dick (75), Graham Parton (76), Hazel Mcfarlane (81), Mrs Lesley McEwan (83), Mr Robbie McEwan (84), Mrs Lesley White (133), Mrs Magdelaine Dick (134), Mrs Margaret Mearns (167) and Mrs Jean Mercer (168)</b> in relation to the allocation of the following housing sites in Dalmuir: BC1(35) Former Transfer Station, BC1(59) Auld Street, BC1(60) Beardmore Place East and BC1 (62) Caledonia Street.</p> <p>The main concerns relate to parking and traffic congestion and the impact on two wildlife corridors. The representations state there is a lack of parking for existing residents and businesses and traffic congestion in the area. Both of these would be exacerbated by additional development, which would also make the roads unsafe.</p>														

In addition the sites are in proximity to two important wildlife corridors. It is stated building next to them would not provide for their protection and would have an adverse impact on wildlife and biodiversity. It is considered that these sites are not required because there is a surplus of housing land, and that there is a lack of open green spaces which could be provided on these areas. New development on these sites would cause overshadowing and privacy issues with current homes. Finally it is considered that there is too high a proportion of social housing in Dalmuir.

#### St Eunans PS

**Philip Watt (6)** considers that the whole site should be developed as public open space to redress the longstanding absence of a park in this part of Clydebank. Since the site has been cleared it has been used informally for recreation and access, and the opportunity to develop it as a local park should be safeguarded. There is an overprovision of housing sites so its loss for housing would not be significant.

#### Rosebery Place

**Clydebelt (169)** believe that the existing building should be re-used and not demolished. Demolition would be contrary to Policy DS1 and there are other more suitable brownfield sites for housing in the area. The site would also be better developed as green open space and be part of the Green Network adjacent to the shopping centre and central Clydebank.

#### Rothesay Dock

**Clydeport Operations Ltd (23)** own this vacant brownfield site which forms part of the Queens Quay Our Changing Place. Clydeport is supportive of the principle of residential development on the site but object to the indicative tenure being for affordable housing. Clydeport refers to the decision not to introduce an affordable housing quota policy into the Plan but to specifically identify sites for affordable housing, most of which are in the ownership of the Council or Housing Associations. Clydeport considers it is inconsistent and unfair to impose 100% affordable housing on this site when other sites and private developers are not required to provide affordable housing. It could have a negative impact in terms of promoting development or make it unviable.

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

##### Dalmuir housing sites

None of these sites should be identified for housing **(75, 76, 81,134,167)**.  
All sites should be identified for green open space not housing **(83, 168)**.  
No development including residential on any of these sites **(84)**.  
Allocate BC1(62) Caledonia Street for parking provision and BC1(35) Former Transfer Station, BC1(59) Auld Street, BC1(60) Beardmore Place East as open green space **(133)**.

### St Eunans PS

**Philip Watt (6)** wants the site to be designated site for development as a local park with implementation within the Plan period.

### Rosebery Place

**Clydebelt (169)** want BC1(79) removed as a housing allocation.

### Rothesay Dock

**Clydeport Operations Ltd. (23)** want site BC1(82) allocated for 40 private units.

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

### Dalmuir housing sites

These four sites – BC1(35) Former Transfer Station, BC1(59) Auld Street, BC1(60) Beardmore Place East and BC1 (62) Caledonia Street. – are all identified as housing opportunity sites in the adopted West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22). All are urban, brownfield sites, easily accessible to the services and facilities of Dalmuir. BC1(35) Former Transfer Station is a small derelict site which was considered to be a natural extension to the private housing development under construction to the east. BC1(62) Caledonia Street and BC1(59) Auld Street have both had the benefit of detailed planning consent for social rented housing, and BC1(60) Beardmore Place East has planning permission pending subject to a S.75 agreement. The sites are all suitable for new housing and would benefit the local area by redeveloping sites currently on the Scottish Vacant and Derelict Land Register(CD11). They are of a scale which is not likely to have a significant impact on local traffic and the development management process will ensure that sufficient parking will be provided and that overshadowing and privacy issues are dealt with appropriately. The suitability of these sites for housing has been long established and they contribute to the generous all-tenure land supply which the Council is required to provide.

A dismantled railway line which is designated as a local nature conservation site runs along the southern boundary of BC1(35) and BC1(59), and the Forth and Clyde Canal bounds BC1(60) to the north. None of the proposed development sites will impinge directly on these wildlife corridors, and any adverse impacts can be mitigated by the development management process. The area is well located in relation to the Clydeside Community Park, the core path network and the open space to the south of the canal, indicating that there is sufficient open space in the vicinity.

For these reasons, the Council does not consider it necessary to make any modification to the Proposed Plan.

### St Eunans PS

This is the former site of the St Eunans primary school which was rebuilt on an alternative site as part of the modernisation of the school estate. The Council has prepared a Property and Land Asset Disposal Strategy (CD47) which identifies sites declared surplus which will be disposed of on a prioritised basis and would

have an overall economic benefit to the community. Along with other former school sites, St Eunans is identified as a strategic disposal site which could provide both private and affordable housing within an existing well-established residential area. The site contributes to the generous all-tenure housing land supply that the Council is required to identify and was agreed as effective in 2012.

Any new development will require to be well-connected with the surrounding area with good pedestrian links. Open space will be provided as part of the development, either within the site or within the wider area, taking account of existing provision. Policies DS1 and GN2 will ensure that accessibility and open space issues will be dealt with as part of the development management process.

For these reasons, the Council does not consider it necessary to make any modification to the Proposed Plan.

### Rosebery Place

This site is currently occupied by Council offices. The aspiration of the Council is to rationalise and modernise its property assets, which will result in the Rosebery Place offices becoming surplus to requirements. The site lies to the west of Kilbowie Road and the Clyde Shopping Centre, and is bounded by the Forth and Clyde Canal to the north and by modern private flats to the west. New housing on this site would be ideally located in terms of all services, facilities and public transport, and would have the added benefit of increasing activity along the canal and within the town centre. The site contributes to the private sector housing land supply that the Council is required to identify, is in public ownership and is of a size preferred by the house builders.

The Proposed Plan does not require the existing building to be demolished and conversion to residential use would be possible. However, the existing building does not have any great architectural merit and it is likely to be more cost-effective and provide a better residential design and layout if the site was cleared. Any new development will be required to protect the setting of the Forth and Clyde Canal in line with Policy GN7, and contribute to the green network in line with Policy GN2. The site lies within Clydebank town centre, where open space provision includes the urban space at Three Queens Square and the canal. The canal, which borders the Rosebery Place site, provides a significant green network asset in the area, providing landscaping and green space, core path links and a wildlife corridor. There is no evidence that there is a requirement for additional open space in the locality. New residential development should be orientated towards and integrate with the canal, and will therefore increase canal side activity and supervision.

For these reasons, the Council does not consider it necessary to make any modification to the Proposed Plan.

### Rothesay Dock

The owners of this site agree with the principle of residential development in this location, but consider that it should not be identified for affordable housing. The site was originally considered as a second phase of development to follow on

from the successful Clydebank Housing Association development completed at Cart Street in 2009. However, it no longer features as a potential project in the latest Strategic Housing Investment Plan(CD32).

The tenure split proposed in Schedules 2 and 3 of the Proposed Plan is indicative, and the Plan suggests that any change to tenure is likely to be acceptable where there is no significant impact on the tenure-specific targets (paragraph 6.2.9). Given that there is greater generosity in the affordable housing land supply than in the private sector supply in the period to 2020, it is accepted that Schedule 4 can be amended to indicate that the indicative tenure for the Rothesay Dock site is private, with the necessary amendments to Table 2 (rows I, J and K).

The Reporter is therefore invited to make this modification to Schedule 4 and Table 2.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

--

**Reporter's recommendations:**

--

<b>Issue 19</b>	<b>BUILDING OUR COMMUNITIES: DUMBARTON AND MILTON ISSUES</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 6 – Building Our Communities Table 2 (p.60) Schedule 2 (p.66) BC1(14) Dumbarton FC BC1 (20) Crosslet House BC1(21) Milton Brae Schedule 3 (p.68) BC1(51) Valeview Terrace BC1(56) Dalreoch Quarry North BC1(58) Townend Road	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Mrs Sara McCuaig (8) Shona Gordon (17) Lefarge Tarmac Limited (22) Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57) Senga Oliver (89) Woodland Trust Scotland (93) Mary McCallion (97) Dumbarton Football Club (130)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	This Issue deals with matters arising in the Building our Communities section of the Plan that affect the Dumbarton and Milton areas including land proposed for housing at Dumbuckhill Quarry, Castle Road, Crosslet House, Milton Brae, Valeview Terrace, Dalreoch Quarry North and Townend Road.	
<b>Planning authority’s summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<u>Dumbuckhill Quarry</u>  <b>Lefarge Tarmac Limited (22)</b> considers that Table 2 illustrates that the generosity of the housing land supply is inadequate, particularly given historic low level of completions. They consider the inclusion of alternative development sites is necessary in order to ensure demand can be met. Lefarge Tarmac Limited own land to the west of Lennox Avenue and Colquhoun Road, Milton, and between Barnhill Road/Hunter’s Avenue and Dumbuckhill Quarry. They consider that this land has no major environmental or infrastructure constraints, has benefits over allocated sites such as those in Bowling, and can deliver housing now.  <u>Dumbarton Football Stadium</u>		

**Dumbarton Football Club (130)** supports the allocation of their existing stadium for residential purposes after it has relocated. However, it notes that the capacity of BC1(14) in Schedule 2 reflects the current planning application for 37 units, and no allowance has been made for residential development on the remainder of the stadium site. The club expect to have relocated in time to allow the redevelopment of the remainder of the site by 2025, which they consider could have a total capacity of up to 200 dwellings.

#### Crosslet House

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)** note that the site is a well-used open space with extensive tree cover and conservation and wildlife value, which could be part of a green network opportunity. Access from A82 would also be problematic. The **Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** state that its development would result in the loss of ancient woodland.

#### Milton Brae

**Lefarge Tarmac Limited (22)** objects to the inclusion of this site for housing as they consider it to be undeliverable due to an unwilling owner. Lefarge own a substantial amount of land in Milton. They propose the replacement of the Milton Brae site with land to the west of Milton which they own and consider is able to deliver private and affordable housing now. The **Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** considers that the Milton Brae site should not be brought forward unless the protection of the adjacent woodland can be guaranteed.

#### Valeview Terrace

**Senga Oliver (89)** notes that the site is greenfield and forms a continuous green space alongside Stirling Road. There are plenty of brownfield sites both within Dumbarton and Bellsmyre which should be used to provide affordable housing for local needs. In addition the proposed development would entail the loss of an extensive grassed area and ecological features. The Council may be disposing of land designated as open space in order to benefit financially from the sale. **Mrs Sara McCuaig (8)** and **Senga Oliver (89)** consider that development on this site would alter the landscape, detract from the view and destroy the natural beauty of the area. Any works would be dangerous, cause noise and air pollution and would compromise the privacy of an existing property.

#### Dalreoch Quarry North

**Mary McCallion (97)** believes that the flora and fauna of the quarry needs to be conserved and development would destroy the character and landscape of the area. Para 6.2.1 states that there is no net shortfall of affordable housing in West Dunbartonshire expected in the period to 2025, so removal of this site should not have an adverse impact. The development could have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of existing residents in Quarry Place and result in the loss of privacy.

#### Townend Road

**Shona Gordon (17)** and **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)** consider that there is a lack of parking and a proper children's playground in this area. There is also a need for more allotments/community gardens and this site would be ideal. In addition **Shona Gordon (17)** believes that there is a Right of Way across this land allowing access to Braehead Primary School; it is imperative that this is maintained if the site is developed.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

Dumbuckhill Quarry

**Lefarge Tarmac Limited (22)** seeks additional land allocations in Milton and west of Dumbuckhill Quarry.

Dumbarton Football Stadium

**Dumbarton Football Club (130)** wish to see Schedule 2 amended to include provision for up to 200 dwellings on their stadium site BC1(14) for the period 2019-2025.

Crosslet House

**Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)** want the site to be re-designated as an Open Space/Environmental Improvement Opportunity – Local Park and Woodland, or alternatively re-designated for a Care Home.

The **Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** wish to see the site allocation deleted due to the direct loss of ancient woodland.

Milton Brae

**Lefarge Tarmac Limited (22)** wish to see the inclusion of land west of Lennox Road and Colquhoun Road Milton for a modest residential extension in lieu of Milton Brae BC1(21). **Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** request that sufficient buffering between the proposed development and the woodland should be identified in planning policy at the appropriate stage.

Valeview Terrace

**Mrs Sara McCuaig (8)** and **Senga Oliver (89)** both want to see the removal of BC1(51) as a site reserved for housing development.

Dalreoch Quarry North

**Mary McCallion (97)** wants Dalreoch Quarry North removed as a housing opportunity site and retained as an open space woodland area within the green belt. If this is not acceptable, support development of 1-bedroom bungalows for social rent as there is a shortage of this type of housing in Dumbarton West.

Townend Road

**Shona Gordon (17)** wishes to see this land used for the community –



playground, allotments and parking, and the right of way maintained. **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)** want the area to be re-designated as useable public open space.

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

Dumbuckhill Quarry

The Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan May 2012 (CD09) indicates in Schedules 8 and 9 that in the preliminary and indicative comparison of private sector supply and demand there is a surplus of housing supply to both 2020 and 2025 in the Dumbarton and Vale of Leven Housing Market Area. Schedule 10 indicates also that there is no shortfall of affordable housing in West Dunbartonshire within these two periods either. In order to ensure that demand is met, West Dunbartonshire's Local Housing Strategy November 2011 (see paragraph 5.6.7) (CD31) has set housing supply targets in excess of the indicative all-tenure housing requirement in Schedule 11A of the Strategic Development Plan. These are set out in Tables 2 and 3 of the Proposed Plan.

Table 2 in the Proposed Plan indicates that there is a requirement for 3,520 all tenure houses up to 2020, and the supply is 3,807, giving a generosity allowance of 8%. The level of generosity in the 2020-25 period is significantly higher at 27%. It is acknowledged that the private sector housing land supply does not have this level of generosity, particularly in the period to 2020. However, the Housing Land Audit 2012 (CD33) indicates that the effective private sector housing land supply in the Dumbarton and Vale of Leven area accounts for two thirds of the West Dunbartonshire housing land supply and includes the only greenfield effective land in West Dunbartonshire. In addition, Schedule 4 of the Proposed Plan indicates that two additional greenfield sites are being released in the Dumbarton and Vale of Leven area at Stirling Road and Lomondgate to augment the effective supply in this area. As there is no strategic requirement to release additional land in this housing market area, and the housing supply has already been augmented by two releases to ensure choice and generosity as required by SPP, it is concluded that any additional release in the Dumbarton area is not required. This supports the settlement strategy (para 4.3 of the Proposed Plan) which indicates that greenfield development outwith the urban area would be less sustainable and reduce the focus on the regeneration of brownfield sites and the urban area as a whole.

Land at Dumbuckhill was included as a potential opportunity for release in the West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan Main Issues Report (CD12) (see Option 17a) having been promoted by the landowner. The WDLDP MIR Background Report: Green Belt Boundary Review March 2012 (CD14) categorised the green belt boundary in this location as very robust along the A82, robust at Milton west and weak at Barnhill Road (see locations 29, 30 and 32). The WDLDP MIR Background Report: Potential New Housing Sites March 2012 (CD13) made a brief assessment of all the sites highlighted in Issue 17a. The current representation does not include a map of the land proposed for release at Dumbuckhill and proposes an allocation 'in whole or in part'; therefore the boundaries of the land in question are unclear. However, the Background Report on potential new housing sites noted that the land is steeply sloping; the

allocation of the sites would weaken the green belt boundary and be visually intrusive. They would also be unlikely to be deliverable in the short term. A much larger site was considered by the Reporter at the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan Inquiry (CD23), who concluded that development, even on only part of the site, would have an adverse environmental impact and in addition would be likely to be detrimental to traffic safety. The adverse environmental impact of development at this location was confirmed by the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the housing land options (CD17).

Any new housing at this location would be likely to have an adverse landscape impact on the setting of the village of Milton and be visually prominent from the A82 Trunk Road. Access to the A82 would have to be taken from via the existing junctions, which could be difficult to obtain. Transport Scotland would require a full assessment to determine the nature and scale of impacts on the A82 (CD55). Since the MIR was published the Dumbuckhill Quarry has restarted operations under new owners. These operations could have implications for the residential amenity of any new housing in the immediate vicinity.

One of the principle arguments is that the land proposed for release is effective because it is in the hands of an owner willing to release the land for development. However, no further evidence is provided to indicate that these sites are immediately effective and could produce houses by 2020. To become effective the sites would have to overcome physical and infrastructure challenges and they would have to be acquired and considered marketable by a house builder.

In conclusion, contrary to the landowners view, the Council believe that there are major environmental and infrastructure constraints which make this site both inappropriate for development and non-effective. For these reasons, the Council does not consider it necessary to make any modifications as proposed by **Lefarge Tarmac Limited (22)**.

#### Dumbarton Football Stadium

Para 3.4.14 of the Proposed Plan indicates that residential use is supported as a suitable use for the whole current stadium site. Given the sensitive nature of the site adjacent to Dumbarton Castle and the Dumbarton Rock SSSI, a masterplan should be prepared and any application accompanied by a design statement. This will ensure that any new development is design-led and a buffer is provided between it and the Castle. Uses that would increase the attractiveness of Dumbarton Castle to visitors would also be supported on this site. Schedule 2: Opportunities for Private Housing in the Proposed Plan indicates a housing capacity of 37, which reflects the number of units with consent on unused land to north and east of the pitch and stand. Whilst it is not unreasonable to reflect additional capacity on the remainder of this site, its sensitive location means that the potential density on the site is not likely to be as high as on adjacent sites or as high as that being proposed by Dumbarton FC. Given these considerations it is suggested that an indicative capacity of 100 units should be attributed to the stadium site.

The Reporter is invited to modify the indicative capacity for site BC1(14) in Schedule 2 to 100, for all output in the 2019-2025 period.

### Crosslet House

The principle of residential use on this site was established in the Dumbarton District, District Wide Local Plan March 1999 (CD28), and it is identified in the adopted West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22) with an indicative capacity of 40 units. It is owned by the Council, and is included in the Council's Property and Land Asset Disposal Strategy (CD47) as a strategic disposal site. At the Inquiry into the current Local Plan (CD23) the Reporter concluded that there was insufficient justification to delete the housing opportunity and designate the site as green belt or open space. It is acknowledged that the site is in attractive parkland, and that access onto the A82 would have to be via the existing junction with Argyll Avenue. These issues have ensured that the capacity of the site remains restricted. This low density will allow significant areas of open space, woodland and areas of nature conservation value to be retained, and protect the visual and residential amenity of the site. The inclusion of a greenfield site for low density housing contributes to choice and quality within the housing land supply. In supporting the potential re-designation of the site for a Care Home, the Community Council accepts that some built development for residential use would be acceptable on the site.

The Scottish Natural Heritage Inventory of Ancient Woodland indicates that less than 20% of the site is covered by long established woodland of plantation origin. The loss of ancient woodland will be minimised by the low density proposed on the site and appropriate design and layout which will be dealt with as part of the development management process with reference to Policies DS1 and GN5.

For these reasons, the Council does not consider it necessary to make any modifications as proposed by **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)** and **Woodland Trust Scotland (93)**.

### Milton Brae

The site is in the adopted West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22) and there has been no local objection to its continued inclusion. It provides an attractive, small, greenfield site within the Milton village envelope. The site is in the private ownership of the owners of Milton House, which is currently on the market separately from the land. It has been marketed in the past and has been the subject of developer interest. There is no evidence to suggest that it cannot be successfully marketed and deliver housing within the timescale of the plan and should therefore be retained as part of the housing supply.

The SNH Inventory of Ancient Woodland indicates the existence of ancient woodland along the Milton Burn. There is already a buffer between this woodland and the site, and the trees within this buffer are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. Any additional protection of the ancient woodland in this location can be dealt with satisfactorily as part of the development management process with reference to Policy GN5.

For these reasons the Council does not consider it necessary to make any modifications as proposed by **Lefarge Tarmac Limited (22)** and **Woodland**

## **Trust Scotland (93).**

### Valeview Terrace

The Valeview Terrace site is in the adopted West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22) as a residential opportunity site and has had two planning permissions granted in the past eight years, both of which have now lapsed. The greenfield site provides an element of choice in the affordable housing land supply. The area is not designated as open space, and consists of agricultural grassland of low nature conservation value. The topography of the site and the density proposed means that there will be a significant proportion of structural landscaping and open space provided within the development which will be required to conform with Policy GN2. The retention of existing trees and hedgerows, the provision of new planting and the introduction of private garden space will increase the biodiversity of the site. The overall impact of the development, particularly on the existing residential amenity, can be limited as part of the development management process. The site is in the ownership of Bellsmyre Housing Association, not West Dunbartonshire Council.

For these reasons the Council does not consider it necessary to make any modifications proposed by **Mrs Sara McCuaig (8)** and **Senga Oliver (89)**.

### Dalreoch Quarry North

The Dalreoch Quarry North site is in the adopted West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22) as a residential opportunity site. Although the whole site is identified for potential development, the physical nature of the site restricts the developable area, and this is reflected in the indicative capacity of the site. This restriction in the developable area will also protect the local nature conservation site interest of the site, as much of the woodland and rock face elements will not be developed. The site is not currently within the green belt and the green belt boundary at this location is very robust. The site is identified for social rented housing, and the specific type of housing provided on the site will reflect what are assessed as the particular needs at the time. Table 3 in the Proposed Plan indicates that there is a shortfall in the affordable housing land supply in the period 2020-2025, which this site helps to reduce. The residential amenity of the surrounding area will be protected by the development management process.

For these reasons the Council does not consider it necessary to make any modification as proposed by **Mary McCallion (97)**.

### Townend Road

Townend Road is identified as a site for social rented housing in the adopted West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22). It lies adjacent to a similar sized site which is a school playing field, and also a small area of land used as an eco-school site. The site is also close to the Meadows, a significant area of parkland and recreation facilities. It is considered therefore that there is no need for additional useable public open space on the Townend Road site, as evidenced by the Main Issues Report Background Report on Open Space Analysis (CD35). A path runs within the site from Chapelton Gardens to Allan Place and provides

pedestrian access to Braehead Primary School. The development management process could ensure that a pedestrian link is retained as part of any planning permission if this is considered desirable to retain connectivity in the area. There is currently no vehicular access to the site and it is unclear what requirement additional parking on the site would serve.

Table 3 in the Proposed Plan indicates that there is a shortfall in the affordable housing land supply in the period 2020-2025, which this site helps to address. It is a brownfield site, used previously for a mixture of urban uses, and now surrounded by a school and established residential areas.

For these reasons the Council does not consider it necessary to make any modification as proposed by **Shona Gordon (17)** and **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council (57)**.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 20</b>	<b>STIRLING ROAD, BONHILL</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 6 – Building Our Communities Schedule 4 (p69) & Table 4 (p70) BC1 (71) Stirling Road, Bonhill	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p>Elaine Somerville (3) Loch Lomond Rugby Football Club (52) Barratt Homes West Scotland (77) Woodland Trust Scotland (93) Scottish Natural Heritage (129)</p>		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	This Issue relates to the allocation of a site for housing at Stirling Road, Bonhill BC1(71)	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><b>Barratt Homes West Scotland (77)</b> are promoting this site for development and <b>Loch Lomond Rugby Football Club (52)</b> are supporting the development. An objection to the development has been received from <b>Elaine Somerville (3)</b>, and representations on the proposal have been received from <b>Woodland Trust Scotland (93)</b> and <b>Scottish Natural Heritage (129)</b>.</p> <p><u>Housing Land</u></p> <p><b>Elaine Somerville (3)</b> considers that there are enough brownfield sites for housing in the local area, and that development at Stirling Road would result in the loss of valuable green space that adds to the quality of life of existing residents. She questions in particular the justification for new private housing at a time of difficulty in the mortgage market, and cites the development at Lomondgate where there has already been significant loss of green space and where new private housebuilding is still ongoing.</p> <p><b>Barratt Homes West Scotland (77)</b> have stated that the site is effective (unlike much of the brownfield land supply), immediately available and in their ownership. It will provide choice in the housing land supply and they are confident the site will deliver a range of new housing within the Plan period to 2020 including an element of affordable housing. Cube Housing Association have stated that they are happy to be the affordable housing partner for the development which fits well with their growth strategy and management arrangements of existing stock.</p> <p><u>Traffic Congestion and Flooding Issues</u></p>		



**Elaine Somerville (3)** is concerned that the development would worsen existing traffic congestion and also exacerbate existing flooding problems. **Barratt Homes West Scotland (77)** have provided a Transport Assessment (SD20.2) which suggests that there will be minimal impact on the operation of the surrounding road network and no capacity concerns in relation to the existing Redburn roundabout or the proposed new roundabout further south at the Strathleven Drive/A813 junction. Sustainable travel will be promoted and the site is considered to be well located in terms of public transport and walking and cycling routes. In relation to drainage, it is proposed that surface water will be discharged to the watercourse on the northern boundary of the site after appropriate attenuation and treatment. The developers consider that the introduction of a positive surface water drainage system will result in the reduction of surface water run-off discharging onto the A813.

#### Leisure Facilities

The **Loch Lomond Rugby Football Club (52)** supports the allocation which will help improve the Club's facilities. **Barratt Homes West Scotland (77)** has agreed to provide new/improved facilities as required in Table 4.

#### Ancient Woodland, Green Network and Table 4 Requirements

**Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** objects to the allocation of the site unless the protection of the adjacent ancient woodland can be guaranteed. **Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** consider that the development of the site at Stirling Road would provide important opportunities for Green Network provision and enhancements, and consider that Green Network provision would be important in helping offset the loss of Green Belt. **Barratt Homes West Scotland (77)** are happy to comply with the requirements in Table 4 with the exception of the requirement that the development should front the A813. They consider the elevation and surface water drainage arrangements are such that development could not successfully provide an active frontage with a direct relationship with the A813.

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

##### Housing Land

**Elaine Somerville (3)** is opposed to the proposed development BC1(71) at Stirling Road.

##### Ancient Woodland, Green Network and Table 4 Requirements

**The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** requests that sufficient buffering between proposed development and the adjacent ancient woodland should be identified in planning policy at the appropriate stage.

**Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** recommends the following amendments and additions to Table 4:

- The requirements of housing fronting onto the A813, and a new footpath alongside the road, should be integrated with retention of the existing trees

and hedges along the A813 wherever possible, to form a multifunctional link

- Other multifunctional green links should be developed through the site, with paths linking into the adjacent LNCS woodland. Developer contributions to low-impact access provision / enhancement within the woodland would complement this
- South of the Rugby Club landform, the new Green Belt edge should be permeable and integrated with open space to encourage people to use the Green Belt. The proposed Table 4 requirement of “structural planting to strengthen [the] boundary” could result in a screen of trees here, with housing turning its back on the Green Belt.

**Barratt Homes West Scotland (77)** proposes to modify Table 4, where instead of the requirement for the development to front the A813, that “an area of landscaping is reserved along the A813, with active frontages envisaged onto the internal streets within the development”.

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

##### Housing Land

It is agreed that there is a significant amount of brownfield land identified for housing in West Dunbartonshire and that prioritising the redevelopment of such urban land is reflected in national, strategic and local planning policy. However, the Council is also required to meet specific housing targets based on the outcome of the Housing Need and Demand Assessment, and there is a need to provide sufficient effective land which can allow the delivery of housing in the period to 2020. A significant proportion of the brownfield land supply is currently considered to be non-effective due to physical, marketing and ownership constraints particularly as a result of the current financial difficulties in the housing market. As a result of the need to identify a range and choice of sites to ensure a generous effective housing land supply, as required by SPP, the Council has allocated a number of additional sites listed in Schedule 4, including Stirling Road. Deletion of this site would reduce further the flexibility in the private sector housing land supply in the first Plan period.

The Stirling Road site is in the ownership of Barratt Homes West Scotland who consider the site to be effective and capable of delivering housing in the period up to 2020. The Council agree that this site is effective, and welcome its contribution to choice and flexibility in the private housing land supply. It will not only offer private housing but an element of social rented housing too.

The Council does not consider it is necessary to make the modification proposed by **Elaine Somerville (3)**.

##### Traffic congestion and flooding issues

The site will be accessed by a new roundabout at the existing Strathleven Drive/ A813 junction. A Transport Assessment (SD20.2) has been prepared indicating that there will be minimal impact on the operation of the surrounding road network



and no capacity concerns in relation to the existing Redburn roundabout or the new junction with the A813. Transport Scotland states that it is unlikely that the allocation would have any significant impact on the A82 Trunk Road (CD55).

In relation to drainage, it is proposed that surface water from the site will be discharged to the watercourse on the northern boundary after appropriate attenuation and treatment. The developers consider that the introduction of a positive surface water drainage system will result in the reduction of surface water run-off discharging onto the A813. The conceptual drainage statement being proposed is in principle acceptable to SEPA, who expect the developer to work with Scottish Water to ensure the design fully meets their specifications (CD57).

#### Ancient Woodland, Green Network and Table 4 requirements

Both Croft Huggan, immediately to the north of the development site and Beech Wood, which lies to the east of the rugby club, are identified as ancient woodland, and protected by Tree Preservation Orders. Protection of this woodland during construction and thereafter will be provided by the development management process with regard to policies DS1 and GN5.

The Council does not consider it is necessary to make any modification as proposed by **The Woodland Trust Scotland (93)**.

In respect of **Scottish Natural Heritage (129)** modifications, the detailed design and layout of the site will have regard to the criteria in DS1 and be required to follow the integrating green infrastructure approach in line with Policy GN2. Green network provision and enhancement will help to offset the loss of Green Belt, and develop multifunctional green links. The management and maintenance of the adjacent woodland, which is under the control of the developers, does not extend to a level at which ongoing risk-free public access to the woodland can be guaranteed. It is considered inappropriate that such a long-term burden be put on the developers or the owners of new homes on the site through a factoring agreement, and attempts to develop a community woodland here have failed. Therefore, the provision of paths into the woodland as part of the development is not supported. In relation to structural planting, it remains important to create a new robust Green Belt boundary to the east and south of the site. This however can still allow an element of permeability and be integrated with the open space beyond.

For the reasons noted above, the Council does not consider that it is necessary to make any modification as proposed by **Scottish Natural Heritage (129)**.

In relation to Table 4, the requirement that housing will front the A813 will be retained. It is believed that a design solution can be found to ensure that the new development will not turn its back on the A813. Such a design solution could still include a landscape buffer.

The Council does not consider that it is necessary to make any modification as proposed by **Barratt Homes West Scotland (77)**.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 21</b>	<b>BUILDING OUR COMMUNITIES: VALE OF LEVEN ISSUES</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 6 – Building Our Communities Schedule 5 (p71) Schedule 6 (p71) BC4(1) Adjacent to Vale of Leven Cemetery	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Kirsty Davison (18) Asset Crest Investments Limited (121) Vale of Leven Golf Club (126) Irene Muirhead (186)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	This Issue deals with matters arising in the Building Our Communities section of the Plan that affect the Vale of Leven area. They include a site proposed for a care home at Lesser Boll of Meal, Alexandria which is designated as open space; an extension to Vale of Leven cemetery; and land proposed for housing at Vale of Leven Golf course.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Proposed Care Home site at Lesser Boll of Meal, Alexandria</u></p> <p><b>Asset Crest Investments Limited (121)</b> currently have consent for a care home, a proposal which has not been reflected in the Proposed Plan. The company has provided evidence to support the case for the development, including a letter of support from the Director of West Dunbartonshire Community Health and Care Partnership stating that additional high quality nursing home capacity would have a clear fit with West Dunbartonshire's vision for older people's services. West Dunbartonshire is looking to replace existing Council run homes with improved accommodation, showing there is strong demand for such services in the area. The company would provide local training and employment and do business with local suppliers.</p> <p>An additional representation, submitted by MacRoberts on behalf of Asset Crest Investments Ltd, was received in response to the consultation on the Proposed Plan (as modified). This seeks the continued identification of the site as a Public Service Opportunity as per the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22). Further, it states that the Lesser Boll of Meal site is included in Schedule 5 of the Proposed Plan; has had Roads Construction Consent drawings developed for it; is subject to an agreement with the Council in relation to accessing the site; and has the support of health professionals as a nursing home. Points are made in</p>		

relation to a letter sent by the Council on 17 January 2014 concerning an extant application to renew planning permission for a nursing home on the site. These are: the site has been previously developed and may be subject to contamination; that there is no justification that there are more appropriate and better accessed brownfield sites for new care homes; the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan did not consider the allocation of the site as a care home to be incompatible with its designation as a Local Nature Conservation Site, the site makes little contribution to the nature conservation value of the wider LNCS and that allocating it as open space will not achieve its environmental betterment.

#### Vale of Leven cemetery extension

**Kirsty Davison (18)** notes that the proposed cemetery extension is separated from the existing cemetery and is therefore a standalone new development rather than an extension. The private road separating the two provides pedestrian and vehicular access to the rural and green network and would be compromised with additional vehicular traffic. The proposed site is not a sustainable location because it will be predominantly accessed by car and is located in the designated greenbelt not within the urban area. It will be highly visible from the A82 as it approaches the gateway to the Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park. More suitable land to the north, south or west of the existing cemetery would provide a more coherent development, could use existing access and would be less visible. More environmentally sustainable solutions to traditional burials should be considered.

As the owner of the land, **Irene Muirhead (186)** states that she was not notified of this proposal before the Proposed Plan was published. She believes the site is critical to the viability of her business and has offered alternative land immediately adjacent to the cemetery which would lead to a more coherent development with less visual impact.

#### Residential development at Vale of Leven Golf Club

The **Vale of Leven Golf Club (126)** is considering a significant investment to upgrade its existing facilities and develop and extend the existing golf course. It is considered that this investment is necessary to ensure the long term financial viability of the club. An element of enabling development will be necessary to help fund these improvements. The Club are therefore proposing the release of around 4.5 hectares from the green belt east of Northfield Road and Steadings Drive which could accommodate a mix of 74 residential units, improved club facilities and possibly some commercial development. The precise boundary of the land to be removed would be subject to discussions with the Council. The proposed development would provide a range of other benefits to the Club and local area including improved traffic management, resolution of drainage issues and enhanced biodiversity. It is acknowledged by the Club that ideally this proposal should have come forward earlier in the LDP process.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

Proposed Care Home site at Lesser Boll of Meal, Alexandria

**Asset Crest Investments Limited (121)** wish to see the site identified as a Public Service Opportunity.

Vale of Leven Cemetery

**Kirsty Davison (18)** wants the location of the proposed cemetery extension to be reconsidered. In particular all feasible sites, including those to the north, south and west of the existing cemetery, should also be rezoned for a cemetery extension until such time as further investigative and feasibility works are undertaken to inform a final decision on siting.

**Irene Muirhead (186)** suggests rezoning all areas suggested with a view to further negotiations resulting in the most suitable area for all concerned.

Vale of Leven Golf Club

The **Vale of Leven Golf Club (126)** want to see the removal of land from the designated green belt for housing development in order to enable its development for residential purposes.

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

Proposed Care Home site at Lesser Boll of Meal, Alexandria

There has been a history of planning applications in relation to this site. The original application for the erection of a residential care home was submitted in March 1996. It was refused by the Council in December 1996, the grounds being that: the access was narrow and congested; there would be unacceptable noise levels during construction and for new residents from railway line and football pitch; visual amenity; the detrimental effect on a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and the proposal being contrary to Local Plan No.1 (CD29), which envisaged redevelopment for recreational open space.

However, consent was granted on appeal in May 1997. The Reporter took into account the replacement Dumbarton District, District Wide Local Plan (CD28), which identified the site as a General Redevelopment Opportunity for housing, and considered that any potentially negative impacts of the development could be adequately covered by conditions attached to any planning permission. This outline consent was then renewed in June 2000 and June 2003. In August 2005 a reserved matters application was approved, and an extension of the time period for commencement of the development was approved in November 2008. An application was submitted in September 2013 to again extend the time period for commencement of this development. The applicant has been advised that additional information would be required to progress the application including up to date flood risk assessment, drainage impact assessment, site investigation/contamination report, tree survey and ecological study. This has not yet been provided.

The adopted West Dunbartonshire Local Plan (CD22) identifies the site for a nursing home, reflecting the above planning permission. However, given that the development had not started on site during the last 17 years, and that planning permission was once again due to expire, its continued identification for this type of development was reconsidered at the Main Issues Report stage. This reflected SPP (CD03) which states that the development plan should contain policies and proposals that will achieve predictable outcomes, and that monitoring should consider whether land allocations have proved viable in setting the direction of the review of the plan. Table 30.3 "West Dunbartonshire Local Plan Sites No Longer Considered Development Opportunities" in the Main Issues Report (CD12) indicates that the preferred use for the Lesser Boll of Meal Park in the Local Development Plan is open space. This followed from a review of all West Dunbartonshire Local Plan development opportunity sites undertaken as part of the Local Development Plan process (CD16) which recommended that the Lesser Boll of Meal site should be removed as a development opportunity as it was greenfield, a Local Nature Conservation Site, and more appropriate brownfield opportunities existed for such development. This recommendation was implemented in the Local Development Plan.

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. Understood to previously have been a gravel quarry, it is now difficult to distinguish 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 (CD24), particularly in relation to its mature trees and the connectivity of the area to surrounding habitats.

The site is potentially at risk from flooding during a 1:200-year flood event. Opportunities for four care homes have been identified in Schedule 5 of the Local Development Plan. None of these opportunities are affected by Local Nature Conservation Sites and all will result in the redevelopment of brownfield sites.

Turning to the matters raised by the objector:

- The Director of the Community Health and Care Partnership is responsible for older people's services within West Dunbartonshire. The CHCP were consulted during the preparation of the Main Issues Report and Proposed Plan and raised no objection to the Lesser Boll of Meal site being removed as a care home opportunity. The Local Development Plan identifies opportunities for four new care homes in West Dunbartonshire (Schedule 5), and the Council is currently seeking to identify sites for two new homes on sites other than those identified in that Schedule.
- The Lesser Boll of Meal site is not allocated in Schedule 5 of the Proposed Plan and is not shown on the Proposals Map. Confusion may have arisen here because site BC2(1) Heather Avenue in Schedule 5, which is shown on the Proposals Map, refers to another care home site in the same vicinity.
- The preparation of Road Construction Consent drawings is not relevant to the suitability of the site for a care home in principle.
- Whilst there have been past discussions between the Council and a potential

developer of the site regarding the sale of land by the Council to enable the site to be accessed, no agreement was concluded, and there have been no recent discussions on this matter.

- It is arguable as to whether the site meets the definition of greenfield as set out in the Local Development Plan. The site was previously developed, but has naturally regenerated to form part of a woodland. The existence of contamination on the site is still to be investigated.
- Whilst the 2010 Local Plan allocates a nursing home on the Fishers Wood and Boat House Wood Local Nature Conservation Site, the review of the development plan and renewal of the planning permission presents the opportunity to review this.

In conclusion, the Council do not consider the Lesser Boll of Meal site to be an effective or appropriate location for a nursing/care home, and do not consider that a modification should be made to include the opportunity in the Local Development Plan.

#### Vale of Leven Cemetery

The existing Vale of Leven Cemetery has three years of lair capacity remaining, and the Council has requested that a site should be identified for an extension to meet future requirements locally.

An extension to the existing cemetery offers convenience to visitors and operational efficiencies. Given this locational need, it is considered to be a suitable low intensity use which will not undermine the green belt at this location. Whilst most access will be taken by car, the additional traffic generated is not likely to be significant. It is accepted that the field identified to the east of the existing cemetery is visible to southbound traffic on the A82, but is not considered to be a significant or unacceptable visual intrusion.

However, because site investigations and negotiations with the landowner have not been concluded, it is suggested that reference to the extension to the Vale of Leven Cemetery is retained in Schedule 6 in the Proposed Plan, thus supporting the principle, but that the specific identification of site BC4(1) be removed from the Proposals Map.

#### Vale of Leven Golf Club

The proposal for the release of 4.5 ha of land from the green belt east of Northfield Road and Steadings Drive, primarily for residential development, was first made as a representation to the Proposed Plan so did not feature in the Main Issues Report.

The appropriateness of the current green belt boundary in this location has been considered as part of the Plan process, see Main Issues Report Background Report: Green Belt Boundary Review (Item 21: Dalmonach) (CD14). It concludes that the boundary along Northfield Drive, supplemented by hedgerow and trees is identifiable and robust and no alternative is proposed. The representation states that the precise boundary of the land to be released would be subject to discussion with the Council, but it is unlikely that anything east of Northfield Road

could be as robust as the existing boundary.

The purposes of the green belt, as per Scottish Planning Policy, are to direct planned growth to the most appropriate locations and support regeneration; protect and enhance the quality, character, landscape setting and identity of towns and cities; and protect and give access to open space within and around towns. The area fulfils these purposes. Significant urban regeneration has occurred within the Vale of Leven (e.g. residential developments at Oakburn Quarry and Dalmonach Works) and opportunities remain (e.g. Heather Avenue and Alexandria Town Centre). These are supported by the current green belt designation and it is not considered necessary or appropriate to draw the green belt boundary any less tightly in this location. The area proposed for release provides part of the landscape setting for the Vale of Leven, lying between the built up area and the Kilpatrick Hills Local Landscape Area. It is currently part of the golf course and provides access to the moorland and hills beyond the course. The development of housing in this area is not consistent with green belt policy and would have an adverse impact on landscape character.

The modification to the plan proposed by the Vale of Leven Golf Club would release land for around 74 houses, with a mixture of private and social rented tenure. The Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan May 2012 (CD09) indicates in Schedules 8 and 9 that in the preliminary and indicative comparison of private sector supply and demand there is a surplus of housing supply to both 2020 and 2025 in the Dumbarton and Vale of Leven Housing Market Area. Schedule 10 indicates also that there is no shortfall of affordable housing in West Dunbartonshire within these two periods either. In order to ensure that demand is met, West Dunbartonshire's Local Housing Strategy (CD31) (see paragraph 5.6.7) has set housing supply targets in excess of the indicative all-tenure housing requirement in Schedule 11A of the Strategic Development Plan. These are set out in Tables 2 and 3 of the Proposed Plan.

Table 2 in the Proposed Plan indicates that there is a requirement for 3,520 all tenure houses up to 2020, and the supply is 3,807, giving a generosity allowance of 8%. The level of generosity in the 2020-25 period is significantly higher at 27%. It is acknowledged that the private sector housing land supply does not have this level of generosity, particularly in the period to 2020. However, the Housing Land Audit 2012 (CD33) indicates that the effective private sector housing land supply in the Dumbarton and Vale of Leven area accounts for two thirds of the West Dunbartonshire housing land supply and includes the only greenfield effective land in West Dunbartonshire. In addition, Schedule 4 of the Proposed Plan indicates that two additional greenfield sites are being released in the Dumbarton and Vale of Leven area at Stirling Road and Lomondgate to augment the effective supply in this area. Both these sites are owned by developers and are agreed as effective and able to provide housing within the period to 2020. The Vale of Leven site is not in control of a developer and is unlikely to be considered effective at present. As there is no strategic requirement to release land in this housing market area, and the housing land supply has already been augmented by two effective releases to ensure choice and generosity as required by SPP, it is concluded that an additional release in the Vale of Leven area is not required. This supports the settlement strategy (para 4.3 of the Proposed Plan) which indicates that greenfield development outwith the urban area would be less



sustainable and reduce the focus on the regeneration of brownfield sites and the urban area as a whole.

With regard to the indicative housing and roads layout included in the representation, the proposed development does not relate well to existing housing and roads. At the southern end of the site the proposed new housing would be significantly elevated above Northfield Road, isolating it from existing housing which it would also overlook causing privacy issues. The indicative layout provided indicates that the proposed new housing would be located in a series of cul-de-sacs, which are discouraged by Designing Streets and the Council's Supplementary Guidance on Residential Development: Principles for Good Design. Furthermore the proposed housing would turn its back on existing housing and constitute ribbon development.

Whilst the Council is supportive of the golf club upgrading its existing facilities and developing and extending the golf course, the proposal as submitted as part of the LDP process is unacceptable and would set an undesirable precedent.

For these reasons, the Council does not consider that it is necessary to make a modification to the Proposed Plan.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 22</b>	<b>SUPPORTING OUR CENTRES</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 7 – Supporting Our Centres Section 7.2 & Table 5 – Network of centres retail strategy Policy SC3 Schedule 7: Retail Development Opportunities	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p>The Theatres Trust (80)  British Land Retail Warehouses Ltd (86)  The Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group (98)  Chester Properties (107)  Hermiston Securities Limited (108)  Walker Group (Scotland) Ltd &amp; Strathleven Regeneration CIC (125)</p>		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Chapter 7 sets out the retail strategy for the Council area which seeks to ensure that all retail centres within the network continue to complement each other and fulfil their roles.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Cultural Assets</u></p> <p><b>The Theatres Trust (80)</b> states that Policy SC3 should support existing leisure and cultural town centre assets. Theatres are a vital part of the community and provide a beacon of vitality for the evening economy. There is a growing recognition that the cultural offer of a town is essential to drawing trade as well as talent and tourism. Town centre leisure facilities are just as important to residents' well-being as woodlands and green infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Network of Centres Retail Strategy</u></p> <p>A number of representees have submitted comments in respect of the inclusion or definition of their sites within the network of centres retail strategy detailed in Table 5, and retail opportunity sites in Schedule 7. These sites are: St James Retail Park, Antartex Village, Clyde Retail Park, Lomond Galleries and Lomondgate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St James Retail Park - <b>British Land (86)</b> is committed to the development of a second phase of the St James Retail Park. The proposed development provides opportunity to focus investment in Dumbarton, provide a catalyst to development in the town centre and claw back expenditure being leaked outwith the catchment. A well-considered format of retail floor space has the</li> </ul>		

potential to retain both expenditure and custom within the Dumbarton area benefiting the town centre and area as a whole.

- Antartex Village - **The Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group (98)** wish to record their support for the identification of the existing Antartex Retail Village as a destination commercial centre in Table 5. It notes that planning permission has been granted to refurbish the Antartex Retail Village and this should be included as a retail development opportunity (Schedule 7, p74) as it would reflect the important role that the Antartex Retail Centre plays in the local retail hierarchy.
- Clyde Retail Park - **Chester Properties (107)** indicate that it would be beneficial to identify the role and function of each of the edge-of-centre commercial centres in the Plan. The Clyde Retail Park's role and function is physically that of a town centre function due to its successful co-existence with the Clyde Shopping Centre. Shoppers do not make a distinction between the two and neither should the West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan. The defined role and function of Clyde Retail Park set out in the Plan is not supported.
- Lomond Galleries - **Hermiston Securities Limited (108)** give support to the status of Lomond Galleries being referred to in para 7.2.2 and Table 5 as the preferred location for new retail investment in Alexandria after the town centre in order to support the preservation of the A-listed building.
- Lomondgate - **Walker Group (Scotland) Ltd & Strathleven Regeneration CIC (125)** state that para 7.2 fails to recognise the significance of the planned Roadside Services at Lomondgate. Lomondgate is acknowledged to be a Strategic Location, however it is not fully supported in this regard. The services which are currently available and the opportunities which remain justify the location being afforded a "destination" status in the network of centres within the retail strategy.

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

##### Cultural Assets

**The Theatres Trust (80)** suggest that Policy SC3 should be include an opening sentence along the lines of:

'The council will protect existing town centre community, cultural and social facilities by resisting their loss or change of use unless replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meets the need of the local population, and it has been demonstrated that there is no demand for another similar use on site.'

##### Network of Centres Retail Strategy

A number of modifications are proposed to the network of centres retail strategy detailed in Table 5 and the opportunity sites identified in Schedule 7:

- *St James Retail Park - British Land (86)* proposes general modifications to the entry in Table 5. The role and function should:
  - continue to support proposals for retail and/or leisure developments in an identified Commercial Centre where their function complements that of other centres within the network of centres, having particular care not to undermine town centres; and
  - clarify that the strategy allows for retail floorspace to be developed outwith the town centre also where its operation ordinarily requires. Retail development of less than 1,000 sq.m for example may be appropriate and justifiable in out of centre retail locations.
- *Antartex Village - The Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group (98)* seek a clearer distinction in Table 5 by introducing a line space between the reference to Lomond Galleries and Antartex Village.

They also seek to amend Schedule 7 to include the refurbishment of the Antartex Retail Centre as a retail development opportunity by adding the following below the last entry:

“SC1(5) Antartex Village, Bowie Road, Alexandria Refurbishment”

- *Clyde Retail Park - Chester Properties (107)* propose a specific description of the role and function of the Clyde Retail Park to be inserted into Table 5, as follows:
  - “strong linkages with Clydebank Town Centre and potential to complement the existing retail offer of Clydebank Shopping Centre. The Clyde Retail Park was historically allocated within the Clydebank Town Centre and this allocation should be re- instated in the forthcoming Local Development Plans;
  - the majority of retail units at the Clyde Retail Park are under 1,000sqm Gross Internal Area and this format works well for the current operators;
  - the Clyde Retail Park does not have a bulky goods restriction;
  - future development opportunities at the Clyde Retail Park exist and these should be assessed on their own merits. Due to the Clyde Retail Park’s function future development at the park would complement the town centre rather than have an impact on it”
- *Lomond Galleries - Hermiston Securities Limited (108)* suggest that reference should be made in Table 5 and paragraph 7.2.2 to the unrestricted Class 1 retail status which the site benefits from on account of the extant planning permission VL/4695 covering an internal area of approximately 5,000 sq.metres (SD22.1 - Planning Consent VL4695).
- *Lomondgate - Walker Group (Scotland) Ltd & Strathleven Regeneration CIC (125)* seek to amend Table 5 to include Lomondgate Services within the “Destination commercial centre” type of centre. The role and function column should read as:
 

“planned roadside services integral to the wider Lomondgate Strategic Economic Investment Location and destination services at a principal gateway to the Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park can be defined as:

  - Appropriate development including retail uses which enhance roadside facilities (in accordance with 5.5.1) will be supported.

- retail development over 1,000 sq.m are to be assessed in terms of their impact on centres higher up the hierarchy.”

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

#### Cultural Assets

Para 7.4.1 recognises that non-retail uses make an important contribution to a town centre’s character. The proposed modification by **The Theatres Trust (80)** to Policy SC3 would seek to strengthen this position through policy. However, it is public support, availability of funding and market conditions that determine whether community, cultural and social facilities thrive in town centres and the proposed modification would pose difficulties for the re-use of buildings should a use become unviable or close. Policy SC3 already supports non-retail uses where these comply with the Network of Centres Strategy.

For these reasons the modification is not considered appropriate.

#### Network of Centres Retail Strategy

Scottish Planning Policy requires local development plans to identify a network of centres, and explain the role of each centre in the network (CD03: Scottish Planning Policy, para 53). Table 5 of the Proposed Plan (CD19: page 75) sets out the network of centres for West Dunbartonshire and includes town centres, edge-of-town commercial centres, destination commercial centres and local centres. Within this hierarchy the Retail Strategy seeks to ensure that the individual role of each centre should support and be supported by other centres, and thus accord with SPP retail policy. The Plan only identifies retail development opportunities within town centres. This is because town centres are the preferred location for new retail development, with other locations less preferred.

The proposed modifications seek to amend the status of key sites which cannot be justified in terms of the role of the Retail Strategy as identified in SPP and the LDP. A more specific response to each site is given below:

- *St James Retail Park* - the commercial centre designation (page 20, Map 5) covers the area that could be developed for new retail development, establishing that, in principle, uses compatible with a commercial centre designation as per Scottish Planning Policy (CD03: page 11, para 54) i.e. specific focus on retail and leisure uses, would be acceptable there, but subject to assessment against policy SC1. It is considered appropriate that St James Retail Park continues to complement the offer of Dumbarton town centre by offering large format/warehouse retailing. The restriction of unit size to above 1,000 sq.m. seeks to protect the town centre which is a role of the Retail Strategy and remains appropriate.

The modification to Table 5 from **British Land Retail Warehouses Ltd (86)** is not accepted.

- *Antartex Village* - the distinction between the two sites in Table 5 is required and the Reporter is invited to accept this modification proposed by **The**

### **Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group (98).**

In respect of the amendment to Schedule 7 to include the refurbishment of the Antartex Retail Centre as a retail development opportunity, Schedule 7 lists the retail opportunity sites that exist within town centres as they are the preferred location for new retail development. The modification proposed by **The Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group (98)** is not accepted

However, the Reporter is invited to amend Schedule 7 to clarify that the retail opportunities therein relate only to town centre opportunity sites.

- *Clyde Retail Park* - the first amendment to Table 5 relates to the issue of Clyde Retail Park being included within Clydebank Town Centre and is covered more fully within Issue 3. Of the remaining amendments the wording provided by **Chester Properties (107)** does not describe a role and function of Clyde Retail Park, rather it reflects aspirations for the site to be included within the town centre and a factual description of unit sizes and its planning status. The role and function/strategy set out in Table 5 of the Plan (page 75) provides appropriate guidance for the future development of the site, safeguarding it for large format/warehouse retailing in an accessible location. The restriction on units under 1,000 sq.m. protects the Core Retail Area of Clydebank town centre, which largely comprises smaller units. Overall, the approach ensures the continuance of a complementary mix of retail provision in a sustainable location and reflects the Retail Strategy.

The modification proposed by **Chester Properties (107)** is not accepted.

- *Lomond Galleries* - Table 5 and para 7.2.2 identify town centres as the preferred location for retail development although it is acknowledged that the Lomond Galleries is the second preferred location for new retail investment in Alexandria in order to support preservation of the A-listed building. In addition, and notwithstanding extant planning consents granted for the Lomond Galleries site, it is appropriate that consents for significant retail developments in less preferred locations are kept under review. Where Plan allocations reflect historical out-of-town centre retail developments the possibility to carry out reviews is reduced.

The modification by **Hermiston Securities Limited (108)** is not accepted.

- *Lomondgate* - the Lomondgate site is a major residential and business development opportunity. The area to the north of the A82 is designated in the Plan for a business park and roadside services. The roadside services currently comprise of a hotel and food and drink uses, with consent for a petrol filling station. This is in keeping with the roadside services designation and strategy for the site. Designation as a destination commercial centre, with its stronger focus on retailing could result in inappropriate development at this location.

The modification by **Walker Group (Scotland) Ltd & Strathleven Regeneration CIC (125)** is not supported.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**

<b>Issue 23</b>	<b>BUILT HERITAGE</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 9 – Protecting Our Built Heritage	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland (21) Woodland Trust Scotland (93)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Policies included within Chapter 9 – Protecting Our Built Heritage seek to protect and enhance specific elements of the historic environment.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><b>The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland (21)</b> have made representations on various aspects of Chapter 9:</p> <p><u>The Antonine Wall</u></p> <p>Policy BH1 needs to be greatly more proactive. The lack of proactive promotion of the Antonine Wall within West Dunbartonshire and infrastructure is of great concern.</p> <p><u>Listed Buildings</u></p> <p>Concern at the lack of proactive action in reviewing listed buildings. Policy BH3 should include clauses about proactive review of our built heritage and gaining relative expertise, either in-house or through other means.</p> <p><u>Conservation Areas</u></p> <p>Similarly concerned at the lack of proactive review of Conservation Areas. Policy BH4 should include clauses about proactive review of our built heritage. West Dunbartonshire has several areas that deserve consideration as Conservation Areas, either independently or as extensions of existing ones.</p> <p><u>Buildings at Risk</u></p> <p>West Dunbartonshire has many listed buildings which are subject to decay due to no longer being viable in the form they were originally intended or have been wilfully neglected. In spite of it being illegal to allow a listed building to reach a condition where it is beyond recovery without good reason, the Council has not usually asserted its authority to ensure remedial action is taken. There should be a policy that covers this, which would provide officials with a better means with</p>		



which to assert authority over offenders.

'Historic Environment' Definition

**Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** comment that the Local Development Plan does not define an historic environment. The Trust would like to see a definition included, and a definition that incorporates ancient woodland as a type of historic environment that will not be available for development.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland (21)** seek the following modifications:

The Antonine Wall

*Policy BH1* to be more proactive in the promotion of the Antonine Wall.

Listed Buildings

*Policy BH3* should include clauses about proactive review of our built heritage and gaining relevant experience, either in-house or through other means.

Conservation Areas

*Policy BH4* should include clauses about proactive review of our built heritage.

Buildings at Risk

The inclusion of a policy covering Buildings at Risk.

'Historic Environment' Definition

**Woodland Trust Scotland (93)** seeks the inclusion of a definition of an 'historic environment'. The definition should incorporate ancient woodland as a type of historic environment that will not be available for development.

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

The Antonine Wall

The Antonine Wall Management Plan (2014-19) (CD44) represents the principal mechanism for proactively promoting the Antonine Wall. West Dunbartonshire Council approved the Management Plan in October 2013 and is an active partner in its delivery, alongside Historic Scotland. The Management Plan provides a broad framework for the management, conservation and enhancement of the Antonine Wall and includes a number of aims, objectives and actions to safeguard and enhance the Outstanding Universal Value of the Antonine Wall; promote awareness and understanding by improving physical and intellectual accessibility; and realise the Antonine Wall's full potential as an education and learning resource. Implementation of the Antonine Wall Management Plan Action Plan is

noted as an action in the West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan Proposed Action Programme (CD21) (reference 42.2) and the Council has recently allocated a budget of £20,000 per annum for Antonine Wall projects.

Policy BH1 and the associated Supplementary Guidance (Note: the existing Supplementary Planning Guidance (CD45) is to be revised and re-adopted as Supplementary Guidance) are primarily aimed at ensuring that the development management process safeguards the Antonine Wall from development that would have an adverse impact on the wall or its setting. The policy wording and Supplementary Planning Guidance has been developed in partnership with the four partner local authorities along the line of the Antonine Wall (East Dunbartonshire, Glasgow, North Lanarkshire and Falkirk Councils) and Historic Scotland. Policy BH1 also refers to the Antonine Wall Management Plan, which would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning application on or close to the Antonine Wall.

The modification of Policy BH1 by **The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland (21)** is not accepted.

#### Listed Buildings

**The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland's (21)** concern regarding the lack in in-house expertise in relation to listed buildings is noted, however, it is not considered that Policy BH3 is the appropriate place to make commitments regarding skills capacity or the review of listed buildings. These matters are not directly relevant to the determination of planning applications affecting listed buildings. The proposed Action Programme (CD21) includes an action to develop a list of non-listed buildings of architectural importance and to consider the merits of listing such buildings (ref. 44.1).

The modification is not accepted.

#### Conservation Areas

The West Dunbartonshire Local Development Plan Proposed Action Programme (CD21) includes an action to undertake Conservation Area Appraisals (ref. 45.1). It is not necessary that Policy BH4 refers to this undertaking.

The modification by **The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland's (21)** is not accepted.

#### Buildings at Risk

The Council does not see merit in a new policy which repeats legislative provisions regarding listed buildings. The modification by **The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland's (21)** is not accepted.

#### 'Historic Environment' Definition

The introduction to Chapter 9 – Protecting Our Built Heritage (paragraph 9.1.1) defines the term 'historic environment' as the monuments, buildings and places

that define West Dunbartonshire's local identity. Otherwise, the term is not used in the Proposed Plan (as modified) and for this reason it is not considered necessary to provide further definition.

Section 8.6 of the Proposed Plan (as modified) addresses forestry, woodland and trees, with Policy GN5 stating that: 'Development that would result in the loss of trees or woodland of amenity, cultural, historical, recreational or biodiversity value will not be permitted unless clear justification can be given and appropriate replanting can be agreed'. This policy therefore gives robust protection to ancient woodlands.

There is scope to highlight the importance of ancient woodland within the proposed Forestry, Woodland and Trees Supplementary Guidance.

For these reasons it is not considered necessary to make the modifications to the Proposed Plan (as modified) proposed by **Woodland Trust Scotland (93)**.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

--

**Reporter's recommendations:**

--

<b>Issue 24</b>	<b>KILBOWIE ROUNDABOUT, CLYDEBANK</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 10 – Supporting Development Paragraphs 10.2.1 – 10.2.3 Policy SD1 Map 9	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
<p>Yvonne McDonald (27) Gary McDonald (28) Beth McDonald (29) Josh McDonald (30) Mrs Kirkpatrick (32) Scott Fergie (33) David McKenna (36) James Cameron (37) Elaine Forsyth-Mowatt (38) Edward Mowatt (39) Rachel Forsyth (40) Brookland Nursery (51) Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council (95)</p>	<p>Kilmarnock Community Council (120) Agnes Thomson (135) Alan Alexander Gall (136) Patrick Fox (171) Thomas Brown (172) Gilbert Howatson (173) James Paisley (174) John Prentice (175) Raymond Stirling (176) Alan Moir (177) Allyson Moir (178) Joseph Craig (179)</p>	
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Policy SD1 of the Plan offers support for transport schemes set out in the Local Transport Strategy including improvements to the Kilbowie Roundabout that are illustrated in Map 19.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><b>Yvonne McDonald (27), Gary McDonald (28), Beth McDonald (29), David McKenna (36), Alan Alexander Gall (136), Joseph Craig (179)</b> object to the closure of Duntocher Road. <b>Brookland Nursery (51)</b> advise that the closure of Duntocher Road would have a significant impact on its business.</p> <p><b>Yvonne McDonald (27), Gary McDonald (28), Beth McDonald (29), Josh McDonald (30), Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council (95), Agnes Thomson (135), Patrick Fox (171), Thomas Brown (172), Glibert Howatson (173), James Paisley (174), John Prentice (175), Raymond Stirling (176)</b> object to the loss of open space. <b>Alan Alexander Gall (136)</b> objects specifically to the loss of flora and fauna</p> <p><b>Mrs Kirkpatrick (32)</b> would prefer for the roundabout to remain as it is.</p> <p><b>Scott Fergie (33)</b> considers the proposal a waste of money and madness, just</p>		

adding to or moving the problem. It would cause tailbacks on Kilbowie Road, Hawthorne Street, Duntocher Road and the A82.

**James Cameron (37), Agnes Thomson (135), Alan Alexander Gall (136), Patrick Fox (171), Thomas Brown (173), Gilbert Howatson (173), Raymond Stirling (176), Allyson Moir (178)** consider the proposal will move the problem.

**Elaine Forsyth-Mowatt (38), Edward Mowatt (39), Rachel Forsyth (40)** advise that no traffic lights are required on the roundabout.

**Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council (95)** state that the proposal received no support at a public meeting attended by 70 people. It is considered too complicated with the potential to create more problems than it solved. It would cost a lot of money with no guarantee it would be completed within a reasonable timeframe or be successful at all.

**Kilmarnock Community Council (120)** support changes at the Kilbowie roundabout only if average net journey times through the new arrangement on the main A82 artery are reduced. A further set of traffic lights at the proposed new entry exit from Duntocher Road is questioned.

**Agnes Thomson (135)** considers emergency vehicle access to Duntocher Road would be inhibited.

**James Paisley (174)** considers the proposal a complication rather than a solution.

**John Prentice (175)** objects on the grounds of cost.

**John Prentice (175)** does not consider the proposal will alleviate the problem.

**Alan Moir (177), Allyson Moir (178)** raise safety concerns.

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

A number of modifications to the Kilbowie roundabout proposal have been sought by those who have submitted representations on the issue. These are:

- deletion of Kilbowie roundabout improvements from the Local Development Plan;
- a new slip road from Duntocher Road towards Dumbarton (westbound) thus avoiding putting additional traffic onto the roundabout;
- a new slip road from Kilbowie Road onto the A82 westbound
- the suggest removal of bus lane from Kilbowie Road (north of Kilbowie roundabout);
- removal of traffic lights from roundabout;
- changes to traffic light sequence on Kilbowie roundabout.
- modifying the existing roundabout to provide more space to allow traffic to flow more freely;
- a flyover for east-west traffic;
- traffic management changes;

- a new roundabout at the junction of the A82 eastbound and the A810 (Dumbarton Rd, Hardgate), reducing traffic using Kilbowie Roundabout;
- filter lanes at all A82 junctions.

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

The Kilbowie roundabout is a focal point on the transport network being strategically located between Glasgow, Clydebank, Bearsden/Milngavie, the Erskine Bridge and Dumbarton. Conflicting traffic movements have led to problems of congestion, queuing and delays occurring around the Kilbowie Roundabout and nearby Hardgate Roundabout further to the north on the A8014.

The Council has recognised the need for intervention on this part of the road network and commissioned a Scottish Transport Analysis Guidance (STAG) Appraisal. This reported in March 2011 (CD62). The STAG appraisal process ensures that potential options to address evidenced-based transport problems or opportunities are identified and appraised in a consistent manner and that such options will contribute to the Scottish Government's purpose and meet the transport needs of Scotland. It is a requirement that an appraisal using STAG is undertaken by commissioning authorities and their agents when seeking Government funding, support or approval for options to change the transport system.

On the issue of whether there are traffic congestion issues on the road network in the vicinity of the Kilbowie and Hardgate roundabouts, the STAG appraisal states: 'Our analysis has shown that network problems in the Kilbowie / Hardgate area are currently being observed and causing significant congestion, queuing and delays. Furthermore, they are only likely to be exacerbated as time goes by and traffic levels grow. It is therefore important that action is taken to address these problems at the earliest possible opportunity' (CD62, pg iv).

The STAG appraisal considered a range of options for improvements to the Kilbowie and Hardgate roundabouts. It concluded that the scheme set out in the Plan (Option 1B in the STAG appraisal) offers the greatest economic and operational benefits with no other option presenting a positive economic case for investment, albeit recognising the loss of open space, loss of biodiversity and conflict with the existing Local Plan (CD62, pg vi-vii).

Many of the alternative options suggested in representations were appraised by the STAG:

- Creation of new slip road from Duntocher Road onto A82 towards Dumbarton – Option 18
- Removal of bus lane from Kilbowie Road (north of Kilbowie roundabout) – Option 11
- Removal of traffic lights from roundabout – not considered by STAG.
- Creation of slip road from Kilbowie roundabout onto A82 westbound – Option 18
- Change traffic light sequence on Kilbowie roundabout – Option 17
- Modify Kilbowie roundabout to provide space to allow traffic to flow more freely – Option 19

- East-west flyover – Option 2
- Traffic management changes – Option 17
- Roundabout at A810/A82 junction – Option 3
- Signalised junction considered under Option 3.
- Filter lanes on all A82 junctions – Option 18

No evidence is presented with any of the representations that the schemes suggested would improve congestion and traffic management better than the preferred scheme.

The proposed scheme was identified as the preferred option in the Main Issues Report. At that stage there were two representations suggesting a flyover as a solution, and one suggesting things be left as they are. There were no objections received when the scheme was identified in the draft Local Transport Strategy. The Local Transport Strategy was approved by the Council in November 2013 (CD30, paras 2.3.1-2.3.5 on pgs 2.4-2.5, & pg4.8). As a corporate document, the Local Development Plan through, policy DS1 supports the projects and schemes identified in the Local Transport Strategy, including the Kilbowie roundabout project.

The loss of open space and impact on biodiversity will be managed through the development management process with compensatory provision sought in line with policy GN1 and GN3. The site is not a designated nature conservation site.

In conclusion, the Kilbowie roundabout scheme identified in the Plan is the recommended outcome of a robust STAG appraisal and is included within the Council's Local Transport Strategy. For this reason no modification to the Plan is supported.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**



<b>Issue 25</b>	<b>SUPPORTING DEVELOPMENT</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 10 – Supporting Development Section 10.5 – Minerals, Aggregates and Coal & Policy SD4 Section 10.7 – Notification Zones Schedule 9: Aggregate Reserves: SD4(1) – Dumbuckhill Quarry	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Health and Safety Executive (181) Patersons Quarries Limited (182)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	This Issue relates to matters dealing with infrastructure and mineral resources.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Minerals, Aggregates and Coal</u></p> <p><b>Patersons Quarries Limited (182)</b> are encouraged by the policy support expressed for the continuation of quarrying operations at Dumbuckhill but have concerns over the precise wording of Policy SD4 which offers support for the expansion of mineral and aggregate extraction at Dumbuckhill on the basis that proposals 'avoid' significant adverse impact, as opposed to 'minimise significant negative impacts' which is the wording used in Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) at paragraph 231. This stricter threshold would unduly restrict future development opportunities and has not been justified.</p> <p>They would also welcome the addition of a requirement for all proposed noise and vibration sensitive developments in the vicinity of existing quarries to provide robust noise and vibration assessments in order to avoid future complaints and the possible sterilisation of consented mineral reserves. Paragraph 11 of Circular 1/2011 recognises that Development Plans have an important role to play in helping to limit the overall number of people exposed to the potential adverse effects of noise and promotes Development Plans indicating either a range of uses likely to be permitted in areas affected by existing or potentially high levels of noise, as well as the noise mitigation measures the planning authority will expect to be applied to new development.</p> <p><u>SD4(1) – Dumbuckhill Quarry</u></p> <p><b>Patersons Quarries Limited (182)</b> also question the inclusion of Dumbuckhill Quarry within the Green Belt, stating that ongoing quarrying operations do not</p>		



meet the role of the West Dunbartonshire green belt as set out in paragraph 4.3.3.

#### Notification Zones

The **Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (181)** recommends that the Local Development Plan includes an analysis of compatible development within consultation zones of major hazard installations and major accident hazard pipelines based on the general advice contained in the PADHI guidance. HSE also encourages planning authorities to include policies in Local Development Plans in relation to the siting of major hazards and development in their vicinity, highlighting that HSE advice may be necessary to determine the appropriateness of such proposals. Policy DC5 of the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan is referred to as such a policy.

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

##### Minerals, Aggregates and Coal

*Policy SD4* – Substitute the word ‘avoid’ for ‘minimise’.

Additional requirement for noise and vibration assessments to accompany planning applications for noise and vibration sensitive development in close proximity to consented quarrying operations. **Patersons Quarries Limited (182)**.

##### SD4(1) – Dumbuckhill Quarry

Removal of Dumbuckhill Quarry, as defined by planning permission DC02/187, from the green belt.

##### Notification Zones

An analysis of compatible development within consultation zones of major hazard installations and Major Accident Hazard Pipelines.

Inclusion of a policy relating to the siting of major hazards and development in their vicinity, highlighting that HSE advice may be necessary to determine the appropriateness of such proposals. **Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (181)**.

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

##### Minerals, Aggregates and Coal

The proposed modification submitted by **Patersons Quarries Limited (182)** to substitute the word ‘avoid’ for ‘*minimise*’ within Policy SD4 is supported. To fully accord with Scottish Planning Policy (CD03, paragraph 231) it is suggested that the sentence reads: “Expansion of mineral and aggregate extraction at these locations and new workings at other locations shall be accompanied by acceptable and fundable restoration and aftercare proposals and *minimise* significant *negative* impact on:”.

To address the second modification proposed by **Patersons Quarries Limited**

**(182)**, the Council suggests that the first criterion in the 'Safe and Pleasant' section of Policy DS1, p47 is amended to read 'avoids unacceptable impacts on or from adjoining uses....'. The requirement for noise and vibration assessments would be a requirement of assessment against this policy so does not need to be stated explicitly.

The Reporter is invited to make these two modifications.

#### SD4(1) – Dumbuckhill Quarry

The Council does not support the removal of Dumbuckhill Quarry from the green belt. Scottish Planning Policy (CD03, paragraph 159) states that the purpose of green belt designation in the development plan as part of the settlement strategy for a area is to: direct planned growth to the most appropriate locations and support regeneration; protect and enhance the quality, character, landscape setting and identity of towns and cities; and protect and give access to open space. It is considered that the designation of Dumbuckhill meets these purposes, particularly in directing new development to the urban area so as to assist urban regeneration. The green belt in this location is also important in preventing the coalescence of Dumbarton and Milton, protecting the character of these two distinct settlements.

Furthermore, a Green Belt Boundary Review (CD14) completed in 2011 found the green belt boundary in this location, defined by the A82, to be very robust (see site 30). Any change to the green belt in this location would result in the green belt boundary would be weakened.

#### Notification Zones

The Proposed Plan (as modified) identifies a number of development opportunities within the consultation zones of major hazard installations, which are clearly shown on the Proposals Map. It considered further analysis of compatible development within the consultation zones, on the basis of general advice contained in the PADHI guidance, is a level of detail which would be best reserved for masterplanning and development management stages, given the level of complexity this could introduce to the Local Development Plan. In the main, the Proposed Plan (as modified) seeks to avoid repeating advice available from other sources.

Paragraph 10.7.1 states that advice will be sought from the Health and Safety Executive for proposals within the vicinity of major hazard installations. It is not considered necessary to restate this in the form of a policy. Furthermore, the modification proposed to policy DS1 above would also apply to development close to major hazard installations.

The modifications proposed by **Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (181)** are not accepted.

**Reporter's conclusions:**

**Reporter's recommendations:**