National Park Authority Board Meeting

Appendix 2 - Verbatim Comments Report

Live Park – Consultation on Proposed Local Development Plan
The LIVE Park consultation process

The LIVE Park Proposed Local Development Plan consultation was held for 6 weeks from 18 May until 29 June 2015. We wanted to encourage as many people as possible to get involved in the process and we welcomed comments and feedback in a variety of ways through:

- our website using the On Line Development Plan system
- posting or downloading and emailing the Representation form
- events focused on working with young people
- comments on facebook, twitter and blog pages
- at community drop-in events
- posting letters

What is this Report?

This ‘Verbatim’ Report includes all the comments submitted during the LIVE Park consultation process as formal responses to the Proposed Plan and supporting documents (draft Supplementary Guidances, draft Planning Guidances, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment) which were available on line at www.ourlivepark.com and within local libraries and National Park offices in Callander and Balloch. As verbatim comments, these are shown word-for-word. To make it easier to analyse, the comments have been separated in order of the Proposed Plan layout. We received 139 representations to our consultation and we recommend it be read on line along with the Proposed Plan which can be found on above website.

How did we prepare this report?

Representations have been reviewed, entered into our database and split up to allocate the content with the relevant part of the Proposed Plan documents. This means we have split up comments where needed. We have not edited or summarised the comments in this Verbatim Report. Responders that submitted supporting information have been attached at the end and are referred to within the text of the responses. There are a small number of comments that we have not published in full – these are marked with asterisks (*) as some comments included personal information

Things to remember

We are preparing to submit for examinations of the Proposed Local Development Plan by the end of this year. The Reporter assigned to the examinations will receive a full copy of every representation submitted along with any associated supporting information. The examinations progress can be followed online using the Directorate of Environmental Planning Appeals website.
If you notice any errors, please let us know by emailing us at hello@ourlivepark.com

Please note that the consultation is now closed so there is no opportunity to make any additional comments at this stage.

If anything is unclear or you need further guidance, then get in touch by emailing us at hello@ourlivepark.com or by calling us on 01389-722600 and asking for Thom, Hugh, Kirsty or Susan.
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Part of Plan Commented On: Introduction

Responder Name/Organisation: Stirling Council
Customer Reference: 00212

Verbatim Comment:
From a Planning & Policy perspective, no changes to the Proposed Local Development Plan are considered necessary.

Part of Plan Commented On: Introduction

Responder Name/Organisation: James Graham
Customer Reference: 00668

Verbatim Comment:
It is not clear to a new reader how all the various pieces of the plan and planning guidance relate to each other, what their standing is and which would take precedence on a particular issue/location. Perhaps an infograpahic would help?
The Mountaineering Council of Scotland represents the interests of mountaineers and mountaineering in Scotland. In so far as it is relevant to these interests, we support the draft LDP.

(For the avoidance of doubt, this support does not extend to the Your Park proposed byelaws.)
Verbatim Comment

Page 18 Development of Arrochar to take over next 20 years on what is this based. More evidence to support this statement is required as the Torpedo Range has been derelict for 27 years along with the other 4 sites at the entrances to the area identified above. Enhancing the range of facilities should focus on providing the basic amenities a village requires. Arrochar does not have public toilets. Toilets and shower facilities for the hill walkers who flock in great numbers to the Arrochar Alps should be a priority yet are never considered or encouraged to be installed by the National Park to improve the tourism experience for the thousands of visitors to this area each year. Range of Businesses Two local businesses have recently closed, others open seasonally. There has been no help or initiative to encourage new businesses to come to Arrochar or established ones to survive. For example: Small local service business cannot afford to employ extra staff or provide support apprenticeships, this is something that desperately needs to be addressed.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Vision for next 20 years</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

Gartmore Community Council

**Customer Reference**

00640

**Verbatim Comment**

Gartmore Community Council reviewed the proposed Local Development Plan at its meeting on 3rd June 2015.

Concerns were expressed that our request for Gartmore to be included in the areas suitable for small scale tourist potential has been ignored. We made this request at both the Live Park presentation at our meeting on 4th June 2014 and in our formal response to the Main Issues Report, but Gartmore has been excluded on the map on page 19.

As stated in our formal response we believe there are several reasons why Gartmore should be included:

- Gartmore is on National Cycle Network 7;
- There are two large caravan and camping sites within the Community Council boundary (Trossachs Holiday Park and Cobbleland Camp Site);
- Gartmore House is a major Conference and Activity Centre;
- The Refurbished Village Hall is attracting business to the area;
- There are several properties offering bed & breakfast and a number available for holiday letting;
- The Black Bull Hotel provides accommodation and meals for tourists;
- The National Trust for Scotland Cunninghame Graham Memorial is a tourist attraction.

We believe that there is considerable potential to increase the economic benefit to these businesses, our community owned village shop and the community in general by encouraging and promoting further tourism. The National Park must recognise this potential in the Local Development Plan and provide support through better signage and local information literature.
We support the inclusion of Aberfoyle (and Callander) as a Strategic Tourism Opportunity. Before financial reorientation, the FCS, by far the largest landowner in the area had identified Aberfoyle as its next mountain bike destination. However, as financial priorities changed, no development ever took place. This has left other destination to increase their visitor numbers whilst Aberfoyle (and the Trossachs) has not. Its excellent catchment area and existing tourist infrastructure together with amazing topography and scenery make it an excellent venue for outdoor sports such as cycling. Bike Trossachs has done some good work in providing a small Bike Park in Aberfoyle and further outdoor tourist attractions and infrastructure should be encouraged both here and in the wider area, such as the Callander Mountain Bike Trails initiative.

Recognition of the National Walking and Cycling Network as a national development in the third National Planning Framework and highlighting that within the LDP is important. More active travel options and off-road connections will benefit residents and visitors, within settlements and between them. Coordination between adjacent Local Authorities is clearly important in order to achieve this in the wider context but links within Callander are as important as those, perhaps more obvious, regional priorities such as links to the east of Callander.
Scottish Water welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposed local development plan and will continue to work with Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park to deliver their vision and on the delivery of the plan.

Scottish Water is committed to enabling development within Scotland and will continue to work with Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park to highlight where there is available capacity within Scottish Water’s network. This allows development to occur in areas where the need to upgrade existing infrastructure is minimal, therefore reducing developer costs. However, insufficient capacity should not be seen as a barrier to development. Scottish Water is able to provide increased strategic capacity once the developer is able to provide evidence of meeting 5 distinct criteria. These criteria are

1. Confirmation of land ownership
2. Confirmation that the development is supported in the local plan or has full planning permission
3. Confirmation of time remaining on current planning permission
4. Confirmation that plans are in place and agreed with Scottish Water to mitigate any local network constraints that would arise as a result of the proposed development
5. Notice of the developers reasonable proposals in terms of annual build rate.

On receipt of confirmation of meeting all of these criteria, Scottish Water will progress to the design and delivery of the necessary strategic infrastructure to support new development. Developers should be aware of this rule set and be encouraged to engage with us at their earliest opportunity.
**Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Delivering our Strategy</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

Anne Currie

**Customer Reference**

00676

**Verbatim Comment**

Change in document requested: I propose that the Plan should include provision for the designation of small areas important for wildlife which occur within the environs of villages & settlement as Local Nature Reserves, carrying an assumption against development for economic gain and for habitat preservation/enhancement for the benefit of the local community.

Reason: Many years ago I was closely involved in meetings with the group of dedicated naturalists who were at the forefront of the lobby to create national parks in Scotland. The vision of these people was aimed towards protecting, enhancing and maintaining these areas of outstanding natural beauty and national importance for wildlife.

I think they would be dismayed to see the lack of specific provision for wildlife habitat maintenance and enhancement within the proposed plan. The principle aim of national parks is 'to preserve & enhance the natural & cultural heritage of the area'; I would suggest that this local plan completely ignores this aim, in spite of the statement to the contrary which appears in section 2.2 'vision for the next 20 years', and the lip service which is paid to it throughout the document. The emphasis throughout the plan is towards economic development only.

This omission of attention to the sandford principle could be addressed by the inclusion of a designation specifically applied to small areas of local importance for wildlife which occur within the environs of towns or villages, and I propose that such a designation should be added to those which currently appear in the specific settlement maps within section 3 'Place'. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Delivering our Strategy</td>
<td>2.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

- Forestry Commission Scotland

**Customer Reference**

- 00710

**Verbatim Comment**

The inclusion of the Development Strategy Map within the Proposed Plan which identifies Strategic Tourism Opportunities in communities such as Balmaha and Aberfoyle is valuable. FES is open to discussions about how these communities could realise any tourism opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Delivering our Strategy</td>
<td>2.5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

- Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council

**Customer Reference**

- 00037

**Verbatim Comment**

Page 23 Development in Flood Risk areas as explained above site MU2 is a prime example of this. Better wording to make areas exempt from zoning required. Place marking could be expanded to include the suggestion of village signage.

A major problem in Arrochar is the continual battering the Head of the Loch receives from the weather and subsequent dumping of rubbish washed up by the storm tides over the car park areas. This is repelling tourists from stopping in what, when in a clean state is a beautiful area to picnic. This place marking paragraph could perhaps include a bullet points on those sea loch areas within the National Park to gain help with initiatives to clean the Head of Loch Long and look at help with feasibility studies to solve the problem.
Support: The opportunity to include a housing land allocation immediately to the north of VE4

Reason: The proposed plan identifies requirement for 900 new homes following adoption in 2017 until 2027.

Land has been identified for 550 units the remaining units to come forward from windfall sites probably brownfield, reliance on this number as yet unidentified is not consistent with forward planning particularly given the restrictions generally placed on development within the national park. The additional homes could be considered within areas where development is consistent with economic activity such as Balloch now strongly identified with Loch Lomond Shores and tourism generation with employment. Widening the opportunity for housing allocations within this plan is suggested and addition of suitable sites.

Housing needs includes "affordable homes" the definition provided within the plan glossary suggests that the homes will be simply available to those who cannot afford to buy and wish to rent. The definition is limited and should be broader widened to meet categories such as co-ownership/equity participation and low cost home ownership with housing sold below market value allowing a wider market tenure. Balloch can provide additional housing land.

While 25% affordable housing is the % unit requirement within a development this should not be area based calculation, the plan should be clear as to its requirements. This is particularly relevant where in certain areas up to 50% of the units are identified for affordable homes. this could be a development restriction particularly given other planning obligations such as education payments etc. Sites may not be economic to develop given infrastructure needs.

The case for economic development should be considered through proper assessment and when justification is such that the planning requirements are too onerous appropriate deductions made in the requirements.
Gartmore Community Council reviewed the proposed Local Development Plan at its meeting on 3rd June 2015.

There is no mention in the Local Development Plan of the importance of communications and particularly broadband to the survival of local businesses and tourism. We made comments about this at the Live Park presentation at our meeting on 4th June 2014 and in our formal response to the Main Issues Report.

We recognise that the provision of improved broadband and mobile phone reception is outwith the remit of the National Park, but it is such a key issue in rural business and tourism development. The National Park should at the very least recognise this in the Local Development Plan and endeavour to engage with other authorities and businesses with responsibility for communications in rural communities (e.g. Scottish Government, Stirling Council, Openreach etc.).
Part of Plan Commented On | Vision | Topic | Section commented on
---|---|---|---
Vision | | Approach to our Visitor Experience | 2.8

Responder Name/Organisation | Customer Reference
---|---
Gartmore Community Council | 00640

Verbatim Comment

Gartmore Community Council reviewed the proposed Local Development Plan at its meeting on 3rd June 2015.

There is little mention of public transport in the Local Development Plan. Policies to encourage more sustainable transport for tourists and locals are mentioned but with no specific details. The National Park should work closely with operators to enhance existing services and connection times and develop new services during the summer months to reduce the dependence on car travel, especially at weekends.

Please also see previous comments made in Sections 2.4 and 2.7 which are relevant to this section.

Part of Plan Commented On | Vision | Topic | Section commented on
---|---|---|---
Vision | | Approach to our Visitor Experience | 2.8

Responder Name/Organisation | Customer Reference
---|---
Mr Nick Kempe | 00662

Verbatim Comment

I wish to object to the categorisation of types of camping in the Development Plan as being incompatible and unhelpful in terms of the objectives set out in the Your Park proposals which suggest the Park’s Camping Development Plan should allow for a range of camping provision. The Development Plan includes site maps for towns and villages "which we have allocated for specific development uses such as housing, economic development and visitor experience" SECTION 3.2). The LLTNP has developed a set of icons to illustrate uses - these do NOT include camping. It may be because of this there are no proposals in the plan for new campsites around settlements. Some examples of where campsites are needed are given below. I wish to object to the failure of the Local Development Plan to illustrate any plans for new campsites in the section of the plan that deals with the places.
As per our comments in relation to Section 4.6 we support this approach. Aberfoyle is well placed to provide both infrastructure in terms of, for example, accommodation and also outdoor experiences in the forest and varied terrain which surrounds it. We would suggest that a working party be formed which brings the largest landowner (FCS) in the area to the table to discuss what the local forest can achieve in terms of bringing in more visitors through attractions, especially out of season. This would underpin the existing attractiveness of the area for tourists and provide outdoor opportunities for residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Approach to Infrastructure and Services</td>
<td>2.11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McLaren Community Leisure Centre</td>
<td>00721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

On balance this is the preferred direction for growth but the necessary infrastructure must be provided to ensure that this is properly integrated with the existing settlement.

In relation to the proposed infrastructure fund, the scope seems limited unnecessarily and this should be referenced in the LDP itself. We believe the scope should be extended to any infrastructure deemed to be for community benefit. Currently it would appear to only related to the road bridge, so why not riverside path enhancement and footbridge upgrade/replacement/maintenance, possible new eastern footbridge in the short-medium term.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approach to Infrastructure and Services</td>
<td>2.11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
McLaren Community Leisure Centre

**Customer Reference**
00721

**Verbatim Comment**

While we are pleased to see the recognition of short term capacity issues in relation to the schools and pedestrian bridge we are not convinced that identifying the water treatment and road bridge issues as medium to long term and long term respectively is beneficial. The urgency of all these issues cannot be known with any degree of certainty.

Technically there may be capacity for an additional 120 homes and a 60 bed hotel but we request that the LDP wording reflects more accurately both the relative urgency and the potential benefits to be derived, in particular, from both pedestrian/cycle and road bridge provision for Callander.

This was strongly supported at the Charrette with proposals to improve the town's relationship with the river as well as access from the town centre to the existing (and proposed development) to the south of the river. There are existing capacity issues and inadequate links between the north and particularly the east end of Callander with that part of the town to the south of the river which includes the schools and the leisure centre.

In relation to capacity issues I do not propose to redraft the relevant sections for you but suggest that the emphasis needs to shift. Currently there are issues identified as only becoming relevant in the long term but it needs to be clear that these need to be considered at an early stage, i.e. from now on, that is surely the purpose of such a development plan. It is noted that land should be safeguarded for the road bridge but bringing forward these discussions, which will inevitably take some considerable time, would be desirable.
Part of Plan Commented On 
Place - Aberfoyle 
Responder Name/Organisation  
Gillan Consulting 
Customer Reference  
00674 

Verbatim Comment
We made previous a previous objection (June 26th 2014) in relation to land being promoted for chalet/holiday lodge development by FCS at Braeval (Site Ref: MIR4). The land identified in the Aberfoyle Charrette (page 37 - Strategic Priorities Map) we still feel is best placed to meet any demand for holiday accomodation. We act on behalf of a landowner who would like to propose his land for that purpose. Previously the Park had responded to previous objection that, despite some wildlife issues, this would be a more preferable site than the FCS land but that no landowners had been identified. Such a landowner has now been identified. Some of this land falls within the village boundary which is why a separate representation has been made and indicative map attached showing the 10 acre site.
Aberfoyle ED1 - There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works, however, when final development flows are known, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.

Forest Enterprise Scotland supports the policies and proposals contained within the Proposed Development Plan and welcomes the inclusion of the proposed economic development site in Aberfoyle.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Aberfoyle</td>
<td>Aberfoyle ED1</td>
<td>3.4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

A small watercourse flows on the boundary of the site and enters a culvert under the A821. Culverts are prone to blockages which can exacerbate localised flooding. Stirling Council have highlighted that there is another small watercourse within the site however this isn’t demonstrated on the OS 1:10000 map and as such we would need clarification of the location and route of this watercourse. We would require a FRA for the site to ensure that any development is located outwith the 1:200 year functional floodplain of both the small watercourse and the River Forth. An FRA has been provided and further clarification is needed see SEPA response of 29/04/14, PCS/132871.
We request reference be made to the presence of outdoor sports facilities in the ‘key considerations’ for the following sites: ed1. It is recommended that reference also therefore be made to Scottish Planning Policy paragraph 226, the requirements of which should be taken into consideration in the development of these sites, in order to provide certainty to the respective developers for each.

Reason or justification for change requested...
We have endeavoured to identify, using aerial imagery, all proposed sites where it is likely that we will be a statutory consultee when they become the subject of a planning application, i.e. sites which appear to include outdoor sports facilities as defined in the development management regulations 2013. Where we are a statutory consultee, we consider proposals against the provisions of SPP paragraph 226. In the event that we have missed any sites that include such facilities, consideration of these sites against the provisions of the SPP paragraph 226 will still be required.

The sites we have identified as possibly containing outdoor sports facilities are as follows:

Arrochar ED1: church road possible impact on pitch identified
There is no new camping proposed at Arrochar but instead 12 new homes are shown on the Caravan Park (a further loss of capacity) and 26 homes at Succoth and the Torpedo range (pp52-54). The Ben Arthur development though being described as part of the Visitor Experience offers no space for camping, an opportunity lost. The context for this is that the magnificent camping site at Ardgarten was developed into a chalet park and does not any longer make provision for camping or touring caravans or motor homes (with planning granted by the National Park). The SYHA hostel, originally endowed to permit young people to enjoy the The Argyll Forest Park was sold off and developed into a luxury hotel. There is now just one small facility, the Glen Loin campsite, left and that is not well signposted so many people unaware of its existence. The result is that campervans etc use the parking area at the head of the Loch. The overall outcome is the Park through its planning framework has failed to do anything to make up the loss of places and excluded the possibility of a campsite around the head of Loch Long despite Arrochar being one of the most popular destinations in the National Park for hillwalkers and climbers. The proposal to ban camping from around the rest of the head of the loch is risible, as there is almost no campable ground left apart from the car parking areas at the head of the Loch.

I wish to object to the lack of camping provision around Loch Long.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</strong></td>
<td>Arrochar and Succoth Settlement Map</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

Within coastal flood extent but operational/locational reasons possible so recommended that cognisance is taken on 4.47mOD Coastal Flood Boundary level. This will need to define the areas at risk of flooding, the relative vulnerability of the proposed use and confirm design layout and levels.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</td>
<td>Arrochar ED1</td>
<td>3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrochar &amp; Tarbet Community Council</td>
<td>00037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

**Arrochar ED1**  
This site is on Luss Estate owned land the - Arrochar and Tarbet Community Council think that they would be better moved to the Luss Estate owned land opposite the Cadet Centre to create a more ‘joined up’ Community through utilising the open land between the two villages.

This would give better access to the A83 for easy transport manoeuvring to the Industrial Units.

Area ED1 will impact on the siting of the village Mountain Rescue, helipad./Fire/Ambulance stations. However the ‘idea’ for the site would be better to be developed now, if not, there will be no businesses left in the area to benefit from this type of development. This has been on the National Park Plan for many years yet nothing has been done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</td>
<td>Arrochar ED1</td>
<td>3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

ED1 - There is currently sufficient capacity at the water and Waste water treatment works, however, when final flows are known, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.
Change: We request reference be made to the presence of outdoor sports facilities in the 'key considerations' for the following sites: H3; ED1; MU1; VE2. It is recommended that reference also therefore be made to Scottish Planning Policy paragraph 226, the requirements of which should be taken into consideration in the development of these sites, in order to provide certainty to the respective developers for each.

Reason: We have endeavoured to identify, using aerial imagery, all proposed sites where it is likely that we will be a statutory consultee when they become the subject of a planning application, i.e. sites which appear to include outdoor sports facilities as defined in the development management regulations 2013. Where we are a statutory consultee, we consider proposals against the provisions of SPP paragraph 226. In the event that we have missed any sites that include such facilities, consideration of these sites against the provisions of the SPP paragraph 226 will still be required.

The sites we have identified as possibly containing outdoor sports facilities are as follows:

Arrochar ED1: Church Road - Possible impact on pitch identified
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On: Place - Arrochar and Succoth
Responder Name/Organisation: Scottish Natural Heritage
Customer Reference: 00712

Verbatim Comment

Additional symbols on the proposal maps
We recommend that the following additional symbols are added to the proposed plan proposal maps. Within the SEA the following sites are highlighted as having significant environmental effects and mitigation is included. We recommend that by including the following symbols on the proposal maps this would help ensure that the SEA mitigation is delivered:

Arrochar and Succoth ED1: ER states ‘topography is an important consideration on this site. The higher part of the site is visually prominent and not suitable for development’, however there is no landscape assessment symbol in the proposal map. We recommend that a landscape assessment tool is added to the relevant map.

Part of Plan Commented On: Place - Arrochar and Succoth
Responder Name/Organisation: SEPA
Customer Reference: 00713

Verbatim Comment

A minor watercourse culverted in sections runs through this site and this represents a potential risk of flooding. A basic Flood Risk Assessment will be required either prior to, or in conjunction with any planning application. This will need to define the areas at risk of flooding, the relative vulnerability of the proposed use and confirm design layout and levels.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</strong></td>
<td>Arrochar H1</td>
<td>3.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrochar &amp; Tarbet Community Council</td>
<td>00037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

**Arrochar - H1**

This site lies at the southern entrance to Arrochar using the A814. Former site of the old Manse orchard, then used as a caravan park and latterly the Fire Station. Although this site is not as visible as the two above it is lying undeveloped. The expired planning application was for 12 houses.

2006/0409/DET expired October 2012.

**HOUSING** The amount of housing development far outweighs development for employment. If housing has to be developed first, and then allocated, a situation could arise whereby there would be no benefit to the area, houses would be filled with people who only sleep in the area (commuters). We need employment to attract families to the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</strong></td>
<td>Arrochar H1</td>
<td>3.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

H1- l is currently sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works, however, a flow and pressure test may be required to assess the local Water network. There is currently sufficient capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.
### Part of Plan Commented On

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</th>
<th>Arrochar H2</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Responder Name/Organisation

- Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council

### Customer Reference

- 00037

### Verbatim Comment

**Arrochar H2**

Dunbritton Housing Association has been granted permission for 26 houses. Social housing is welcomed. With further consultation on-going on road costs and the relocation of power lines which it seems from the Proposed Plan require to be placed underground as per Energy Policy Para b at what stage does cost overtake the viability of this scheme. The Community Council however, would like to see our villages being more compact rather than the creation of a stretched out ribbon community. Access and amenities should be taken into consideration when earmarking sites for housing.

**HOUSING** See comment on housing at H1 Arrochar...

### Scottish Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</th>
<th>Arrochar H2</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Customer Reference

- 00145

### Verbatim Comment

H2- There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works, however, a flow and pressure test may be required to assess the local network. There is currently sufficient capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works and Scottish Water are currently working closely with the developer of this site on its delivery..
A minor watercourse culverted in sections runs through this site and is a potential risk of flooding. A basic Flood Risk Assessment will be required either prior to, or in conjunction with any planning application. Adjacent to coastal flood extent so recommended that cognisance is taken on 4.47mOD Coastal Flood Boundary level. This will need to define the areas at risk of flooding, the relative vulnerability of the proposed use and confirm design layout and levels.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On  Topic  Section commented on
Place - Arrochar and Succoth  Arrochar H3  3.6.5

Responder Name/Organisation  Customer Reference
Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council  00037

Verbatim Comment

Arrochar H3
This site is on Luss Estate owned land the - Arrochar and Tarbet Community Council think that they would be better moved to the Luss Estate owned land opposite the Cadet Centre to create a more ‘joined up’ Community through utilising the open land between the two villages.

This would give better access to the A83 for tenants of the social housing. See comment at Arrochar H2 above.

Part of Plan Commented On  Topic  Section commented on
Place - Arrochar and Succoth  Arrochar H3  3.6.5

Responder Name/Organisation  Customer Reference
Scottish Water  00145

Verbatim Comment

H3- There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works, however, a flow and pressure test and drainage impact assessment may be required, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.
## Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Arrochar MU1</strong></td>
<td>3.6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrochar &amp; Tarbet Community Council</td>
<td>00037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Comment

**Arrochar MU1**

This site contains the locally known ‘old football field’ owned by the proprietors of the Arrochar Hotel. There was talk of this being earmarked for social housing and a pay back to the Community by a donation of a piece of land directly behind the 3V Hall for outdoor recreation only. No progress to date of this happening. Again the owners have lopped a line of trees to the back of the site which now enables the site to be viewed when entering Arrochar on the A83 from the east. The proposed mixed use of this site would involve major construction access from trunk road / A class road.

No planning application has been put forward for this site.

The Community Council recommends more housing, small employment opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Arrochar MU1</strong></td>
<td>3.6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Comment

**MU1-** There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works, however, when final flows are known, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.
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Part of Plan Commented On: Place - Arrochar and Succoth

Responder Name/Organisation: Sportscotland

Customer Reference: 00188

Section commented on: 3.6.6

Topic: Arrochar MU1

Verbatim Comment:

Change: We request reference be made to the presence of outdoor sports facilities in the 'key considerations' for the following sites: H3; ED1; MU1; VE2. It is recommended that reference also therefore be made to Scottish Planning Policy paragraph 226, the requirements of which should be taken into consideration in the development of these sites, in order to provide certainty to the respective developers for each.

Reason: We have endeavoured to identify, using aerial imagery, all proposed sites where it is likely that we will be a statutory consultee when they become the subject of a planning application, i.e. sites which appear to include outdoor sports facilities as defined in the development management regulations 2013. Where we are a statutory consultee, we consider proposals against the provisions of SPP paragraph 226. In the event that we have missed any sites that include such facilities, consideration of these sites against the provisions of the SPP paragraph 226 will still be required.

The sites we have identified as possibly containing outdoor sports facilities are as follows:

Arrochar MU1: land next to 3 villages hall - possible pitch on site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</td>
<td>Arrochar MU1</td>
<td>3.6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sportscotland</td>
<td>00188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

**change requested**

We request reference be made to the presence of outdoor sports facilities in the 'key considerations' for the following sites: mu1. It is recommended that reference also therefore be made to Scottish planning policy paragraph 226, the requirements of which should be taken into consideration in the development of these sites, in order to provide certainty to the respective developers for each

**Reason or justification for change requested...**

We have endeavoured to identify, using aerial imagery, all proposed sites where it is likely that we will be a statutory consultee when they become the subject of a planning application, i.e. sites which appear to include outdoor sports facilities as defined in the development management regulations 2013. Where we are a statutory consultee, we consider proposals against the provisions of SPP paragraph 226. In the event that we have missed any sites that include such facilities, consideration of these sites against the provisions of the SPP paragraph 226 will still be required.

The sites we have identified as possibly containing outdoor sports facilities are as follows:

**Arrochar MU1: land next to 3 villages hall possible pitch on site**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Arrochar and Succoth</strong></td>
<td>Arrochar MU1</td>
<td>3.6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
Ms Fiona Jackson

**Customer Reference**
00655

**Verbatim Comment**

I would like to support Arrochar MU1 - "Land next to the 3 Villages Hall- Mixed use Visitor Experience and Community use" because I believe the Arrochar & Tarbet Community Development Trust is applying for funding to redevelop the community-owned café adjacent to the new 3 Villages Hall, into a modern community café facility and heritage/visitor attraction, which will maximise the cultural heritage and recreational tourism markets for social benefit. There is also potential of developing the site to complement proposals from the adjacent Hotel to create a much-needed community 'civic' space with views to Ben Arthur and the loch, with potential for the development of a pontoon to enable marine access to the villages.
**Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received**

**Part of Plan Commented On**

- **Place - Arrochar and Succoth**

**Responder Name/Organisation**

- Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council

**Customer Reference**

- 00037

**Verbatim Comment**

**Arrochar MU2.**

The complete area would require extensive land fill operations to take place before this could ever be considered. With the exception of the land running towards Stronafyne Farm at the top of the Argyll & Bute owned land the complete area is a flood plain.

The Community Council would recommend removing zoning from this area and designating the area as a flood plain/open space as per NATURAL ENVIRONMENT POLICY 13.

**Section commented on**

- 3.6.7

---

**Part of Plan Commented On**

- **Place - Arrochar and Succoth**

**Responder Name/Organisation**

- Scottish Water

**Customer Reference**

- 00145

**Verbatim Comment**

**MU2-** There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works; however, a flow and pressure test and drainage impact assessment may be required to assess the local network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.
I am writing to object to the proposed development at the head of Loch Long. I don’t know quite what I’m objecting to, but I have been told that if I do not object before the 29th June, 2015, I would not be allowed to object when it came to an actual planning application.

This system seems weird as I would have no objection to a low key development, i.e. bird watching, picnic tables or a small play area, but a larger scale development I would have to object.

I feel there is no need to develop the green areas around Arrochar. They should concentrate on the large brown areas which have been under development for years but as yet are just stagnating and looking worse all the time.

The green areas at the head of Loch Long are marshland and home to many wild species. They are the gateway to the Glenloin loop, a walkway used by many.

Also there is an abundance of accommodation in the Arrochar area on all different budgets. Why not concentrate on improvements, i.e. the pier, torpedo range, even a jetty would benefit all in the community. The Waverley could come back, tourists would walk through the village, shop sales would go up, sales in the garage would see an increase with boat users. Please look at what is required to get the village back on its feet.
### Verbatim Comment

**Ms Fiona Jackson**

I welcome this space being protected/set aside for ‘Community’ use. It is currently an open green space and provides excellent views for Succoth residents down Loch Long. I therefore feel it is inappropriate to suggest it has 'Visitor Experience' potential, or at least there should be building restrictions on it as large buildings would a) affect views down the loch for local residents and b) negatively affect the aesthetics of the natural environment and 'openness' adjacent to the head of the loch and the Loin Water. This land has been known to flood intermittently (it is very marshy), but I could envisage a community recreation area (if raised) could be developed, or even a community trail (locals use it as a pleasant cut through between Succoth and Arrochar) in the future if there were resources to achieve this.

---

### Verbatim Comment

**Cherry MacTavish And Peter McFarland**

I am writing to you to object to the development proposal that was sent to us. I do not think this would have any benefit in keeping this a National Park and would hate to see the natural landscape and wildlife be destroyed.

Arrochar MU2
Change requested: 1) Remove Land Use Allocation Or 2) Reduce Extent Of Area Allocated As Potential Development Site (See Below)

Reason: The majority of the area allocated for mixed use development including community uses, tourism facilities, and small scale residential use associated with other development lies within the tidal flood plain associated with the river Loin and its tributaries. This is contrary to one of the guiding principles given in the introduction to the plan "the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 to ensure measures are put in place to address the impacts of climate change including; adaptation, avoiding development in flood risk areas etc." The entire area is therefore not suitable for development of any form and should be designated as open space. Even if the reduced site which lies above the high water level was to be allocated for development there is a very limited opportunity for vehicular access from Glen Loin Crescent (the only possible access which would not lie within the flood within the area liable to flooding). Please see the attached photographs which illustrate the typical flooding during a spring high tide. (photos taken in January 2014)

*Please see attachment 1 for supporting information*
**Verbatim Comment**

Looking at Arrochar & Tarbet as one area the first point noted by the Community Council is the fact that five of the sites earmarked within the Plan are all very strategic entrances to our villages which were highlighted in the 2010 Plan still lie undeveloped and the condition of the sites are not conducive to a high tourist area.

**Arrochar VE1**

Site of the Former Torpedo range. Planning permission passed for mixed use of Housing and Visitor Experience. Developer flattened some of the old buildings and removed the line of trees that had blocked the vision of the site from the A83. To date no more action has been taken. The site which is situated at the western entrance / exit from Arrochar has now become nothing more than a drive through dumping ground. The local belief that asbestos contamination on site occurred and remained when the old MoD buildings were demolished with no removal of debris from the site this remains of a high concern in the village, particularly as this is now over a year since part demolition took place. This contamination is covered by Natural Environment Policy 16.

**Should planning permission on this site reach its expiry date, renewal for planning should be questioned: should the Community Council support this again? Especially if there is no clause to make developers keep the site tidy and secure along with a Community Planning gain incorporated into conditions.**

VE1- There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works, however, a flow and pressure test and drainage impact assessment may be required, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.

A Flood Risk Assessment will be required either prior to, or in conjunction with any planning application. Within fluvial and coastal flood extent. This will need to define the areas at risk of flooding, the relative vulnerability of the proposed use and confirm design layout and levels. Approximate Coastal Flood Boundary level is 4.47mOD.
### Verbatim Comment

Balloch

No proposals are shown on the site plan. This is not a popular area for camping, although some respondents to the Your Park consultation referred to people camping in the country parks at Balloch. However, if the National Park is serious about promoting the John Muir Way as a cross country trail, campsites are needed along it and Balloch is one of the places where a small camping facility should be situated.

I wish to object to the lack of camping provision at Balloch for walkers of the John Muir Way.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Balloch

Responder Name/Organisation
John Brown and Company

Customer Reference
00682

Section commented on
3.7.1

Topic
Balloch Settlement Map

Verbatim Comment

Support: Housing and visitor experience allocation to the north of VE4.

Reason: To meet future housing need and provide an allocated site near to Loch Lomond Shores.

We put forward two areas in addition to VE4.

1. VE4A as the land lying south.

2. A housing opportunity. The land immediately north of VE4. This land has direct access to Old Luss Road. This site offers considerable scope for housing and should be considered as a wider part of VE4 with its own housing allocation. It is in support of the area development and adds to the housing supply opportunities locally.

The site could meet demand for new housing in this area and is well located and within the overall envelope of the drumkinnon community.

General support of VE4 and opportunity to include additional areas.

We support VE4 for tourist related development and housing potential with additional land added to provide a more comprehensive approach and a 10 year development plan which will offer a broader allocation of land zoning.

This sites should be considered as suitable for inclusion as allocated sites in addition to VE4.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Balloch
Responder Name/Organisation
Scottish Water

Verbatim Comment

H1- There is currently available capacity at Ardoch Water Treatment Works to serve the proposed development. Separate drainage systems are essential to being able to accommodate new development growth and minimise flow impact on both the sewerage network and Waste Water Treatment Works. A totally separate drainage system will be required with surface Water discharging to a suitable outlet. Scottish Water supports the principle of sustainable urban drainage systems (suds) as part of the design which will require to meet the specifications as detailed in sewers for Scotland (3rd edition), should the developer wish the surface Water system to vest in Scottish Water.

Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Balloch
Responder Name/Organisation
Mr Gary Young

Verbatim Comment

Being a resident in Craiglomond Gardens I have to say that I do not agree with the proposals for the planned housing at the site reference H1.

The proposal states approximately 8 units. My objections/concerns are of the size of development to accommodate 8 units. I believe this would encroach both the properties to either side, reducing their privacy. The development would also increase the traffic at the entrance to the estate and think it would also create a hazard in terms of parked cars. Households today average two cars, this would mean the possibility of accommodating 16 cars which I cannot see fitting in along with 8 properties.
I would like to place an objection to the proposed flats being built within such close proximity to our business. I feel that the building of these flats should not take precedence over a well established business in the area that has been running for over 30 years.

I believe that due to the nature of our business as relates to late night entertainment there could be cause for suffering and complaints from any new residents in the area. We strive to maintain the happiness of our neighbours as relates to the noise during operating hours both inside and outside the building. Out with operating hours there can be noise from patrons that have left the premises and any new residents would have to made aware that this is a situation that occurs every weekend and has done so for the last thirty years.

Things to consider

1: If developers are considering building a property on the proposed site then I feel that they must let potential residents aware of the noise that will be created by our business, so that they can make an informed decision before they commit to buy, so that complaints about noise cannot be raised at a later date.

2: If a developer is building a property in the vicinity of a music venue then it should be there legal and financial responsibility to make sure that there property has been fitted with adequate soundproofing to prevent any inconvenience thereafter to either residents or the music venue.

Balloch H1
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Balloch</strong></td>
<td>Balloch H1</td>
<td>3.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

The Ballagan Burn is located on the eastern boundary of the site with parts of the site at risk of fluvial flooding as well as surface water. SEPA would therefore require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk of flooding to the site from this watercourse to ensure that built development is located outwith the functional floodplain. Most of the site is developable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Balloch</strong></td>
<td>Balloch MU1</td>
<td>3.7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

MU1 - There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works, however, when final flows are known, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss the site requirements.
In pursuance for what is best for the community in Balloch and tourists coming to the area, our community council is somewhat confused that the area behind your HQ at Carrochan has had various control headings over the past 15 years. Started off as HO62 for the grass area, RIA for the car park, then next local plan it was H3 and the latest local plan MU. In correspondence your department states "The site has been allocated for mixed use development including housing for 23 units and car parking following our public consultation last year. Surely you have not listened to the vast majority of people in Balloch who over the past 15 years have stated that they do not want this area used for housing but allocated for recreation and car parking.

More recently in April this year at a public meeting the community were outraged that those in authority at NPHQ are making decisions against the wishes of the local population. So please take note once again that the community do not want housing on this area of land. WDC Ward Councillors are also aware of public feelings for this site—but their officers, don’t particularly care about local opinion and feelings as do the National Park officers, who just see the space as a gap site to fill up.

This area helps provide a distinctiveness and sense of place enhancing the quality of life for the community by helping separate it from the urban sprawl of the surrounding area. The opening up of the old car park to its former use would still provide a sense of space but would ensure that the east side of the village can continue to support and expand sustainable tourist and business development that will provide future prosperity for the community. There is a need to provide coach parking close to the village amenities and to Balloch Castle Country Park.

B&HCC have looked at all the parking in Balloch Village area especially east of the river Leven and have found it to be inadequate for the visitor and local alike. The parking at the village square is full most of the day, and a funeral at the church next to it adds greatly to the amount of cars in the vicinity. The visitor parking opposite Balloch Park gates fills up very quickly, especially if there is an event in Balloch or at National Park HQ, and the NP car park is always at capacity. Having said all that, B&HCC are of the opinion that since the decision, a number of year ago, to sell off the car park was made, much has changed, and the asset to Balloch is to have cars parking at this site with the added footfall enhancing the local economy over many many years and the grass area used for recreation.

There are 3,000 houses all within three-quarters of a mile of this site, why there is a need for a further 23 beggars belief and just a spoiler to a beautiful open area. Your Balloch placemaking priorities seem to lie on the west side of the river Leven, The village proper is mostly on the east side of the river and placemaking should be happening there as well. On a point on what you have called the documentation "LIVE PARK". Its the Local Development Plan not 'T' in the Park as your title suggests. Quirky titles are all very well, but only confuse the general public. To sum up, listen to what local people are saying:

This site, which is valued by the local community as an important green space amenity should be retained for public use and as a natural resource which contributes to the quality and character of this part of Balloch. Further it is also part of the ‘green corridor’ and as such forms an attractive approach to Balloch as a gateway to the National Park.
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Park- it forms part of the Balloch 'boundary' which separates the more urban part of the Balloch from the more rural edge of Loch Lomond. B&HCC trust this response will at long last be listened to and action taken to remove the control heading for this area for the foreseeable future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Balloch</td>
<td>Balloch MU2</td>
<td>3.7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation: Scottish Water
Customer Reference: 00145

Verbatim Comment

Balloch MU2

MU2- There is currently sufficient capacity at Ardoch Waste Water Treatment Works for the 23 foul only connections. Separate drainage systems are essential to being able to accommodate new development growth and minimise flow impact on both the sewerage network and Waste Water Treatment Works. A totally separate drainage system will be required with surface Water discharging to a suitable outlet. Scottish Water supports the principle of sustainable urban drainage systems (suds) as part of the design which will require to meet the specifications as detailed in sewers for Scotland (3rd edition), should the developer wish the surface Water system to vest in Scottish Water.

There is currently sufficient capacity at the Blairlinnans Water Treatment Works to serve the proposed development.
## Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Balloch</td>
<td>Balloch MU2</td>
<td>3.7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

Robert And Jan Shields

**Customer Reference**

00696

**Verbatim Comment**

My husband and I have already submitted our strong objection to the above and attended a meeting at your offices along with others who were like minded so it came as some surprise to receive your letter of 13th May. This infers that LL & TNPA "have identified the above site for development" whereas the planning application noted above was submitted by West Dunbartonshire Council - this gives the impression it is a "done deal"!

Based on our experience of National Parks in the Cairngorms, the Lakes, the Peak District and Yorkshire, we looked forward to having a planning authority which cared about areas of amenity as being sacrosanct i.e. conservation rather than commercialisation and exploitation. To date we have been disappointed by what we have seen to date in Balloch.

Excluding Balloch Park, the village of Balloch has only three green areas of amenity:
- The green area on which yet again housing is proposed
- The land running up the west side of the River Leven on which there is a proposal to build an hotel/housing yet there is one in Balloch in receivership and another one has been opened
- The Moss of Balloch which is used for the Folk Festival, Highland games, Kilted Walk and other events but despite thousands being spent on drainage it is still a quagmire

Why do the people of Balloch, and the tourists who come here, have to be further deprived of areas of amenity? Green spaces are the "lungs" for people and when a green space is lost it is lost forever to future generations.

It is common knowledge your organisation does not have sufficient parking spaces to cater for staff and visitors so they park in the small public one on Drymen Road which leaves little or no room for tourists. When you have big meetings/events the now closed car park was utilised and I have seen it almost full on occasions. In addition, it is the only place where Tour Buses can stop. Also, despite there being double yellow through the village due to indiscriminate parking on same we often have "bottle necks" in the village. It is getting to the stage that something will have to be done e.g. a one way system comes to mind. People are too lazy to park in the Moss of Balloch but having said that, the car parking closest to the shops is normally filled with either the vehicles of staff from local businesses or those of residents who have nowhere else to park.

To the best of our knowledge the land in question was designated as a play area for the houses which abut the land and those that overlook Stirling Road. This green area is regularly utilised:
- the children from the surrounding houses play on it;
- by those less able to exercise their dogs as they are (or were) able to drive up to it and they knew their dogs were safe;
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- in the summer people picnic on it and, last but not least,
- people who come to your offices for meetings utilise the car park which has now been closed.

My next point is if this car park remains closed where do people now park when there are big events on in the Moss of Balloch e.g. Highland Games, Folk Festival and Kilted Walk - the latter resulted in people parking on the pavement on Drymen Road? Yes the Co-Op has plenty spaces but they might not take too kindly to people using it as a car park - unless they are spending money in the shop.

The above application proposes to put 23 houses/flats on this small area of land. This will detract from the ambience of the surrounding area as well as disturb the wild life. The hedgerows and grassy area are home to a wide selection birds, bats, fox, hedgehogs and rabbits. These will be lost to the residents, children and visitors (many of whom come from the city where they do not get the opportunity see such wild life). In addition the access/egress is extremely dangerous due to the short distance from the bus stance and cars turning on to Carrochan Road from Drymen Road and almost directly opposite the bus stance. People wanting to cross the road will need eyes in the back of their heads as they will have to watch for cars coming out of the Co-op, cars coming up from Balloch and coming round from Drymen Road as well as cars coming in and out of the proposed access road - all accidents waiting to happen due to the speed at which many of these vehicles travel.

Why, when there were so many objections to the WDC Planning Application, do you want to include it in your Plan? Why do you want to lose this green area to housing? If you really cared about the wishes of your neighbours you would not have sent this letter - conservation more like exploitation!

The housing market is not particularly buoyant and the only houses which sell quickly are those in a "prime" area like Drymen Road where the last one sold within a week but these are big, solid, roomy houses not like the modern norm of "little" boxes which are likely to go on the above site. Despite the agents ad for the flats at Balloch Bridge stating "last few remaining" at the time of writing 10 of these currently remain unsold.

The WDC application was no doubt based on the fact that, despite strong objections, your Planning Committee previously agreed to a planning application by a builder. Fortunately, due to the economic climate thankfully this lapsed but a precedent has been set. How can you expect people to respect and have faith in the administration of the National Park Authority if you as the planning authority appear to take no cognisance of objections or the needs of local people to have green space close to where they live? If your organisation is truly working in the interests of the people of Balloch and its visitors then you will turn this application down, buy the car park and allow others to park on it!

We totally object to the site being designated for housing on the grounds stated above and hope you will consider the future generations who will lose out if there are no Breen spaces left in Balloch as before you know it they will be building in Balloch Park!
VE1 - There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works; however, when final flows are known, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss the site requirements.
I am writing as a concerned home owner within Drumkinnon Gate Balloch which borders the proposed development link from Lomond Shores to Balloch village. Drumkinnon Wood is a long established woodland which contains a diverse range of insects, birds and mammals with some having protected status. If tree felling commences, however minimal, a comprehensive survey/study must be conducted to determine the impact on the resident wildlife; 50 plus bird species, red squirrel and bats that I have documented.

It would be totally irresponsible of the national park authority to allow any development which would risk the long term preservation of the habitat found within the wood. A nature trail at the north end of the wood has recently been created which is used by locals and visitors alike and consideration should be given to enhance the trail rather than any other development proposal that would see a reduction to the woodland.

I therefore request that the site boundary is moved slightly east to exclude Drumkinnon Wood with Pier Rd to be used as the natural westerly site boundary.
Verbatim Comment

Change Requested: The Transport Assessment Icon Should Potentially Be Added To The Map For This Site, (See Below)
Reason: It is not clear from the proposed plan what the development of this area is likely to entail, if the proposals for this site are for a new vehicular link between Balloch and Loch Lomond Shores or for any other proposal which will see increased traffic in the area then a transport assessment should be required.

We also note that Pier Road is currently a private road.
Part of Plan Commented On  
**Place - Balloch**

Responder Name/Organisation  
Scottish Natural Heritage

Customer Reference  
00712

**Verbatim Comment**

Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps

We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps

The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application.

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Balloch</td>
<td>Balloch VE2</td>
<td>3.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

VE2 - There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works; however, when final flows are known, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss the site requirements.
Change: We request reference be made to the presence of outdoor sports facilities in the 'key considerations' for the following sites: MU1 and VE2. It is recommended that reference also therefore be made to Scottish Planning Policy paragraph 226, the requirements of which should be taken into consideration in the development of these sites, in order to provide certainty to the respective developers for each.

Reason: We have endeavoured to identify, using aerial imagery, all proposed sites where it is likely that we will be a statutory consultee when they become the subject of a planning application, i.e. sites which appear to include outdoor sports facilities as defined in the development management regulations 2013. Where we are a statutory consultee, we consider proposals against the provisions of SPP paragraph 226. In the event that we have missed any sites that include such facilities, consideration of these sites against the provisions of the SPP paragraph 226 will still be required.

The sites we have identified as possibly containing outdoor sports facilities are as follows:

Balloch VE2: East Riverside - possible impact on playing fields
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Part of Plan Commented On: Place - Balloch  
Responder Name/Organisation: Archdiocese of Glasgow  
Customer Reference: 00627  
Section commented on: 3.7.6

Verbatim Comment:

Please amend site map to remove hatched area (Map attached) - ground belongs to Archdiocese of Glasgow.

The red hatched area should be reserved for use by the church and other approved societies. Please remove this area of ground from the visitor experience proposal site.

Balloch VE2

Part of Plan Commented On: Place - Balloch  
Responder Name/Organisation: Scottish Natural Heritage  
Customer Reference: 00712  
Section commented on: 3.7.6

Verbatim Comment:

Additional symbols on the proposal maps
We recommend that the following additional symbols are added to the proposed plan proposal maps. Within the SEA the following sites are highlighted as having significant environmental effects and mitigation is included. We recommend that by including the following symbols on the proposal maps this would help ensure that the SEA mitigation is delivered:

Balloch VE2: The Environment Report describes flooding as an issue but there is no flood icon in proposal map. We recommend that the relevant flooding symbol is added to the relevant map.
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Part of Plan Commented On

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place - Balloch</th>
<th>Balloch VE2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation
Scottish Natural Heritage

Customer Reference
00712

Section commented on
3.7.6

Verbatim Comment

Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps
We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps
The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

"The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application."

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

"A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan."
## Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Balloch</td>
<td>Balloch VE2</td>
<td>3.7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**  
SEPA  

**Customer Reference**  
00713

**Verbatim Comment**

The River Leven is located on the eastern boundary of the site with large parts of the site at risk of fluvial flooding. We would therefore require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk of flooding to the site from the Leven to ensure that built development is located outwith the functional floodplain and or adoption of appropriate flood management measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Balloch</td>
<td>Balloch VE3</td>
<td>3.7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**  
Scottish Water  

**Customer Reference**  
00145

**Verbatim Comment**

VE3 - There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works; however, when final flows are known, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss the site requirements.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Balloch</td>
<td>Balloch VE4</td>
<td>3.7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

**VE4 - There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works; however, when final flows are known, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss the site requirements.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Balloch</td>
<td>Balloch VE4</td>
<td>3.7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Fraser Shields</td>
<td>00633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

Thank you for your letter dated 13 May 2015 regarding the development of Woodbank House, Balloch and the adjacent field owned by Mrs Telfer Smollett of Cameron Home Farm, Alexandria, who owns the field which is opposite to Drumkinnon Farm, the home of Glendale Kennels.

Glendale Kennels has been in business (on this site) for forty seven years and is licenced for 76 dogs and 6 cats. As you will understand, this number of dogs does create a level of noise which would be unacceptable to close neighbours.

I feel it is of paramount importance, when implementing your plans, that no permanent housing or temporary caravans etc. be erected on the land adjacent to the kennels because of the aggravated noise level.

Please note that I have marked in red, on your map, the area of my concern.

Balloch VE4

**Please see attachment 2 for supporting information**
As residents on Old Luss Road for more than 20 years, we would be concerned about the impact of any proposed tourism development on traffic in the locale. In principle we are not against the development of the site as such for tourism, and believe it would be a positive addition to Balloch, but Old Luss Road is not entirely suitable for the additional traffic that visitors to the site would create. It is a small, narrow residential street, which is popular with walkers and families, and is therefore not compatible with more cars. We would urge you to consider alternative access points.

Balloch VE4
Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Balloch

Responder Name/Organisation
Mr Kenneth Gibson

Customer Reference
00651

Section commented on
3.7.8

Verbatim Comment

When consulting upon the proposed plan for the above site the residents would like the LLT park authority to take account of the following points:-

1. Traffic Flow

We can only assume that this visitor experience will bring more people and therefore a greatly increased traffic flow to the area requiring a substantial parking area. This traffic flow is over and above the recent increase onto Old Luss Road due to the new Queen of the Loch hotel and bar diner.

We would like you to take account the residents of Old Luss Road who have approximately 20 dwelling houses and a total investment of around £6 million in their properties. Generally the residents have been here for a many years, long before the introduction of the National Park and bought into their properties with Old Luss road as a quiet dead end road with very little traffic flow.

Based on our assumption we have taken the plan provided which indicates the allocated site and come up with a traffic flow proposal. The proposal is a logical solution and will direct the visitors via the Lomond shores area to the new visitors experience and parking without impacting on the current residents of Old Luss road and Lower Stonymollan road.

Proposal

The proposal is to:-

a) Bring forward the dead end on Old Luss road to just after the dwelling house at 16 Old Luss road.

b) Route the visitor experience traffic and any other traffic for the north end of Old Luss road onto Ben Lomond Way, join Ben Lomond Way to Old Luss Road (north) around the entrance to the Lomond Shores car park.

Please refer to changes highlighted on proposed plan.

2. Drainage Infrastructure

The current infrastructure at the proposed site already suffers from sewage, drainage and flooding problems exacerbated by the burn which crosses both Lower Stonymollan road and Old Luss road.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Our assumption is that any development here which will change the meadow land near the burn, which acts as a ground soak area when the burn floods. A change to this area of land would only add to the existing problems and require a new upgraded drainage and sewage system to be installed.

Repeated requests to WDC over a thirty year period has failed to implement a satisfactory solution.

Representatives from Old Luss road will attend to discuss the above points with LLT park authority when requested.

**please see attachment 3 for supporting information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Balloch</td>
<td>Balloch VE4</td>
<td>3.7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random Name/Organisation

John Brown and Company

**Verbatim Comment**

There is opportunity within Balloch to provide a site for housing development adjacent VE4. A financial contribution should be clear within policy and not such as to restrict appropriate development. The adoption of policy to promote in certain locations self build should be considered to offer a wider housing opportunity. Balloch VE4 Woodbank House is supported given potential housing number shortfall with around 35% of housing areas requirement unidentified or effective the VE4 site should be widened to include for housing and tourism. The site VE4 is supported and other the adjacent land which fronts Old Luss Road is put forward as housing land as shown on plan (marked blue) together with the VE4A (marked pink) (supporting document by representee XX)

**please see attachment 4 for supporting information
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Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Callander

Responder Name/Organisation
Callander Community Council

Customer Reference
00675

Section commented on
3.9

Verbatim Comment

Callander Community Council has undertaken a detailed review of the draft local plan and we have carried out several consultations with the community including public meetings and discussions with individuals and smaller groups. We have found the majority of the plan to be very well prepared and presented in a comprehensive, but not too technical, format.

Our only objection to the plan is the proposed development site: LT3 Balgibbon Drive. Part of this site has been included in previous local plans and has been accepted as a possible development site by the Community Council. However we have had a significant response from local residents against the planned site, which we have to consider.

Our objections are:
- Access to the site will be through a private housing development
- The site has flooding and surface water drainage issues
- The development would impact an important geological feature

We acknowledge the fact that the proposed development has been reduced in the number of houses and it will be designed with an irregular plan form. But we consider the proposed access route to the site along Balgibbon Drive, to be unsuitable. The road is too narrow, it has residents’ cars parked down both sides of the road and the access onto the A84 trunk road is narrow with poor site lines and difficult to negotiate.

The site also has a history of flooding from the Mellis Burn, which the access road would have to cross. Houses to the south of the old railway line have been flooded in the past due to excess water in the burn and blocked culverts. This development would increase the risk of this flooding happening again. Drainage of the site, especially to the east is poor and the old culverts under the railway embankment would have to be replaced to keep the site dry. By replacing the culverts there will be an increased risk of flooding for the properties to the south of the railway line.

Finally we object to the extension of the site to the east because this will impact the glacial moraine, ageological feature which we should be protecting within the National Park.
This is relevant to the Allocation map:

Allocation Map

The LT2 long term housing and visitor experience should be allocated at Auchenlaich rather than Claish farm due to concerns over the SAC, concerns over the funding requirements and visual impact of a bridge, and the ease of access of the Auchenlaich site to the A84. These points have been expanded upon in the individual submission for the LT2 allocation.

The northern area of the RA1 allocation may compromise the tourism offered here. Visitors to a National Park will be seeking the tranquillity and beauty of the national park and may be put off by an adjacent business/activity area. This area could be counted into the overall site area for long term housing and visitor experience.

Auchenlaich - The Visitor Experience VE1 allocation is welcomed; however it is a site which is also suitable for long term housing as well as Visitor Experience and does not come with the major infrastructure impacts of requiring a bridge over the River Teith.

There should be sufficient expansion space left around the existing schools to ensure the schools can stay on their existing campuses. Relocation of schools will negatively impact on viability levels and deliverability of other new development within the National Park area.
Site ED1 should be identified as a mixed use site for housing, business and community use.

Despite having been marketed for economic development uses for many years and also as a result of the very low historical take up of class 4/5 land within the town, site ED1 has remained vacant and undeveloped. The north western boundary of site ED1 lies immediately adjacent to a historic garden and designed landscape and also the Callander conservation area boundary. It is considered that a mixed use land use designation would be more appropriate for this site given its sensitive location and thus provide a 'softer' transition between the edge of the conservation area and the designed landscape and the existing industrial units that are located to the south east. As part of a more pro-active approach to development of this site and also in recognition of the important amenity value of the land to the North West, it is considered that a mix of housing, small business units and community type use would provide a better overall land use fit for this site. Drummond Estates consider that there is demand for allotment gardens within the town which could be accommodated on the site and potentially act as a green buffer between the conservation area boundary and edge of the designed landscape and the remaining developed parts of the site and existing economic development to the south east. A mixed use development of this type could also help to subsidise investment in lower value land uses e.g. Industrial. Given the sites location within Callander and its proximity to existing services such as the medical centre and open space as well as being within walking distance of the proposed supermarket site, a mix of land uses would offer greater benefit as a whole and meet with the principles of sustainable development set out in the ldp and also within Scottish Planning Policy - June 2014.
ED1- There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works and a drainage impact assessment will be required to assess the impact of this proposed development. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works; however, further network investigations may be required to assess the local network. Early engagement with Scottish water is recommended. There is also Scottish water infrastructure running through this site and early engagement should be made with Scottish water service relocation team at service.relocation@scottishwater.co.uk
On 11 June I went to the Live Park drop-in session at St. Kessog's in Callander and discussed the items below with Susan and Thom of your Forward Planning Team.

I would like to object to the Proposed Local Development Plan that is currently out for consultation. The objection is specifically for Callander ED1 for the following reasons:

1. As part of the Callander South Masterplan Framework there is a need to locate a new bridge over the River Teith. So far the location of the new bridge and the access road to it on the north side of the river have not been specifically identified but the suggested location would appear to be at the bottom of Geisher Road with the bridge crossing the river close to Norman's Pool. This could impact on Callander ED1 area and it is essential that the access road to the new bridge does not go through ED1 and should be on the line of the present narrow section of Geisher Road. This road and bridge position needs to be safeguarded for future planning needs.

2. The proposed area of ED1 on the plan has been extended to show a narrow area between the Council Yard and properties to the north. This area should not be used as the road access to ED1. Road access to ED1 should only be from the bottom of Geisher Road for the same reason as 1 above.

3. Residential properties in Gullipen View and Willoughby Place will have their residential amenity impacted by nuisance and disturbance if industrial units are created and if a new road access is built as noted in 2 above. This loss of amenity is likely to take the form of noise, smoke from burning of waste and smell, all of which are currently experienced from present operations within the Lagrannoch Industrial Estate.

4. ED1 is very close to a Core Path and a Geological Heritage feature. Development of ED1 will lead to a loss of amenity for users of these features.

5. ED1 is an ideal site for the development of allotments and should be retained for this purpose.
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Part of Plan Commented On

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place - Callander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callander ED1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation

Mr And Mrs Neil And Helen Foot

Customer Reference

00657

Section commented on

3.9.2

Verbatim Comment

Change in document requested: Redirect proposed access down to the end of Geisher Road which is already in use by current business units.

The access proposed is too narrow and far too close to residential property boundaries.

We understand development may be proposed in the future but additional traffic to any more industrial units would bring further noise and disruption to residents of Gullipen View who already put up with considerable noise nuisance from council yard properties.

We have attached a map showing an alternative access route for traffic in/out of proposed development site.

We hope our comments will be looked at sympathetically for the sake of existing residents.

Callander ED1
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander ED1</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**  
Peter Stallard  

**Customer Reference**  
00678  

**Verbatim Comment**

**Change requested:**

- Change ED1 site use to open space/allotments.

The proposal for extending the Lagrannon Industrial Estate onto the field that Gullipen View backs onto is totally unacceptable for the following reasons.

1. The site of Gullipen View was selected some 18 years ago and marketed specifically at the retiree area, at that time there were no other buildings so the entire development was surrounded by open fields. Since then some development has been approved along Geisher Road, which has negatively impacted on the environmental conditions of Gullipen View. To now surround a residential area with industrial buildings would be a disaster to the community of Gullipen View, it would be virtually impossible for this proposed development to conform to the 'Prohibited times for noise creation in Residential areas', together with contravention of the 'Environmental Protection (Residential Noise) Regulations'. These are consistently broken today by the Geisher Road development, which is a fraction of the size of the proposed new development. This will have a serious effect on the house values and health of a predominantly retired community. Any landscaping of the proposed new industrial estate cannot replace today's open field situation, a few selected tree plantings will do nothing to alleviate the destruction of the natural flora and habitat.

2. Access to the riverside path and the Geological Heritage feature will be lost for the many users of this feature, and will also negatively effect the wildlife of this area.

3. This area should be maintained in its present form as 'open green space', or changed to the development of allotments which are urgently needed in Callander. It is not a suitable site for commercial development.
Change in document requested: Change use to open space/allotments.

The proposal for extending the Lagranonn Industrial Estate onto the field that Gullipen View backs onto is unacceptable for the following reasons.

Gullipen View was marketed specifically at the retiree area and at that time there were no other buildings so the entire development was surrounded by open fields. There has been some development along Geisher Road over the years, which has negatively impacted on the environmental conditions of Gullipen View. To now surround a residential area with industrial buildings would be seriously detrimental to the community of Gullipen View, it would be impossible for this proposed extension to the Lagranonn Industrial Estate to conform to the legislation relating to 'Prohibited times for noise creation in Residential areas', together with contravention of the 'Environmental Protection (Residential Noise) Regulations'.

Today these are consistently broken by the development along Geisher Road, this being a fraction of the size of the proposed new development. This will have a detrimental effect on the house values and health of the retired community of Gullipen View. Landscaping of the proposed new industrial estate can not replace today's open field outlook, a few selected tree plantings will do nothing to alleviate the destruction of the natural habitat and it's flora.

Access to the riverside path and the Geological Heritage feature will be lost for the many users of this feature, and will also negatively effect the wildlife of this area.

This area should be maintained in its present form as open green space, or changed to allotments, or similar, which are needed in Callander.

It is not a suitable site for commercial development, as this can not be achieved without irreversible damage to the Gullipen View community.
Change in document requested:
Proposed access re-directed to existing tarmac lane, leading from Geisher Road and currently used by businesses.

Reason: Map with existing highlighted lane - attached

The existing tarmac lane leading from Geisher Road has been used, and is still used, by businesses located along its length. I can confirm this, from personal experience, as I've used, and still use, one of the motor repair garages since 1997.

The proposed access shown on the plan is narrow and right against residential property fences.

Nothing remains the same forever and development has to take place, but it is sincerely hoped that it will be carried out with low level structures to minimise the impact and be done with sensitivity and respect for residents.

I, for one, selected the site of my house because of its open aspect and was not informed of any potential future development by the solicitor carrying out searches.

It was some years later, that a Community Councillor mentioned verbally that the land would be earmarked for industrial development at some point in the future. We were told, again verbally, that with existing businesses already there, any development would work up from the bottom of the field.

We can only hope you will take our comments into consideration.
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Part of Plan Commented On
Place - Callander

Responder Name/Organisation
Mark Bowman

Customer Reference
00684

Topic
Callander ED1

Section commented on
3.9.2

Change in document requested:
Proposed access objected to as well as residential/retail development.

Reason:
I object to the proposed proposal to the field to the rear of my property at 21 Gullipen View, Callander, on the grounds of the unsuitability of the planned access road being too narrow and the proximity to the boundary of my property, impacting both in privacy and noise pollution to the bedrooms at the rear of my dwelling.
I would also object to any development that was other than economic i.e. residential/retail and operational within 8am - 6pm, office house. Due to the open aspect that was planned on, this would have impact if it is built to a high level and would also create a corral effect to the Gullipen View estate, therefore, I am unable to give my support to the existing proposal and formally object.
Part of Plan Commented On: Callander ED1

Responder Name/Organisation: Fiona Guthrie

Customer Reference: 00685

Verbatim Comment:

Change in document requested:
Proposed access redirected to existing tarmac lane, leading from Geisher Road and currently used by businesses.

Reason:
The proposed access shown on the plan is narrow and will be up against residential property fences. There is already a tarmac lane leading from Geisher Road that businesses on the Lagrannaoch Industrial Estate have used for years and for the last 18 years to my personal knowledge.

It is appreciated that the development has to take place, but it is sincerely hoped with low level structures and with respect to the residents.

I along with others, specifically chose the site for my house due to it having open aspect and relative peace and quiet, along with others, I was not informed of any potential future development by the solicitor carrying out the searches.

As with other residents, it was some years later, that a community councillor mentioned verbally that the land would be earmarked for industrial development at some point in the future. We were told, again verbally, that with existing businesses already there, development would work up from the bottom of the field. We can only hope that you take these comments into consideration.

** Please see attachment 5 for supporting information **
Part of Plan Commented On: Place - Callander  Topic: Callander ED1

Responder Name/Organisation: Alexander Livingstone  Customer Reference: 00686

Section commented on: 3.9.2

Verbatim Comment:

Change in document requested:
The lane from Geisher Road is in use by several other businesses which is more suitable for access to the proposed local plan ED1.

Reason:
Access by the land on the plan is very narrow and against garden boundary fences.
I bought my house 17.5 years ago for the reason it had an open outlook.
(Map attached)

**Please see attachment 5 for supporting information**
Verbatim Comment

Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps
We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps
The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

"The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application."

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

"A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan."
SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the Teith and small watercourses which affect the site. Consideration should be given to any nearby culverted watercourses which cause flooding in this area. PAN 69 states that "buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active". Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment is requested within Proposed LDP.
## Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Callander</strong></td>
<td>Callander MU1</td>
<td>3.9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

| Scottish Water | 00145 |

**Verbatim Comment**

Callander MU1- There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works, when final flows are confirmed for this proposed site, contact should be made with Scottish water as drainage impact assessments may be required. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works; however, a flow and pressure test may be required to assess the local water network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Callander</strong></td>
<td>Callander MU1</td>
<td>3.9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

| Roy Flint | 00680 |

**Verbatim Comment**

Change in document requested : MU1 to be removed.

The car park is quite often full, a priceless asset with first class toilets. Visitors arriving from the central belt and further afield should feel they have arrived in a place worth spending some time giving a relaxed and individual air. This happens with the 20 minute car journey, or 40 minutes by service bus, leaving behind motorways and Stirling to arrive at the Park - with real mountains and grandeur at your feet. So - arrive in the car park, nearly always find a space, get out to stretch and relax with space, trees and lovely vistas - will worth a photograph.

Shops of all kinds are a couple of minutes away in the Main Street and to have new retail and business premises confronting car arrivals could be a turn off and the suspicion of more development, how strange. The impression of arriving at open spaces and the ethos of a National Park would surely be lessened. Some tweaks could help eg. Getting rid of the drab, brick walls at the entrance to the car park to be replaced by stone and incorporating some wooden seating at the top would be good for many, visually and for rest.

Development and loss of parking spaces I feel to be detrimental for Callander as a gateway to the National Park.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On: Place - Callander
Topics: Callander MU1
Customer Reference: 00713
Section commented on: 3.9.3

Verbatim Comment:

SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow through the site. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges which may exacerbate flooding. Planning Advice Note 69 states that "buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active". Site will likely be constrained due to flood risk. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage. Flood Risk Assessment (no DIA) is requested within Proposed LDP.
Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Callander

Responder Name/Organisation
Mrs Doris Clark

Customer Reference
00725

Verbatim Comment

- Put forward plans for a community hall.

This is something that would benefit the whole community.

A hall with a stage could be used by many local groups.

The Scout's hut was burnt down. The price to hire the Local High School is going up.

I think we are one of the only places in Scotland that does not have a community hall.

Attaching the local Tourist Board office alongside this would not be out of place being very central and with good parking area.

With disabled access provided for the hall and a decent sized tourist office with gift shop I am sure this would be a better use for the site.

I believe that to go ahead with the plans for retail businesses and transport would be too much for Callander on the whole with the amount of traffic we already have and the local shops struggling to keep going.
Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Callander

Responder Name/Organisation
Scottish Water

Customer Reference
00145

Section commented on
3.9.4

Verbatim Comment

H1- There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works to serve this proposed site. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works to serve this proposed site. Further network investigations may be required and early engagement with Scottish water is recommended.

Verbatim Comment

We write as owners of 110A Main Street, Callander, FK17 8BG.

We received your letter dated 13th May 2015 informing us that there is a proposed housing allocation at land off Pearl Street, Callander. You included a site map of the area.

We wish you to note that the area leading from Main Street and the parking area behind the property is jointly owned by ourselves and the other 4 owners of flats/houses in the building. We have enclosed an altered copy of the site map for your information.

We trust that this was a clerical error and that you will confirm to all householders that your plans do NOT include our property. We also wish you to confirm that no access to the site will be gained from Main Street and that parking of vehicles/deliveries involved with the development and future tenants of the properties will not use our land.

Callander H1 - Pearl Street, Callander
Council may have more info on flood risk to site. SEPA support the provision of an Flood Risk Assessment. SEPA do not hold any additional information on flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment requested in Proposed Plan.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Verbatim Comment

H2- There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works and a drainage impact assessment will be required to assess the impact of this proposed development. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works; however, further network investigations may be required to assess the local network. Early engagement with Scottish water is recommended.

Verbatim Comment

Additional symbols on the proposal maps

We recommend that the following additional symbols are added to the proposed plan proposal maps. Within the SEA the following sites are highlighted as having significant environmental effects and mitigation is included. We recommend that by including the following symbols on the proposal maps this would help ensure that the SEA mitigation is delivered:

Callander H2: Environment Report highlights flooding an issue but there is no flood icon in LDP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander H2</td>
<td>3.9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

SEPA did comment on this site during the planning process (2010/0021/DET) and offered no objection as mitigation measures incorporated within design to prevent risk of flooding from surcharging of upstream culvert. Should the site design/layout change compared to what was previously agreed we would require an Flood Risk Assessment that takes into account the risk from the small watercourse which is culverted adjacent/within boundary of site. Only a Drainage Impact Assessment requested in Proposed LDP - suggest that an Flood Risk Assessment should also be requested.
H3- There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works and a drainage impact assessment may be required to assess the local network. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works; however, a flow and pressure test may be required to assess the local network.

Change: We request reference be made to the presence of outdoor sports facilities in the 'key considerations' for the following sites: H3; ED1; MU1; VE2. It is recommended that reference also therefore be made to Scottish Planning Policy paragraph 226, the requirements of which should be taken into consideration in the development of these sites, in order to provide certainty to the respective developers for each.

Reason: We have endeavoured to identify, using aerial imagery, all proposed sites where it is likely that we will be a statutory consultee when they become the subject of a planning application, i.e. sites which appear to include outdoor sports facilities as defined in the development management regulations 2013. Where we are a statutory consultee, we consider proposals against the provisions of SPP paragraph 226. In the event that we have missed any sites that include such facilities, consideration of these sites against the provisions of the SPP paragraph 226 will still be required.

The sites we have identified as possibly containing outdoor sports facilities are as follows:

Callander H3: Churchfields - Possible pitches on site
**Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received**

**Verbatim Comment**

**Removal of site H3.**

*Site H3 would perpetuate the already serious flooding issue in this area.*

**Verbatim Comment**

*A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken for this site and developable areas have been agreed with SEPA. We would highlight that the site will be constrained due to flood risk. Should site have changed we would require an updated Flood Risk Assessment. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage. Flood Risk Assessment (but not DIA) requested in Proposed LDP.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Callander</strong></td>
<td><strong>Callander H3</strong></td>
<td>3.9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation: Cambusmore Estates  
Customer Reference: 00720

### Verbatim Comment

Available expansion land adjacent to the nursery school, the primary school and the secondary school is now proposed for development under proposed policies H3 and MU2. It is understood that there are existing and future capacity issues with these schools. The schools are favourably situated adjacent to the leisure centre and its facilities. New residential development proposed for Callander generally will put pressure on the existing educational provision but it is possible that the schools will have to relocate if available expansion land is not reserved adjacent to current school premises. Relocation of schools, rather than allowing space for their expansion, will increase the developer contributions required from other development sites within Callander. This will bring further challenges to overall viability levels and deliverability of new development within the National Park area. Therefore it is suggested that the plan ensures that sufficient land is put aside for school expansion not relocation.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander LT1</td>
<td>3.9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation

Mr George Cruickshank

Customer Reference

00080

Verbatim Comment

Callander LT1

Objection

1. The boundary of the proposed allocation be extended to include all of the land shown in red on the attached plan and owned by Mr Cruickshank.

2. The term 'Longer Term Visitor Experience' be amended to a 'Large Scale Leisure and Tourism Resort' and explained in the supporting text as per the attached comments and as development falling within Classes 7, 8, 10 and 11 and ancillary uses falling within Classes 1, 3 and 9 of the Use Classes Order. (Background attached)

Callander Housing

Objection

The area shown in purple on the attached plan should be identified as a housing allocation for c. 10 units. (Plan attached)

**please see attachment 6 for supporting information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander LT1</td>
<td>3.9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation

Mr And Mrs Brian Denison

Customer Reference

00706

Verbatim Comment

LT1 similar comments as LT2. Strongly oppose any development of LT1.
Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps

We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps

The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

"The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application."

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

"A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan."
Potentially SEPA have not commented on this site before. As this site is for tourism we require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the River Teith and adjacent loch/ workings. Site will likely be constrained and we would stress that this site allocation may be unsuitable for more sensitive uses as defined in our vulnerability guidance due to a significant portion being at risk of flooding. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Flood Risk Assessment (no Drainage Impact Assessment) requested in Proposed LDP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander LT2</td>
<td>3.9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

LT2- There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works and a drainage impact assessment will be required for this site. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works; however, further network investigations may be required to assess the local network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander LT2</td>
<td>3.9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>00185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

Change in document requested: Removal of indicative housing number from allocation in Proposed Plan; inclusion of Historic Environment Scotland as stakeholder in relevant Action Programme entry.

**Please see attachment 12 for Supporting Information**
## Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander LT2</td>
<td>3.9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responder Name/Organisation

Mr And Mrs Brian Denison

### Customer Reference

00706

### Verbatim Comment

1. LT2 is located directly behind our property and although we accept we have 'no right to a view' we hope our concerns on any future development on LT2 will be taken into account in any final decisions. We have invested a great deal of our hard earned money into our property having recently upgraded our home to run a B&B business and its location, with unspoiled views are a big selling point with our clients and would therefore strongly oppose any development of the land in the area.

2. LT2 How would you protect the important archaeological sites.

3. LT2 How would you deal with the flooding and ponding in this area.

4. LT2 How and where would you access this area. The A81 is a fast stretch of road and the traffic would need to be slowed.

5. LT2 Would you include constructing a pedestrian footway from the access off A81 to Callander.

6. LT2 Would you provide utility services such as gas, power, water & sewage in the verge / footway along the A81 from Callander to LT2/LT1.

7. LT2 Should the development go ahead, how would you keep the construction noise to a minimum.

8. LT2 It was stated at the consultation meeting in Callander that LT2 was currently proposed for development after 10 years, however, another member of the planning teams mentioned it's status could change and development could be earlier. Any development in these areas is a great concern for us at any time but should this go ahead within the next 10 years this would be more upsetting for my wife and I as we mentioned earlier, we have just ploughed a substantial amount of our money in opening up our B&B business.

9. Letter It2, Claish Farm. - This letter was very poorly put together and gave very little information. This came as a big shock to my wife and I when it arrived and feel that further explanation behind the correspondence should have been included.

10. Letter It2, Claish Farm. - This letter was very poorly put together and gave very little information. This came as a big shock to my wife and I when it arrived and feel that further explanation behind the correspondence should have been included.
Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps
We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps
The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

"The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application."

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

"A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan."
### Verbatim Comment

SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the River Teith and small watercourses which flow through the site. Site will likely be constrained due to flood risk. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage. Flood Risk Assessment (no DIA) requested in Proposed Plan.
This is for Callander LT2 site

The proximity of the LT2 and MU2 allocations lying adjacent to the SAC site of European importance has the potential for significant in-combination negative effects on this SAC site, for example from pollution due to run off from a flooding event. The Auchenlaich site should be used when carrying out an Appropriate Assessment as an alternative solution to Claish Farm. Auchenlaich is recognised as being suitable for tourism and is also able to deliver the aspirations of policy LT2 for long term housing and Visitor Experience.

Allocating Auchenlaich for long term housing and Visitor Experience will not require a new bridge over the river, which may further compromise the SAC due to air pollution, litter and water runoff from the road surface as the Auchenlaich site has direct access onto the A84. Furthermore because of this A84 access point, developer contributions will not be required to pay for a new bridge which will lessen the challenge to overall viability levels and deliverability of other new development within the National Park area.

The A84 is the preferred road (to the A81) between Callander and Glasgow or Edinburgh. Since the upgrade of the M80 motor way connecting Stirling to Glasgow, the majority of motorists travelling to Glasgow from Callander take the A84 then the M80. Using the RAC route planner, it now only takes 52 minutes to get to the centre of Glasgow using the A84 then M80 motorway, but if the route used was along the A81 by the proposed Callander South, the time taken to reach the centre of Glasgow would take 68 minutes using the A81 or 70 minutes using the A81 and A809 to Glasgow. This is an approximate difference of up to 35% extra travel time using the A81 or old 'Glasgow road' compared to the more direct A84.

Not only is the A84 and M80 the preferred route to Glasgow, the A84 and M9 is also the main link to the North, South and East.

The development of the Auchenlaich site would not cause congestion at the Cross street bridge junction in the centre of Callander; a further reason why a road bridge bypass to enable cars to easily access the A84 is not required.
Since the last Local Plan the site has been extended to the east forming an extended site which includes the field next to the golf course and the narrow strip of land to the north of the old railway line. Inclusion of the narrow strip of land is my objection to this site.

The land includes all or part of the geological feature, the glacial moraine. This feature is a linear feature and the loss of any part of it will destroy the formation in terms of the shape of the feature and the composition of the material. In verbal consultation with the planners at the Callander open day, it was said that if any development was proposed on this feature then it would be refused because of the impact on the geological feature - therefore exclude it now from this plan.

The land between the old railway line and the geological feature is a depression in the ground where water seeps out of the moraine and in its natural condition, would drain slowly down to the river. Because of this wet ground, the old railway line in this section was elevated on an embankment with culverts underneath the embankment to maintain the drainage of the land. In normal winter conditions there is a significant amount of water which builds up on the north side of the embankment and in wet weather this becomes a small lake feature. If the land was developed for housing then it would have to be raised to be above the winter water table but how would the water drain under the embankment. If new culverts were constructed under the embankment they would discharge into the housing area on the south side of the embankment, potentially causing drainage issues or flooding issues for these houses. It would be better to leave this section of land alone and let the existing drains cope with the water in the way they have done for the past 100 years i.e. exclude this strip of land from the plan.In conclusion, my objection is to the extension of this development area to the east and I object because it will affect a geological feature and it will impact the drainage of the area and potentially flood existing houses.
LT3: There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works and a drainage impact assessment will be required for this site. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works; however, further network investigations may be required to assess the local network.
I am writing in response to the proposed housing development to the north of Lagranoch Drive, Callander (PMIR2). I am not convinced that Callander needs more housing at the present time - the local housing market is depressed and two houses in Balgibbon Drive have been on the market for over a year.

But what concerns me more is the proposed extension of Balgibbon Drive to service the development. When the houses in Balgibbon Drive were built in the 1970's they were supplied with garages designed to house a family car of the time. I have a Ford Fiesta and just manage to use my garage, but it is a tight fit. Most families nowadays have at least two cars, which are considerably larger, and therefore have to be parked on the road. The road, already narrow, has therefore become one-track and the prospect of forty or more extra cars using it presents problems of safety and congestion. The rubbish collection vans have to back down the road, and it would make their job impossible.

I have lived here for 13 years and in that time have watched the population of Callander double in size, but without an increase in amenities. We are urged to "shop local", which is what I like to do, but we are restricted to two convenience stores, and desperately need a new supermarket. Parking is totally inadequate, with no time restriction on Main Street and not a single disabled bay, which unfortunately I need. I am quite unable to visit my bank and other essentials.

I remember Callander as a delightful town, beloved of tourists and serving the outlying villages, but it is fast becoming a dormitory town, with those residents who are able to, shopping elsewhere, and having little loyalty to the town.

I am sorry to paint a bleak picture, but I am very anxious to maintain the town's identity, which I feel is beginning to erode.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Callander</strong></td>
<td><strong>Callander LT3</strong></td>
<td>3.9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation

Callander Golf Club

Customer Reference

00289

Verbatim Comment

With reference to the proposed development of PMIR2, Callander Golf Course would wish to add to its previous submission. We were disappointed that there was no reference made to our letter by the author of the paper submitted to the board for consideration. Our concerns over the safety of the residents was not raised and we consider this omission should be corrected in future papers submitted to the Board for consideration.

We also would wish to have assurances that any proposed development would not adversely affect the drainage of the golf course. The field drain running from the 16th fairway across to the Mellis Burn is particularly important for the drainage at the far end of the course and is not shown on the diagram published with this application.
Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Callander

Responder Name/Organisation

Miss Cherie Bettison

Topic

Callander LT3

Customer Reference

00294

Section commented on

3.9.9

Verbatim Comment

Change in document requested: Remove Site from plan.

Reason: I realise that this area is for probable development in the future but;

The housing would severly diminish the little wild area country feel of the area so enjoyed by those using the National Cycle Track which edges the area and is used by dogwalkers, children and tourists as well as what little non-houses view that the houses on the other side of the track still have.

Although reducing the number of houses to 22 would allow the possibility of tracks between the houses (properties) for struggling wildlife and it would allow larger gardens, the latter might well be paved or pebbled with a few plant pots by the owners - a practice used by many of the surrounding property owners! This would be of use for the wildlife of the area.

Entrance to the area would not be easy. Balgibbon Drive is concerned of any increased traffic and Glen Gardens is out of the question as it is very narrow with cars having to be parked along the edges of the road AND it would mean crossing the burn which is prone to flooding. Also where ever the cars accessed the National Cycle track to get to the area would affect the track for walkers and real dangers for the young children.
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### Verbatim Comment

As a resident of Balgibbon Drive I would like to record my objections to the proposed planning application to build a further 22 houses in a green field site at the end of Balgibbon Drive with access to the proposed building site being Balgibbon Drive. My main concerns are

1. Access off the main A84 road via Glen Gardens to Balgibbon Road is not wide enough to take further traffic

2. Balgibbon Drive is again too narrow to take further traffic, presently some of the residents including myself have to park on the pavement to allow the flow of traffic to access the road, there can be up to 10 to 12 vehicles parked like this. We have to do this to ensure access for emergency vehicles at all times

3. Glen Gardens is the main route for all traffic from Balgibbon Drive, Marshall Crescent, Livingston Avenue and Drummond Place to gain access on the main A84, again the road is not suitable to take an increase in traffic during the construction of the houses and after from the new planned residents

4. Glen Gardens is the main road for local residents including children to walk or cycle to school. Again increasing the traffic would cause safety issues

5. There would be major disruption by lorries etc. accessing the site during the building phase causing noise and dirt pollution

6. Local services are at breaking point, both the pre-school nursery and primary school are full with plans having to be made find further places with a council that has no budget. The local doctors practices are both at breaking point with patient numbers

Only today I witnessed the Stirling council road sweeping lorry unable to access Balgibbon Drive due to parked traffic at the bottom end of the road. The driver had no option but to abandon his cleaning duties and reverse back down Glen Gardens (Picture attached).

I have also attached picture of how I have to park my car outside my house to allow for access further up Balgibbon Drive

I hope you will consider my points of objection before making you decision.

Callander LT3
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On  

**Place** - Callander

Responder Name/Organisation  
**Mr Richard Nelson**

Verbatim Comment

In the earlier consultation proposing the development from short to medium term, some 60 objections including one from the Callander community council were submitted to the national park. The objections were varied, pertinent and rational and presented an irrefutable case that access to the proposed site via Balgibbon drive was not only totally impractical but also involved serious risks to the general public. The logical expectation following these representations was that the national park would acknowledge that access through Balgibbon drive was totally unsuitable and this option would be removed from the development plan. The national park's decision to ignore the submissions and retain the proposal, albeit on a longer time frame, raises questions about the validity of any consultation process involving the national park and a possible lack of objectivity regarding this particular proposal. Questions regarding the rationale for retaining the proposal and ignoring objections were put to national park employees during the open day at St Kessog's, Callander. They were unable to provide any definitive answers, but did inform me that as the plan had been amended (???) I would have to resubmit my objections to the proposal and that failure to do so would indicate I no longer objected.

I have recently discovered that a similar proposal was made in 2001 and was rejected due to "problems with access". Nothing has changed and in some respects has worsened due to increases in traffic and car ownership. The national park needs to explain what has changed in the interim regarding access.

I can see little point in detailing all of the objections I made during the earlier "so called", consultation but have provided below the main issues of concern:

The transport report used by the national park has one very significant factual error. The width of Balgibbon drive and most of glen gardens leading into Balgibbon drive is much narrower than stated in the transport report. A single parked car would make it impossible for a lorry to pass without the lorry mounting the pavement. Of course there are significant numbers of parked cars at any time of the day in glen gardens and Balgibbon drive and the traffic problems and potential risks of accidents will be considerable during the development stage of the proposal.

There are around 130 households with over 200 cars (not including delivery vehicles, bin lorries, etc.) Using glen gardens for access to and from the main A84 road. Due to the narrowness of the glen gardens, it would be impossible for any large vehicle to turn into glen gardens if there was a vehicle waiting to join the a84. There could be several vehicles involved as well as parked cars and the idea that this would not cause significant traffic problems as stated by the transport consultant is nonsense.

There is a blind bend leading from Glen Gardens into Balgibbon Drive where the road narrows considerably. Drivers have to be very careful in their approach to the bend in case of oncoming vehicles due to the very narrowness of the road and the poor visibility. Accidents can and have occurred and the possibility of numerous lorries using this route increases the potential for accidents exponentially.

There is insufficient off-street parking to accommodate all the residents cars in Balgibbon Drive. To allow access to other drivers many cars are parked on pavements. Even
then, there have been occasions where larger vehicles have been unable to gain access.

There is a piece of grassed land at the end of Balgibbon drive owned jointly by all the residents, designated as a play area for children and is still used by residents' children. This land would need to be traversed to gain access to the proposed development site. All the residents are adamant about retaining this land for the use by theirs and future residents' children.

In the past, Balgibbon and adjoining areas have been subject to flooding. The risk of flooding would increase with the proposed development.

There are protected trees as well as families of red squirrels and bats which would likely be displaced as a road would need to be built through the local wood to access the site.
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Verbatim Comment

There are a number of points that we would wish to raise as objections to the above Proposal.

Flooding
The Mellis Burn has flooded on at least two occasions since we have lived in Balgibbon Drive (32 years) and the area adjacent to the old railway line holds water every year during the winter. On the most recent occasion water from the burn ran down Balgibbon Drive and into some properties on the south side of the street. Flood prevention work on the golf course carried out after the last flood now means that water has been diverted towards the farm land away from existing properties in Balgibbon Drive and should there be similar levels of precipitation as the last flood the volume of water in the Mellis Burn will be greater.

Trees and Wildlife
There is an area of ground on the west side of the proposed development adjacent to Balgibbon Drive that supports a number of mature native trees. I would support the need to maintain a wildlife corridor and would wish to see the trees being maintained to support the red squirrels. Bats and owls are also regularly seen in this area. The planned access in my opinion would act as a barrier to wild life. Access to the planned site can not be achieved without the felling of a significant number of these trees.

Access and Road Safety
This is a major concern. On a daily basis the access to the pavement for pedestrians on Balgibbon Drive is compromised with parked vehicles. Given the number of vehicles owned by residents in Balgibbon Drive a number are regularly parked partly on the pavement which means pedestrian access is restricted and pedestrians, mothers with pushchairs and users of motorised wheelchairs have to go onto the road to pass these vehicles. Wheelie bins and recycling boxes also cause pedestrians to move onto the road.

Parking on the pavement is particularly a problem at the start of Balgibbon Drive where a number of properties have been developed over the years and there is no off street parking, or where there is limited parking, it compromises access to the pavement for pedestrians. Currently the first six houses have 15 vehicles of which only 7 can be parked off street without compromising the pavement. Figure 2.2 from the Transport Survey clearly demonstrates this. I would also wish to challenge statements made in section 2.2 of the TS. It makes reference to good quality pedestrian facilities on Glen Gardens and Stirling Road. This is not the case. There is no footpath on the east side of Glen Gardens and the footpath on the west side of Glen Gardens is in need of renewal and has been for several years. There is no continuous adopted footpath on the north side of Stirling Road. There are no pedestrian crossings in this area to provide safe access to the pavement on the south side of Stirling Road although the TS gives the impression that there is a controlled crossing. Pedestrians waiting to cross the road or buses stopped at the bus stop cause further obstruction to clear lines of sight for vehicles exiting Glen Gardens.
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Stirling Council's response to the original additional site states that the priority now in terms of street design should be for pedestrians then cyclists. Should the residents of Balgibbon Drive park on the road to provide unrestricted access for pedestrians access for emergency vehicles will be compromised never mind the increase in HGVs to service the construction of the proposed properties.

Large rigid bodied delivery vehicles regularly have to reverse down the street to exit as they cannot turn in the hammerhead without dual rear axle steering. 40 foot articulated lorries cannot access the street and turn in the hammerhead and with current parking arrangements cannot reverse down the street. I know this from the experience I had having deliveries made when I extended my property in 2010. During the construction phase of any development this problem can only be exacerbated and I estimate that with the number of properties being proposed we could be talking about a minimum of 750 to 1000 goods vehicle movements.

The response from Transport Scotland and from Stirling Council both state that a vehicle management plan would be required at final planning stage before they offer a final opinion but their current acceptance is based on the Transport Statement which I believe is factually flawed.

The TS states in 2.9 that the approximate width is 6m when it is actually 5.5m and the width of Glen Gardens at the junction is actually only 4.6m. It also states vehicle flows are therefore low and predicts that a 130% increase in the number of properties is only going to increase movements by 16 or 17 double movements per day. With only 17 properties there are currently more movements than they are predicting for an increased number of properties. Glen Gardens also provides access for a number of other streets onto the A84 and services many more properties than the TS acknowledges.

I also anticipate that the access for HGVs, and commercial vehicles from Stirling Road onto Glen Gardens could cause significant risk of a serious road traffic accident. The TS states there were no capacity issues noted. I appreciate that the site visit was for a limited period only but if they had asked any local resident they might well have given more consideration to their recommendation. The visibility lines are compromised from both directions as are the turning radii. The width of Glen Gardens at 4.6m at the junction is too narrow to allow an HGV or van and a car to pass never mind two HGVs. I understand that this was the significant limiting factor when the original development plan rejected Balgibbon Drive as an access for this site and nothing has changed since that decision was taken by Stirling Council other than the size and number of vehicles using the roads.

HGVs entering or exiting Glen Gardens need to cross over the central white line compromising oncoming vehicles. The biggest risk is to vehicles travelling east on Stirling Road turning left into Glen Gardens when there is an HGV or van exiting or approaching the junction and they have to give way without exiting the main road. Vehicles behind will not necessarily see the obstruction and will anticipate the turning vehicle will clear the trunk road and run the risk of running into the back of the turning, now potentially stationary vehicle.

It should also be noted that Glen Gardens is regularly used for learner drivers under tuition and examination for their reverse turns and I do not think that L drivers and construction traffic is a good mix.

The access from Glen Gardens onto Balgibbon Drive has similar problems with compromised lines of sight and turning radius. There is also the added safety concern that pedestrians and cyclists exiting the national cycle route need to cross Glen Gardens within a very short distance of turning traffic from Balgibbon Drive because there is no pavement on the east side of Glen Gardens.
I consider that the Transport Survey and the responses from Stirling Council and Transport Scotland should have addressed these points because all the residents who use Glen Gardens are only too well aware of the difficulties and the risks associated with the narrow width of the junction.

Historically an access was envisaged through the chalet park to the east of Callander but recent building development failed to take into consideration that access to Balgibbon Farm might be required in the future. An alternative access road from the east side of the proposed development through the wood would be a much safer option and would not adversely affect an existing residential development. Such an access road would also provide for potential long term development joining up properties to the east of Callander.

Services
My understanding as a result of recent emergency repairs to the gas supplies is that this would need to be upgraded if the number of properties was to be expanded.

Privacy and Light
Whilst the proposed development does not show any new properties adjacent to mine it is likely in the future that infilling might well have a detrimental impact on our privacy and the amount of light our property would get. Given that we have just extended our property and have east facing windows unlike other properties in the street we would be disadvantaged by having a property adjacent to our eastern boundary.

Amenities
We chose this property because of the quiet rural location in a small cul-de-sac and the proposed development would significantly change the environment. After the construction phase there could be a 150 to 200% increase in vehicle movements and impact on noise and privacy would be negative.

Access Ownership
Graham and Sibbald’s report states that access to the land is in the ownership of their client as shown in Appendix 1c. I would wish to challenge this as I believe I own part of the land that is being considered as the main access to this site and we would not be supporting this application or be prepared to sell our land. Figure 4.1 shows an area of grass and tree in front of the access gate. My deeds show that this is in my ownership and I enclose a copy to back up this statement. I also understand that the remaining grass area is jointly owned by the residents of Balgibbon Drive as a play area for children.

Conclusion
It is my opinion that the Transport Statement is flawed and the conclusions drawn are not accurate. This has also influenced the recommendations made by Transport Scotland and Stirling Council. I also consider that any proposal should have considered the problems that would be caused by transport during the construction phase rather than wait for a detailed planning application. The width of the access from the trunk road at 4.6m was a significant reason for the rejection of access to this site through Balgibbon Drive historically and nothing in this application has changed that factor. I can also see no justification for overturning the original decision of 2001 regarding proposed access to this site or the officer recommendation not to progress this site for access and safety reasons. By maintaining this site as long term potential with access through Balgibbon Drive creates uncertainty and will adversely affect all those living in Balgibbon Drive and potentially reduce property values. Given there are also flooding, environmental and pedestrian safety issues I can see no justifiable reasons for the inclusion of this site with access through Balgibbon Drive. Appreciating that costs will be a major consideration an access from the east of the proposed site would eliminate the need to bridge the Mellis Burn and provide a safer and easier access both during and after the construction phase with the potential for longer term development.
Comments: AGAINST the document.

As a resident, and after consulting with my family, I wish to put forward reasons why we are not in favour of the proposed development:

1. Initially, Balgibbon Drive will be inundated with the contractors vehicles and supply deliveries to the site.

2. Balgibbon Drive is a narrow cul-de-sac, and the aforementioned vehicles will find great difficulty in negotiating through the maze of parked vehicles belonging to the residents.

3. Balgibbon Drive was not built with the intention of carrying the volume of weight relevant to accessing a building site.

4. The contractor’s vehicles, when faced with each other in the opposite direction, would have to encounter mounting the pavements in order to pass one another. At the current time, the weight of parked cars already cause subsidence in the pavements, leading to unsatisfactory conditions for pedestrians.

5. Gas/water supply pipes would be under serious threat from the voluminous pressure caused by these large vehicles mounting the pavements.

6. The entrance to Balgibbon Drive from Stirling Road, is via Glen Gardens. The entry to Glen Gardens from the main thoroughfare (A84) is very narrow, and is difficult to negotiate as a two-way system.

7. Balgibbon Drive presents a blind corner on entering/exiting, and an increased volume of traffic would exacerbate what is already a safety hazard.

8. As a cul-de-sac, the residents of Balgibbon Drive are frequently left to fend for themselves with regards to heavy snow and icy conditions.

9. The increased volume of traffic would be detrimental to the lifespan of pets, which are not fenced in, owing to open-planned gardens being a condition of the residents missives.

10. The childrens' play area, situated at the top end of Balgibbon Drive, is also an open-planned area, and this too could lead to future accidents, with the new traffic passing by.
11. Since the original building of Balgibbon Drive, car ownership per household has increased. This has led to the need for on-street parking. Owing to the narrow width of the road, vehicles have to park on the pavements, which in turn causes pedestrians (especially with disability buggies, shopping trolleys, prams or golf trolleys) to walk in the middle of the street. Once again, a safety hazard.

Callander LT3
The proposed site LT3, Balgibbon Drive, should not be developed as proposed (for housing).

1. The Callander Charrette concluded that any expansion to the east and west would only elongate the town. A more compact concentric form of growth to the south was agreed as the best way forward. This proposed development goes against that agreement.

2. Existing access roads to the proposed development site are too narrow to accommodate additional traffic. The road is often congested with existing traffic.

3. The eastern half of the proposed development would result in a reduction of natural habitat which is currently home to red squirrels, owls, bats, hedgehogs, etc. This development would have an impact on the red squirrel population.

4. The eastern half of the proposed development comprises of an important geomorphologic landform - moraine left by the Teith Glacier at the end of the last ice age. This feature (slope) stretches across the eastern half of the proposed development and on towards the A84.

   This is a rarely preserved example of a glacial feature from Scotland's recent geological history and should be preserved in its current state in line with the aim of Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park to "conserve and enhance the natural heritage of this area".

   This proposed development would have an impact on this important geological/geomorphological feature.

5. Established broadleaf woodland at the western boundary of the proposed development supports a range of wildlife as detailed in Section 3. This development would have a major impact on the natural habitat of wildlife in this area.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander LT3</td>
<td>3.9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

Balgibbon Drive Residents

**Customer Reference**

00666

**Verbatim Comment**

The residents of Balgibbon Drive have discussed the proposal Callander LT3 and would wish to respond collectively to some of the points raised at the workshop held on Thursday 18th June. This letter has been produced as a joint consultation and is approved by all the residents of Balgibbon Drive as detailed in the accompanying schedule.

As residents we feel that we have been disadvantaged by the report which was published prior to the last meeting. It clearly stated that the site was no longer deemed suitable and as a result of this statement we felt our attendance at the Board Meeting was unnecessary. We were therefore extremely disappointed when the report of the Board meeting showed that the proposal was still included albeit with a small reduction in the number of properties and now considered for long term development. It was stated at the workshop that these changes were in recognition of the number of objections and the difficulties in access. If there was recognition and acceptance that there were significant problems in progressing this site such a small reduction in property numbers does nothing to remove our concerns over safety.

We would also comment that the report failed to mention the number of objections that were received and we feel that given the number and the validity of the objections far greater weight should have been given to them.

It was news to many of the residents that the proposed site was first included in long term plans back in 2001. Subsequent investigation has identified that when this site was first proposed there was an understanding by Stirling Council and reported by Councilor Finch that access was not safe via Balgibbon Drive and that access would be through the chalet park. This has subsequently been developed for housing and no long term planning to ensure access to the proposed site has been put in place. Other planning decisions have also exacerbated the problem of access in Balgibbon Drive. The majority of properties have been extended over the years and they have no or limited off street parking which now means that a significant number of cars are parked partly on the pavement and on the road.

If the difficulty of access and safety were valid reasons back in 2001 the only thing that has changed are an increase in the number of vehicles on the road and the size of these vehicles and this can only make the problem worse. The junction of Glen Gardens onto the A84 is probably the worse junction in Callander given the number of properties it serves and the volume of traffic. With an extremely narrow width and compromised lines of sight this junction is unlike any other junction in Callander and given the proposed increase in the volume of traffic that will be using this junction it is in our opinion more likely that a serious accident will result.

The objections raised in the original submissions with regard to flooding, environmental issues and safety are still relevant even with a reduced number of properties and we would wish to reiterate the original objections as still being valid. Whilst the total number of vehicle movements to construct the properties will be slightly reduced there will still be a significant number. Whilst it may not be a relevant item for consideration at this stage of the application it seems inconceivable that it should not be considered at an early point as it will be impossible for large construction vehicles and deliveries to be accommodated in a quiet residential street where parking is already a significant problem. We understand from new government guidelines on street design that pedestrians and cyclists should now have priority and this would clearly indicate that...
residents in Balgibbon Drive and Glen Gardens should not obstruct the pavement with parked vehicles. This would restrict access to emergency vehicles never mind construction traffic. It is also relevant that an environmental report has not been done at this stage. It was stated at the workshop that only at a later stage of the process would this be necessary but when the environmental officer was on site she stated that mature native trees would not be felled to provide road access and the presence of bats and red squirrels would be protected as well as the glacial morrains.

The final point worthy of repetition is the ownership of what is being termed a ransom strip. Collectively the residents of Balgibbon Drive own a small area of land at the end of the road and there is no chance that this would be sold to provide access as this is designated as a play area for children.

Given that there are significant and justifiable reasons to reject this proposal at this stage of the planning process we, the residents of Balgibbon Drive, request that the inclusion of this site with access through Balgibbon Drive be removed from the plan and if it is necessary to include this site then it should only be considered if an alternative access to the east of the site can be identified. (List of Residents ATTACHED)
My husband & I happily moved into Balgibbon Drive in 2004. We chose this street as it was a quiet, dead end street, safe enough for our children to play without too much traffic. All of us who live in the street drive carefully knowing full well that there are children who enjoy playing outdoors at times but the amount of traffic is limited to the residents with occasional visitors to the street. It also is a tranquil and attractive street to live on with very little traffic noise.

The thought of this proposal to use Balgibbon Drive as access fills us with dread and sadness. Apart from the safety factor the noise will be incredibly annoying and unwelcome. The end of our street is a safe turning point for vehicles as the road is quite narrow even when we are parked in our driveway we often have difficulty manoeuvring in and out due to the amount of cars parked on the street. I imagine when the street was designed there were not so many cars but today most houses have at least two vehicles per residence. The driveways are not designed well and a lot of vehicles are not suitable for them as they have a rather raised bump and several cars have 'bottomed out' hence most residents park on the street.

Apart from the above comments we don't believe that the town can cope with many more houses. The medical centre is already quite stretched and certainly the nursery and primary school struggle to place children. The nursery was built as a temporary unit many years ago (portacabin) but is still in use. The primary school classes are full with most of them as composite due to the high number of pupils. There are two small supermarkets which serve the town but again with more housing this will need to be reviewed.

Please take the above complaint into consideration. We strongly object to this plan and sincerely hope that you will register this objection and keep us informed of any future developments.
**I would like to propose a concern for the development of homes on some of this proposed site.**

The land behind Glen Garden's and some of LaGrannoch Drive is very flat (see attached diagram amended into red line). Where this box ends this land begins to increase heavily in height and is both marshy and densely populated with tree's it then comes to a point.

I would like to see the boundary of this site however changed to reflect the lie of the land for the following reasons:

1. Land is very steep
2. The Land is heavily populated with tree's
3. The Land is heavily populated with local wildlife
4. The site is used by the community for both child's play, dog walking and off road cycling.
5. The Land is very high compared with the other side of this land and unless heavy excavation is undertaken the houses on this site will look directly into the homes behind this land which constitutes some of LaGrannoch Drive and the back of Robertson Way numbers 30, 32, 34, 36.

**Please see attachment 7 for supporting information**
I am writing regarding the proposals to develop additional housing thereby extending Balgibbon Drive and the proposed access through Balgibbon Drive.

I am writing to object against the proposals. The reasons for my objections are as follows:

1. I believe the proposal entrance via Balgibbon would create excessive traffic through an already congested area. Balgibbon Drive is used for turning by residents and visitors and can and does get very busy.

2. Balgibbon Drive is a very narrow road with very narrow pavements. Current residents tend to park on the kerb to allow access by larger vehicles. If, as on occasions, this is not done the road becomes blocked. I believe the proposed development would create more traffic making an already congested road more so.

3. Emergency vehicles will have difficulty accessing properties due to excessive vehicle movements, and additional congestion created by the development.

4. Negotiating the bend at the start of Balgibbon Drive is already difficult and especially so if vehicles are parked there. I believe it would become hazardous should there be even more traffic movement.

5. The junction from Stirling Road into Glen Gardens is difficult to negotiate at busy times. The entrance to Glen Gardens is particularly narrow. I believe an increase in traffic movement which would happen with the proposed development would make this extremely dangerous.

6. Cars pull out of the second Glen Gardens quickly. The road is narrow and there are often blind spots due to parked cars. This is hazardous but will, I believe, be even more so with increased traffic movement.

7. As a mother of two very young children I have a very real concern that any increase in traffic movement will prove hazardous to their health and safety. If more cars park on the kerb which is highly likely, there will be limited access to the kerb. They will be forced to walk on the road at some points and with increased traffic they will be in danger as will other pedestrians. My children, myself and other pedestrians frequently have to use the kerb currently because of cars parked on the kerb. The danger to them will increase if there is an increase in traffic movements. I am very concerned that accidents will happen as a result.

8. My children play on the land at the end of Balgibbon Drive. It is currently a safe play area. This would no longer be the case and should there be through traffic under the proposed development. In conclusion, that the proposed development presents potential hazards and difficulties for locals. I believe the risks significantly outweigh the benefits.
In conclusion that the proposed development presents potential hazards and difficulties for locals. I believe the risks significantly outweigh the benefits.
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Hugh English

Customer Reference

00697

Verbatim Comment

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in reference of your proposal of the development plan (Site ref LT3) location at Balgibbon Drive Callander.

I wish to strongly object to these houses being built on this site as it would have a very unhealthy impact on the environment and more importantly take our beautiful view of hills and countryside away.

I was informed when I bought this property that this land would never be built upon as it is part of the National Park. I also feel that it would have a big affect on propoerty prices all along this area. I hope this is taken into consideration.
SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assess the small watercourse which flows through the site. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges which may exacerbate flooding. PAN 69 states that "buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active". Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment requested in Proposed Plan.
I am more than a little concerned that the site at the end of Balgibbon Drive should be considered for development with access through the Balgibbon route. I am also perplexed that the National Park has permitted this proposal to enter an advanced stage of consideration when access to the proposed site is clearly compromised due to the width of Balgibbon Drive and current ownership of the proposed entrance, Balgibbon residents and objectors. My key concerns are as follows:

1. The Balgibbon proposed entrance contains an area of old established woodland which houses a wide variety of wildlife including Owls and Pipistrelle Bats. These creatures are of local interest and add to the valuable rural setting of this Callander boundary.

2. The Balgibbon proposed entrance would create excessive traffic movement through an already congested area, currently used for turning by the existing residents, visitors, delivery and service vehicles.

3. Many of the residents are either retired or working from home thereby parking their vehicles throughout the core parts of each day and receiving multiple deliveries and services.

4. Balgibbon Drive was constructed when vehicles were of a smaller proportion than today and therefore the road is frequently difficult to negotiate by car and van. Many residents therefore park partially on the pavement (see 5) to ease congestion and allow access to emergency vehicles (see 6).

5. By permitting the development of the site with Balgibbon access, current residents will be required to park vehicles fully onto the pavements on both sides of the road. This would force pedestrians, people with prams and disabled persons into using the road to enter or exit.

6. By permitting the development of the site with Balgibbon access emergency vehicles will have difficulty accessing all properties due to congestion and excessive vehicle movements created by the development. Judging from other recent developments each property has two vehicles on average creating a further minimum of 60 vehicle movements each way plus deliveries and services within an already 'at capacity' road.

7. It should be noted that the junction from Stirling Road into a narrow Glen Gardens is a challenging manoeuvre, which frequently causes congestion, particularly during the hours of 07.30 and 08.45 and 16.00 and 18.30 in both Glen Gardens and Stirling Road which can create difficulties for the emergency services that are located nearby.

8. It should be noted that there have been a number of accidents at the Stirling Road, Glen Gardens junction and this is likely to increase without additional traffic management measures being employed.
9. It should be noted that the entrance to the proposed site is located precisely at the site where land is bequeathed to the people of Balgibbon for their use. This land is frequented by children in Balgibbon who use it as a safe play area. This use would be jeopardised as the area would no longer be as safe with ‘through traffic’ at speed.

10. It should be noted that the land as mentioned in point '9' has a constructed stile that is frequented by the local population, adult and children, and visitors thereby increasing pedestrian traffic, see '5'.

11. Balgibbon has a 'Green Road' pedestrian entrance to the Golf Course at the Entrance to Balgibbon Drive and this also gives access to surrounding walks which are frequented by pedestrians, see '5'.

12. The route through Glen Gardens to Balgibbon Drive will transect the Cycle Route entrance. The route then follows Livingstone Avenue. This road is often used by delivery vehicles as a short cut to Balgibbon Drive during busy times thus avoiding the congestion at Stirling Road. This usage would be escalated by a factor of three. Consideration will be required for the safety of cyclists continuing with this route.

13. The entrance to Balgibbon Drive has a narrow 90 degree bend where a large van and car cannot pass. Consideration will be required to re-engineer the road layout to avoid incident. It should be noted that this is also the access for pedestrians at point '11'.

14. Glen Gardens is an already well used road servicing Waverly Drive, Drummond Place, Marshall Crescent, Livingstone Avenue, Murdiston Avenue and Balgibbon Drive plus rear entrance and parking for a number of premises in Stirling Road. Further access using this road will create increased congestion and further difficulties for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.

15. Balgibbon has in the past suffered from significant water damage as a result of water run-off from the Golf Course. Water is now successfully fed off through a stream running through the old established forested part of the proposed site approximately 20 metres from the end of Balgibbon. I have serious concerns that if this water course be redirected or re-engineered it may create a return to flooding of the Balgibbon/Glen Gardens area and more importantly the Callander Health Centre in extremis.

I hope and trust that you will give the above objections your full consideration and take the points raised into consideration and reject the proposal as it exists with Balgibbon access.
I am more than a little concerned that the site at the end of Balgibbon Drive should be considered for development with access through the Balgibbon route. I am also perplexed that the National Park has permitted this proposal to enter an advanced stage of consideration when access to the proposed site is clearly compromised due to the width of Balgibbon Drive and current ownership of the proposed entrance, Balgibbon residents and objectors. My key concerns are as follows:

1. The Balgibbon proposed entrance contains an area of old established woodland which houses a wide variety of wildlife including Owls and Pipistrelle Bats. These creatures are of local interest and add to the valuable rural setting of this Callander boundary.

2. The Balgibbon proposed entrance would create excessive traffic movement through an already congested area, currently used for turning by the existing residents, visitors, delivery and service vehicles.

3. Many of the residents are either retired or working from home thereby parking their vehicles throughout the core parts of each day and receiving multiple deliveries and or services.

4. Balgibbon Drive was constructed when vehicles were of a smaller proportion than today and therefore the road is frequently difficult to negotiate by car and van. Many residents therefore park partially on the pavement (see 5) to ease congestion and allow access to emergency vehicles (see 6).

5. By permitting the development of the site with Balgibbon access, current residents will be required to park vehicles fully onto the pavements on both sides of the road. This would force pedestrians, people with prams and disabled persons into using the road to enter or exit.

6. By permitting the development of the site with Balgibbon access emergency vehicles will have difficulty accessing all properties due to congestion and excessive vehicle movements created by the development. Judging from other recent developments each property has two vehicles on average creating a further minimum of 60 vehicle movements each way plus deliveries and services within an already 'at capacity' road.

7. It should be noted that the junction from Stirling Road into a narrow Glen Gardens is a challenging manoeuvre, which frequently causes congestion, particularly during the hours of 07.30 and 08.45 and 16.00 and 18.30 in both Glen Gardens and Stirling Road which can create difficulties for the emergency services that are located nearby.

8. It should be noted that there have been a number of accidents at the Stirling Road, Glen Gardens junction and this is likely to increase without additional traffic management measures being employed.
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9. It should be noted that the entrance to the proposed site is located precisely at the site where land is bequeathed to the people of Balgibbon for their use. This land is frequented by children in Balgibbon who use it as a safe play area. This use would be jeopardised as the area would no longer be as safe with ‘through traffic’ at speed.

10. It should be noted that the land as mentioned in point '9' has a constructed stile that is frequented by the local population, adult and children, and visitor’s thereby increasing pedestrian traffic, see '5'.

11. Balgibbon has a 'Green Road' pedestrian entrance to the Golf Course at the Entrance to Balgibbon Drive and this also gives access to surrounding walks which are frequented by pedestrians, see '5'.

12. The route through Glen Gardens to Balgibbon Drive will transect the Cycle Route entrance. The route then follows Livingstone Avenue. This road is often used by delivery vehicles as a short cut to Balgibbon Drive during busy times thus avoiding the congestion at Stirling Road. This usage would be escalated by a factor of three. Consideration will be required for the safety of cyclists continuing with this route.

13. The entrance to Balgibbon Drive has a narrow 90 degree bend where a large van and car cannot pass. Consideration will be required to re-engineer the road layout to avoid incident. It should be noted that this is also the access for pedestrians at point '11'.

14. Glen Gardens is an already well used road servicing Waverly Drive, Drummond place, Marshall Crescent, Livingstone Avenue, Murdiston Avenue and Balgibbon Drive plus rear entrance and parking for a number of premises in Stirling Road. Further access using this road will create increased congestion and further difficulties for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.

15. Balgibbon has in the past suffered from significant water damage as a result of water run-off from the Golf Course. Water is now successfully fed off through a stream running through the old established forested part of the proposed site approximately 20 metres from the end of Balgibbon. I have serious concerns that if this water course be redirected or re-engineered it may create a return to flooding of the Balgibbon/Glen Gardens area and more importantly the Callander Health Centre in extremis.

I hope and trust that you will give the above objections your full consideration and take the points raised into consideration and reject the proposal as it exists with Balgibbon access.
I do not support this document.

I am concerned that the site at Balgibbon going ahead due to the major access problems from start to finish.

It should be noted that the junction from the A84 (Stirling Road) is not wide enough for a start and is land locked on both sides with private gardens and could not be widened. This alone would be a major health and safety risk for the general public at this junction.

The whole route up through Glen Gardens and more so Balgibbon Drive is not suitable for increased traffic flow and was not built for that purpose to start with.

The access through Balgibbon Drive for this site is not suitable for through traffic due to access rights that the residents of Balgibbon have for the strip of land owned by them at the start of the new development. The right of access that the land owner has for entry to his new site was only for livestock and farm vehicles, not for a residential development.

So I reject this application for planning access through Balgibbon Drive.
## Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Callander</strong></td>
<td>Callander MU2</td>
<td>3.9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Comment

**MU2-** There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works and a drainage impact assessment will be required to assess the impact of this proposed development. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works; however, further network investigations may be required to assess the local network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is Recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Callander</strong></td>
<td>Callander MU2</td>
<td>3.9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Comment

**H2-** MU2- There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works and a drainage impact assessment will be required to assess the impact of this proposed development. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works; however, further network investigations may be required to assess the local network. Early engagement with Scottish water is recommended.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander MU2</td>
<td>3.9.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Morris Paterson</td>
<td>00629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Verbatim Comment

I would object to houses being built on this site as it would restrict the open aspect which we have at the moment.

I feel that my property would be devalued if houses were built at the foot of my garden.

If permission was granted for this development, would you be able to clarify the following:

a) How far from my property would the proposed development be?

b) I had planning permission for an extension, but there were restrictions because I was not allowed to look into neighbours gardens.

c) If planning was granted would I still have any opinion on this development?

I would like to be kept up to date with regard to this site. Letter or email.

Callander MU2 Claish Farm
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Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Callander

Responder Name/Organisation
Niall Williamson

Customer Reference
00665

Verbatim Comment

Removal of the mixed use area development to the south of the River Teith in Callander and amendments to the proposed housing developments.

The proposed development within the Callander area has many merits. There is a distinct shortage of rural housing in the Stirlingshire area and careful, sensitive planned developments are encouraged. The section adjacent to the Mollands Estate in Callander should be expanded to the south, but also extended west, to include a greater number of houses in that development. The development adjacent to Mclaren High School is an access that is heavily used by school children for the High School. The development here will have a permanent negative impact (a potential increase in road traffic accidents as well as an increase in traffic) on the access for the young people as well as acting as a wildlife corridor allowing safe peregrination of various species to the riparian sac in the River Teith. This proposed development could be transferred to the land adjacent to the ancient woodland at Coilhallan Woods, thus maintaining proposed house numbers and reducing traffic on the access road to the high school. There is also a significant risk of flooding in that area, especially where the recurrence intervals are reducing and periods of extreme weather are increasing.

The mixed use development to the west of the River Teith will have an ongingoing permanent negative impact on both the sac, the riparian access and the wildlife in the surrounding area. Building of an industrial estate and hotels will only serve to push away the sensitive wildlife in our area. It will also negate the possibility of increasing the biodiversity of our area, removing improtant wildlife corridors and increasing the volume of traffic. Callander is an area where red squirrels have a foothold, and consequently their numbers will be affected due to the increase in noise and traffic. The developemnt will also disturb the teaching and learning going on at McLaren High School, especially during exam times due to the excess of noise coming from the naturally occurring business or such a development. There will also be an increase in traffic, thus increasing the likelihood of road traffic accidents. This will have a permanent negative impact on all learners. As a school, we are using the outdoor environment in an ever increasing capacity, and the mixed use developemnt will not allow for futher valid development of this (which is a nationally driven policy to develop the outdoor classroom). I also personally use the view from the classroom window as a valid teaching resource. The development of this area will cease this avenue of learning and restricts the potential of our learners and will permanatly change the feel and look of the school for the negative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander MU2</td>
<td>3.9.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

Lyndsey Drysdale

**Customer Reference**

00667

**Verbatim Comment**

Mixed use is inappropriate so close the the River and within the Conservation Area boundary. It goes against the point of protecting this landscape. It would also be detrimental to the High School in terms of visual and noise pollution. Light industry so close to the River Teith would have a detrimental effect on wildlife in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander MU2</td>
<td>3.9.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

Peter Stallard

**Customer Reference**

00678

**Verbatim Comment**

**Change requested:**

Remove MU1 site at Station Road car park.

Parking in Callander is very difficult at the best of times, during the main visitor period it is even more so, removing the main car park is just not practical - Callander needs this facility, as does the National Park to ensure regular visitor numbers are maintained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander MU2</td>
<td>3.9.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr And Mrs Brian Denison</td>
<td>00706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

10. MU2 How would you deal with the flooding and ponding in this area.

11. MU2 How would you slow the traffic down on this fast stretch of road.
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Part of Plan Commented On: Callander

Responder Name/Organisation: Scottish Natural Heritage

Customer Reference: 00712

Section commented on: 3.9.10

Verbatim Comment

Additional symbols on the proposal maps

We recommend that the following additional symbols are added to the proposed plan proposal maps. Within the SEA the following sites are highlighted as having significant environmental effects and mitigation is included. We recommend that by including the following symbols on the proposal maps this would help ensure that the SEA mitigation is delivered:

Callander MU2: the Environment Report identifies the potential impact on Mollands SSSI but there is no ‘natural environment designation’ icon in the proposal map. The Mollands SSSI (a peat-filled kettlehole that has a valuable fossil pollen record) could be affected by changes in drainage from adjacent development.

Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps

We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps

The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

"The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application."

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

"A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander MU2</td>
<td>3.9.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation: SEPA
Customer Reference: 00713

Verbatim Comment

SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the Teith and the small watercourses which flow through the site. Site will likely be constrained due to flood risk (including part of the site is within marshy ground). Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage. Flood Risk Assessment (no DIA) requested within Proposed LDP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander MU2</td>
<td>3.9.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation: Cambusmore Estates
Customer Reference: 00720

Verbatim Comment

Available expansion land adjacent to the nursery school, the primary school and the secondary school is now proposed for development under proposed policies H3 and MU2. It is understood that there are existing and future capacity issues with these schools. The schools are favourably situated adjacent to the leisure centre and its facilities. New residential development proposed for Callander generally will put pressure on the existing educational provision but it is possible that the schools will have to relocate if available expansion land is not reserved adjacent to current school premises. Relocation of schools, rather than allowing space for their expansion, will increase the developer contributions required from other development sites within Callander. This will bring further challenges to overall viability levels and deliverability of new development within the National Park area. Therefore it is suggested that the plan ensures that sufficient land is put aside for school expansion not relocation.
Support: recreational and educational opportunities

pg.21 LDP - We welcome this consideration of the role of the LDP "Encouraging and supporting recreational and educational opportunities for all is a core part of our work, and this Plan supports the appropriate physical development to deliver this aim."

pg.44 LDP - We fully support the aims to improve links within and outwith Callander and the aspiration to be a walking and cycling friendly exemplar.

The Callander South allocation is strengthened significantly by highlighting the necessity to include open space and in particular playing fields/games area as an integral part of any development at this site. Reference in the LDP to mixed use and a riverside park are welcome but stop short of what is detailed in the planning guidance which specifically includes extension to playing fields. The community would benefit greatly from a flexible games space which could accommodate larger events such as the Highland Games.

pg.21 DPG - We support the identification of land should be made available to the south of the existing playing fields to accommodate an extension if required.

pg.24 DPG - 1.2ha for playing field expansion is not considered adequate when measured against the aspirations to become the outdoor capital of the Park. The wish for a highland games field, additional sports pitches and an outdoor gateway associated with the Leisure Centre could not be accommodated within this area.

By including, in the Callander South Masterplan – Proposals figure, an area (1.2ha) separate to the mixed use allocation there is a risk that any developer will interpret that as being sufficient. While ‘mixed use’ can still include an expansion of this for open space, parking, playing fields by specifying this area the implication is that this would be enough. Simply highlighting the requirement for sports pitches etc. at this location, within a mixed use allocation, rather than specifying an areal extent may be preferable and is consistent with the MU2 allocation plan.

We attach concept layouts, sketching some possible options, a larger area, smaller option and finally the possible integration between existing pitches/parking and identified playing field expansion and the mixed use within the allocation MU2. (Attachments)

In relation to sports pitch expansion it would be more appropriate to indicate a location for this, within the mixed use allocation, we would suggest you remove the 1.2ha separate allocation for this within the DPG. The reason is clear in our submission. Our plans were merely to illustrate a more appropriate scale for playing fields, parkland and public open space, and it’s integration with the existing leisure centre/parking. This would then provide for the multiuse site the community wishes to see, linked with...
outdoor recreation, the leisure centre and accommodating highland games and/or any other events. We are not suggesting that these drawings be incorporated into the LDP/DPG but simply that the LDP/DPG should not steer developers towards a less than adequate provision.

**Part of Plan Commented On**
- **Place - Callander**

**Responder Name/Organisation**
- McLaren Community Leisure Centre

**Topic**
- Callander MU2

**Customer Reference**
- 00721

**Section commented on**
- 3.9.10

**Verbatim Comment**

There is a great deal of support for sustainable and safe routes to school, for example, and an off road link with an eastern pedestrian/cycle bridge and riverside path improvements in the shorter term would be both proportionate to the development of MU2 (potentially with support from other developer contributions with respect to sites to the north of the river) and would assist, if sited appropriately, in safeguarding a crossing location for a road bridge to follow in the longer term. Of course such an approach would be equally desirable for visitors and residents alike.
Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps
We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps
The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

"The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application."

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

"A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander RA1</td>
<td>3.9.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the Keltie Burn which flows along the southern perimeter of the site and the small watercourse (and pond) which flows through the site. We commented on part of this site as a mushroom farm was proposed (PCS111543, 2010/0324/DET) and due to low sensitivity of proposal we did not object. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment requested in Proposed LDP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Callander</td>
<td>Callander RA1</td>
<td>3.9.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the change of use from a green-belt area with wonderful views, peace and tranquillity, into an area developed solely for tourism with hotel and self-catering lodges. I also object to site code RA1 Rural Activity Area. The idea of pony-trekking, golfing, etc. combined with workshops and food-processing is ridiculous. These proposals, in every way, contravene totally the National Park’s aims to conserve and enhance the area’s cultural heritage and to promote and care for the special qualities of the area for the public* (*not land owner).
Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Callander

Responder Name/Organisation

Cambusmore Estates

Customer Reference

00720

Section commented on

3.9.11

Verbatim Comment

RA1 -- This is the one for Callander
Siting the northern section of rural activity area RA1 allocation adjacent to an existing caravan park and next to the VE1 allocation may compromise the Visitor Experience offered here. Visitors to a National Park will be seeking the tranquillity and beauty of the national park and may well be put off by an adjacent business/activity area. The northern part of the site falls adjacent to our existing caravan park and the provision of holiday lodges will complement this existing tourist facility and would be a linked expansion to this caravan park. We have much experience of successfully running this type of operation.
I am dismayed having to go through the same procedure I previously did several years ago only for the National Park to be embellishing the plans in hope of them being accepted this time around.

The area of land that is currently farmed around Auchenlaich Farm went through many years of heavy constant disruption due to quarrying where locals were told it would be reinstated as green belt land for agricultural/ livestock use only when finished, the archaeological areas were to be protected, red squirrels, barn owls and other wildlife like the swans/geese that nest in the pond every year and more recently otters could live undisturbed.

I believed the role of the National Park was to preserve our precious and rare green belt areas where at the moment many locals and visitors alike enjoy walking out through the woods from Callander to take in the views and see the returning swans and geese breed in the pond and many have reported watching ewes give birth or enjoy watching the lambs running around at close proximity.

Surely areas like this are more in need of being preserved as they are rather than being exploited?
We had previously put forward representations to the finalised local plan for the Stirling Road site (RET1) as being suitable for convenience retail use. We were therefore pleased to note that planning permission was subsequently granted by the National Park for a retail store on this site. We therefore support the identification of the 1.44ha site (RET1) as being suitable for retail use within the LDP.

RET1- There is currently limited capacity at the waste water treatment works and a drainage impact assessment may be required to assess the local network. There is currently sufficient capacity at the water treatment works, however, a flow and pressure test may be required to assess the local network when final flows are known.
This schematic is incorrect the building highlighted as being designated for retail development is the Callander Medical Centre. The area under consideration for RET1 lays in the playing fields to the west of the medical centre.

This error demonstrates unacceptable levels of incompetence on the part of the Park Planning Department. Such a significant mistake in this important document should have been identified and rectified by those who gave final approval to this plan.

That RET1 Be Redesignated As Housing Land

The decision of the reporter in his examination of this site during the last local development plan was unambiguous.


‘Drawing these matters together, I do not consider that there is a pressing need to identify a site for additional modern convenience floorspace in Callander’

However in May 2012 LLTNP went against the reporter’s final decision and gave consent for a supermarket to be developed on the Stirling Road site. Their reason for this decision appeared to be based on the preliminary findings of the Callander Charette. A consultation which at the time of the decision had carried no weight at all.

Three years into the life of the planning consent there appears to be no interest from any supermarket chains in developing this site and it lies fallow. Meanwhile the co-operative in Callander has been fully refurbished - suggesting that there is no interest from them in expanding into the Stirling Road site. Tesco are clearly no longer in the business of expansion and are selling off existing sites in Scotland.

Since 2011 there has been a considerable expansion of supermarket activity in stirling with the opening of a new Waitrose, a Tesco metro store in Bridge of Allan, considerable expansion of the existing sainsburys site in raploch and planning permission has been given for a 41,000 sq. Ft. Supermarket on the barbush site in Dunblane. These development reinforce the reporter’s view that:

'Given the limited size of the overall population in the park and the scale of its largest settlement, I consider that it is unrealistic and inappropriate for the plan to attempt to make provision for the full range of facilities, services and retail opportunities within its boundaries. The availability of such facilities and services is to a very large extent determined by the distribution of population and its ability in numerical terms to support a particular level of service provision. I believe that the availability within easy travelling distance of the park of a range of alternative retail facilities in larger centres such as stirling and the towns of west dunbartonshire largely determines the scope and scale of retail facilities that it is realistic to plan for within the settlements of the National Park.'
Part of Plan Commented On

**Place - Callander**

Responder Name/Organisation

SEPA

Customer Reference

00713

Section commented on

3.9.12

Verbatim Comment

SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows on the boundary of the site. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges which may exacerbate flooding. PAN 69 states that "buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active". Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment is requested within Proposed LDP.
Verbatim Comment

VE1- Depending On The Final Flows For This Site, Further Network Investigations May Be Required, Early Engagement With Scottish Water Is Recommended.

Verbatim Comment

SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows through the site. From historic flooding photos this site will likely be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment is requested within Proposed LDP.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On: Callander VE1
Section commented on: 3.9.13

Responder Name/Organisation: Neil Cattigan
Customer Reference: 00719

Verbatim Comment:

VE1 Proposals for Cambusmore should extend to including the above hotel/self-catering, etc., which would keep all the developments in the one area which is unused, out of the public view, and will cause much less turmoil than the one suggested. RA1 Land at Mollendhu (Just outwith N.P.) plus land at Cambusmore, ‘formerly used for food production, etc., would be much more suitable and less disruptive for these plans.

1. Woodland to the west of the farm (proposed for hotel) is red squirrel habitat and very old woodland not even shown on the proposal maps.

2. Disruption will be caused to the ancient burial chamber and ancient woodlands within the proposed area.

3. Historical moraine and woodland also home to red squirrels and several nesting herons will be disrupted, as well as woodpeckers and deer.

4. Pond/Nature Reserve (again not even shown on plans) is a wonderful asset and home to nesting moorhens, dabs, oyster catchers, swans and coots among many others will disappear due to the proposed upheaval.

5. Visitors and locals alike love walking and cycling in the area at Auchenlaich purely for the joy of all the above-noted and the ideal open fields with lambs and calves grazing peacefully and the sheer pleasure of the tranquility.

6. The streams running through the area (and into the S.A.C. of the River Teith) will be polluted causing a detrimental effect to the fish, frogs and newts therein. The area also frequently floods.

7. The services to the area will not withstand the HGV’s and extra vehicular and pedestrian traffic. It will be catastrophic to a lovely quiet area.

8. No-one except the landowner has ever suggested the need for spa/boutique hotels and lodges, especially in this economic climate. Callander needs proper housing for locals, quality shops and the retention of ancient farmland as it has been for centuries and the retention of the few green-belts left.

9. Several sightings of otters have been observed in and around the ponds and fields of Auchenlaich these habitats are obviously close by and need protected.

10. The A84, particularly this section, is extremely busy and dangerous access and visibility will cause enormous issues and will cause road safety and pedestrian hazards.
I am dismayed having to go through the same procedure I previously did several years ago only for the National Park to be embellishing the plans in hope of them being accepted this time around.

The area of land that is currently farmed around Auchenlaich Farm went through many years of heavy constant disruption due to quarrying where locals were told it would be reinstated as green belt land for agricultural/ livestock use only when finished, the archaeological areas were to be protected, red squirrels, barn owls and other wildlife like the swans/geese that nest in the pond every year and more recently otters could live undisturbed.

I believed the role of the National Park was to preserve our precious and rare green belt areas where at the moment many locals and visitors alike enjoy walking out through the woods from Callander to take in the views and see the returning swans and geese breed in the pond and many have reported watching ewes give birth or enjoy watching the lambs running around at close proximity.

Surely areas like this are more in need of being preserved as they are rather than being exploited?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Carrick Castle</strong></td>
<td>Carrick Castle H1</td>
<td>3.10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

**Carrick Castle**
H1- There is currently very limited capacity at Carrick Castle septic tank. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended. Please note There is also some distance to Scottish Water sewerage infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Carrick Castle</strong></td>
<td>Carrick Castle H1</td>
<td>3.10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

Adjacent to coastal flood extent and for information Coastal Flood Boundary level is approximately 4.28mOD Coastal Flood Boundary. This should be used to help define the areas at risk of flooding, the relative vulnerability of the proposed use and confirm design layout and levels.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Crianlarich</strong></td>
<td>Crianlarich Settlement Map</td>
<td>3.11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**  
Tactran

**Customer Reference**  
00073

**Verbatim Comment**

As there are no current proposals for a timber railhead at Crianlarich the site is not shown in the LDP. It is suggested that the Plan should ensure that any future proposals could be supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Crianlarich</strong></td>
<td>Crianlarich ED1</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**  
Scottish Water

**Customer Reference**  
00145

**Verbatim Comment**

ED1- There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works, however, when final flows are known, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On  Topic  Section commented on
Place - Crianlarich  Crianlarich H1  3.11.3
Responder Name/Organisation  Customer Reference
Scottish Water  00145

Verbatim Comment

H1- There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works that serves the proposed site.

Part of Plan Commented On  Topic  Section commented on
Place - Crianlarich  Crianlarich H1  3.11.3
Responder Name/Organisation  Customer Reference
Ms Catriona McKenna  00632

Verbatim Comment

I live in a SC 2 bed in Crianlarich. Out of 18 social housing properties in the village, four of us are entitled to a 3 bed, and are on the waiting list. I would agree to 6 homes being built if they are all adequate sized to fit our needs.
I am contacting you as a resident and property owner within a 20 meter radius of the proposed development of housing at Willow Brae.

I am finding your site and form impossible to navigate. I don't have any technical, geographical, ordinance survey, political, land survey or legal qualifications.

I do however have an opinion and concerns about this development of 6 residential homes which I am finding impossible to translate into your form.

The site directs me to you for help so here goes. I would like to detail my opinions and objections and would, ask for your help and assistance on how to complete this into the form. I am registered disabled and retired due to ill health as I suffer from Multiple Sclerosis, at the age of 37. As well as this causing problems with my mobility it causes me cognitive memory issues, which affect my short term memory and my ability to retain information. This makes navigation of your form and site very difficult for me.

1. Plan out of date and does not show the completed new bypass. The plan included with the letter I received does not show the bypass at all.

2. Proposed double lane road to access development and new residential properties via Willow Brae will prevent the side access to rear of my property. I suffer from Multiple Sclerosis this will prevent my only access to my property with my mobility scooter, or a wheelchair. I can not just move as my husband owns the property and on only one income we can not afford to buy elsewhere, nor can we afford to make expensive new access provisions. The road is on a slope and if it is extended the raised section will prevent my access. Some form of allowance or dropped kerb will be required with enough space for me to access, otherwise I would consider this discriminatory of my disability and access needs to my own property.

3. Access via Willow Brae is problematic for existing residents in winter months. The Brae as it is, is effectively impassible for existing residents in snow or icy conditions it is not treated or ploughed in the winter and can be a few feet deep in snow in winter trapping residents who need to use a car to get out. Extending the brae will only heighten and add to this problem.

Create access road from newly built bypass solving my points 2 and 3.

4. As the nearest resident to this development my privacy will be directly affected. My back and only garden will be directly overlooked. My front entrance faces into the existing residences so is already overlooked and also faces all of the already cramped residents parking of Willow Square. We are property owners. If developers want to buy my property feel free this will solve all of my objections and an able bodied person can move in. Or the property be purchased by the council and can once again be a local authority rental.
5. As a home owner who is housebound due to disability. Having just suffered the noise and disruption for 2 years of the bypass construction, which was further away from my property. I will have to suffer the construction noise, plant machinery directly passing my house at a very close proximity, and on completion the extra traffic noise of people accessing their property. At present the access road serves one private property and is a single lane it was built only for access to the one private property at the back. If you would like to sound proof and insulate my property to prevent this noise this will be acceptable. Or make access from the newly built bypass.

6. Building these properties on the slope above my property may cause drainage issues my property will bear the brunt of this sitting directly below this. I am not a property surveyor and do not wish to suffer the expense of having all of this surveyed for possible consequences and landslides. I also do not want to suffer sky high insurance premiums due to these issues.

7. The residents children from Willow Square use the proposed development land to play away from the car parking and traffic accessing the Brae. Due to us being near a main route to Loch Lomond and also Argyll and Bute we suffer extra traffic caused by drivers taking the wrong turn. This is the only safe place the children have to play.

I would greatly appreciate you assisting me in putting this into the reply form appropriately, so as I can submit it electronically before the deadline on June 29th.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Croftamie</td>
<td>Croftamie H1</td>
<td>3.12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
Scottish Water

**Customer Reference**
00145

**Verbatim Comment**

*Croftamie*
H1- There is currently limited capacity at croftamie Waste Water Treatment Works. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended. There is currently sufficient capacity at gartcarron Water Treatment Works.
Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps

We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps

The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

"The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application."

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

"A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Croftamie</td>
<td>Croftamie H1</td>
<td>3.12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

SEPA would require a Flood Risk Assessment for the site in order to assess the risk of flooding from the Catter Burn and potential developable area.
**Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received**

**Verbatim Comment**

**VE1** - There is currently limited capacity at Croftamie Waste Water Treatment Works and sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works, early engagement is recommended when final flows are known for development.

**Verbatim Comment**

I would object to any development on the above that would have a negative impact on my health due to increased noise. When I bought my property it was for the seclusion and privacy. Increased traffic would remove this and have negative impact on the amenity of the site surrounding area.

I feel that this is against the National Park aims and the Sandford Principle should be applied.

I also feel that the proposal is conflicting with the current title deeds (from when it was built) and its uses.
**Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Croftamie</strong></td>
<td>Croftamie VE1</td>
<td>3.12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
Fortune Properties

**Customer Reference**
00704

**Verbatim Comment**

*Change requested*: Our client requests that the Policy is renamed to locations which are potentially suitable for tourism related development.

*Reason*: Our client objects to the presumption towards a visitor experience type of development at Pirniehall, Croftamie. Our client favours a residential led development which will enable the redevelopment of pirniehall. Our client requests that a more flexible approach is taken to the development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Drymen</td>
<td>Drymen Settlement Map</td>
<td>3.13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Currie</td>
<td>00676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

Change in Document Requested: The designation of the site at Drumbeg, Drymen, should be changed from visitor experience to open space, with an assumption against development.

Reason: I request this change for 3 reasons:

1. **Access.** Access to the site at Drumbeg is via a narrow single track road which incorporates both the west highland way and cycle route 7. The road is also used by local horse riders, walkers and cyclists. The narrow, twisting nature of this road means that it is already a high risk environment for these users. Any increase in traffic on this road would increase these risks and be extremely detrimental to the enjoyment of both visitors accessing the long distance routes and to local users.

2. **Landscape.** For visitors heading north on the west highland way and cycle route 7 the section of these routes overlooking Drumbeg is the first view they have of Loch Lomond and the surrounding landscape. It is a spectacular introduction to the national park which is enhanced by the semi-natural appearance of drumbeg itself. Opportunistic development of this site would significantly degrade this experience.

3. **Wildlife habitat.** The disused sand quarry at drumbeg represents an important semi-natural place within an area of increasingly intensive agriculture. Habitats for a wide variety of wildlife, particularly birds, are becoming fragmented and constricted, resulting in a noticeable decline in numbers and species.

There is a unique opportunity at Drumbeg to manage and enhance the slow regeneration of grassland, scrub, and wetland for its own sake, and for the benefit of the local community. In addition the sand faces which were exposed during the working life of the quarry could be restored, potentially to encourage back the important colony of sand martins which has all but vanished. These habitats are extremely rare in this area and it would be a tragedy if this special place was lost to development.

The principle aim of National Parks is 'to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area'. There is currently no specific reference to the natural heritage aspect of this aim within the proposed Local Plan. I suggest that the redesignation of this site as Open Space, with a proposal that the area be acquired as a Local Nature Reserve to be managed and enhanced as a place for wildlife, would address this omission.
Drymen H1- There is currently limited capacity at Drymen Waste Water Treatment Works and a drainage impact assessment may be required for this site. There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works to serve this proposed development.
Part of Plan Commented On: Place - Drymen
Topic: Drymen H1
Responder Name/Organisation: Morag White
Customer Reference: 00160
Section commented on: 3.13.2

Verbatim Comment:
Change requested: I think a smaller number of houses would be more appropriate on this site.

Reason: In my opinion, placing such a large number of houses here would be detrimental to the village for the following reasons:

1. Such a high density development would detract from Drymen's sense of place. In Gartocharn there are two sites, which look approximately the same size as this one, earmarked for sixteen houses. I don't think it's right or fair that 36 homes are squeezed in here. I think the quota for affordable housing should be the same for all villages within the National Park.

2. The quota of housing earmarked for Drymen (80 houses) is too high. Gartocharn is a similar size and its quota is 16 homes. This is not balanced planning. Drymen is a very special village and I fear that this amount of building will irrevocably damage Drymen's sense of place. I think it will also negatively impact on the infrastructure.

3. I think the volume of additional traffic generated by 36 homes will cause real difficulties in the village.
A minor culverted watercourse potentially flows through the site. This should be investigated as part of the Flood Risk Assessment. Consideration should be given to Planning Advice Note 69 which states that "buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active". We would be likely to object to the development of this site unless appropriate additional information is submitted / the site plan is amended to remove the sections thought to be at risk. A basic Flood Risk Assessment will be required either prior to, or in conjunction with any planning application. This will need to define the areas at risk of flooding, the relative vulnerability of the proposed use and appropriate detailed design layout and levels.

H2- There is currently limited capacity at Drymen Waste Water Treatment Works and a drainage impact assessment may be required. Please note There is also Scottish Water sewer infrastructure running through this site. Early engagement with Scottish Water regarding diverting these mains is recommended. There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works to serve this proposed site. Mu1- There is currently limited capacity at Drymen Waste Water Treatment Works and sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Drymen</td>
<td>Drymen LT1</td>
<td>3.13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

LT1- There is currently limited capacity at Drymen Waste Water Treatment Works and a drainage impact assessment may be required for this site. There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works.
Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps

We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps

The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

"The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application."

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

"A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Drymen</td>
<td>Drymen VE1</td>
<td>3.13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
Scottish Water

**Customer Reference**
00145

**Verbatim Comment**
VE1- There is currently limited capacity at Drymen Waste Water Treatment Works and a drainage impact assessment may be required for this site depending on the final flows for the proposed visitor experience, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On
Place - Gartmore

Responder Name/Organisation
Mrs K Brisbane

Customer Reference
00077

Section commented on
3.14.1

Introduction
This statement relates to land north west of Park Avenue, Gartmore.

It is proposed that part of this land, which is owned by Mrs Brisbane, be allocated in the Proposed Plan for residential development. The relevant area is identified on the attached Site Plan. An indicative scheme is enclosed showing a c. 6 plot scheme, with a new road serving the plots, and an option for a turning head for refuse vehicles (see attached letter from Modus Transport Solutions Ltd).

At present, Mrs Brisbane does not have a developer associated with the site, but is happy to discuss the proposals further with the Park Authority, Gartmore Community Council, and Gartmore Community Trust, in due course, as to how it can be brought forward in the best interests of the village. This could include some of the plots being made available for affordable housing and/or to self-builders, for example.

Mrs Brisbane spoke briefly to the Community Council about the potential for the site in 2013, and again in 2014, and will do so again if the site is included in the Proposed Plan as an allocation.

Gartmore
Gartmore is c. 1 mile from the main A81 Glasgow to Aberfoyle road, c. 3 miles to the south of Aberfoyle. It lies c. 18 miles from Stirling and c. 20 miles from Glasgow. Bus services run four direct services a day to Stirling and three direct services a day to Glasgow.

The total population estimate for Gartmore and surrounding area is c. 468, with an increasingly ageing population.

The village has a range of services and facilities including: Gartmore Community Shop and Post Office; Gartmore Primary School; The Black Bull Hotel; Gartmore Village Hall; Gartmore House; and mobile services including a library visit.

Gartmore is an example of a planned estate village founded in the 18th Century. It is generally linear in form, with the central part defined as a conservation area, although there are housing developments that extend out from the Main Street to the south east and north west, including Park Avenue.

The village boundary shown in the Proposed Plan includes all existing development, including that existing on the south west side of Park Avenue, which dates from the 1970s onwards.
The village has a tranquil atmosphere, which is helped by it not being on a main thoroughfare. The village has a 20mph speed limit, which underlines its status as a relatively safe village for those that live there.

Housing in the village is mainly owner-occupied, with eight properties for rent by the Rural Stirling Housing Association. There are no plans in the existing Local Plan (or the current Proposed Plan) to increase the overall number of houses, and only one new house has been built in the last c. 10 years.

The village website www.gartmore-village.co.uk states that the vision for the village is a diverse community capable of influencing its own future with a thriving economy, outstanding facilities and a beautiful, safe village set in accessible countryside. However, it is clear that achieving this will be challenging, and modest new housing development might be the only way that this aspiration can ever be met in part or in full.

As an example, the same village website explains that Gartmore Village Shop is an important facility that has been run by the community since January 1998, and is owned by a community co-operative. However, the website states that the shop faces challenging times, and there is currently a campaign for each villager to "spend a minimum of £5.00 per week to ensure its future!" The website ends by stating that Please do what you can as the shop is a lifeline for many, if not all of us, at some time during each year!. Further modest development equals new people in the village, further customers and, in a small way perhaps, help in ensuring that the shop remains open.

As a further example, the primary school roll is low. It had 19 pupils in 2012 (Gartmore Community Action Plan 2012-2017), 12 pupils in 2013 (Education Scotland website) and 16 in 2014 (Stirling Council website) and whilst there is no suggestion that it is under pressure to close, a school with this few pupils is always at risk where cuts to the education budget are a fact of life. To some extent, the school roll will be maintained by families living in the village, and by those moving there as houses come onto the market as second hand sales, but, unless you have new houses, you cannot guarantee that the average age of the village will not increase, which is seen as an issue in the Park generally, and, therefore, the number of pupils attending the primary school reducing to an unsustainably low level.

Gartmore Community Action Plan 2012-2017
The Community Action Plan sets out the community’s priorities for the development of Gartmore until 2017. It is noteworthy that "Theme 2: Local Services & The Economy" has "Priority 3: The Provision of new, cheaper housing" and states that the community will aim to "Develop relationships with Rural Housing Associations to provide a link between the community and potential developers" and will "Identify areas of land for potential development". The second of these has not yet been done, and the Proposed Plan, it could be said, does not help by not allocating any new sites for housing in the village.

The Community Action Plan is available to download by following this hyperlink http://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/living/gartmore/menu-id-202.html

Main Issues Report
It is important to understand the starting point for the Proposed Plan, and what is was seeking to achieve, and, in that regard, reference is made to the Main Issues Report (page 107), which states that a priority for Gartmore was to "Support small scale housing adjacent to settlement boundary, where access is possible". It is considered that the Proposed Plan, by not identifying any sites in the village, fails to achieve this aim.

Proposed Plan
The Proposed Plan explains that homes are required in the National Park "to help retain our population and attract inward migration" and to "address... our ageing
population and projected long term population decline”. New housing will also "help more people to stay in the Park and help create more sustainable communities, supported by a good range of services and facilities”. With this in mind, it is noteworthy that Gartmore is one of very few settlements in the Park where no new housing is allocated, despite it having a range of services and facilities that need the support of new people (see above). That is not to say that the Plan is completely against new housing in the village, with the text suggesting that opportunities may exist for infill and for development close to the village, although what this means is not defined in the specific village text and, instead, reference has to be made to Housing Policy 1, which states that:

"Sites adjacent or close to Towns and Villages where new housing is sensitive to the scale and character of the host community and where there are no opportunities for housing development or proven difficulties in delivering housing sites within the town or village, as identified in the Action Programme. Development on these sites will provide for 100% affordable housing."

The Site
The site is situated on the north eastern edge of Gartmore, taking access from Park Avenue. Mrs Brisbane’s land is currently used as grazing land, under an annual reviewable rental agreement. It is generally open, other than along the north eastern boundary where mature trees define the boundary, and divide it from the grounds of Gartmore House. The site is not within the Gartmore Conservation Area, the boundary of which follows the line of Park Avenue. It does, however, lie on the edge of the grounds of the listed Gartmore House, but the trees along the north eastern edge prevent any intervisibility of the site with the setting of the main house, and its various associated listed buildings and structures, the closest of which is the burial enclosure, which lies to the north east, and beyond a thick belt of mature trees. The site generally slopes from north west to south east, with the north western part generally level, and at above 70 metres OD, before the land falls towards a low point at about 40 metres OD. As mentioned above, only the Park Avenue frontage is shown for development. The site itself has no cultural, historic, or archaeological, interest, as shown on PastMap. There are no biodiversity designations shown on SNH’s SiteLink. The site is outside of the SEPA defined indicative floodplain.

Proposed Housing Allocation and Effectiveness
This is the only site being promoted for new housing to support Gartmore. There are no alternatives, and failing to support it means that there will be probably be no new houses built in the village for the next 5 years and probably much longer. Despite Housing Policy 1 probably supporting development on the site, as an exception to the Proposed Plan, this means such a housing scheme would have to be 100% rather than 33% affordable housing; the lower percentage would only apply if it were an allocated site (see page 26 of the Proposed Plan), and would be a risky venture with no guarantee of planning permission being forthcoming. Therefore, Mrs Brisbane would prefer, for reasons of certainty and financial viability, that the site is allocated. She would be reluctant to commit to the costs of a planning application, if the site were not allocated, and it would equally be difficult to persuade a developer (or RSL) to take such a risk.

To be appropriate as a housing allocation, a site is required to meet certain ‘effectiveness’ tests. In this case, the site is considered to be ‘effective’ for the following reasons:

Ownership - Mrs Brisbane is willing to release the site for development.
Physical - The site is not within the indicative floodplain, or within an area known to suffer from ground instability. The site does slope down from the north west to south east, but a stepped frontage development will allow separate housing platforms to be created with graded slopes between. This will then be screened to the rear by structural landscaping (tree planting), leaving the remainder of the land as grazing. Vehicular access to the site itself can be taken from Park Avenue. The attached letter from Modus Transport Solutions Ltd deals with this issue in detail.
Contamination - Review of historic plans, including those in the Gartmore Conservation Area Character Appraisal, suggests that this land has either been in agricultural use, or woodland. As such, it is unlikely to be contaminated.

Marketable housing - It is considered that a residential development would be deliverable on the site, but only if it is allocated.

Infrastructure - It is thought that the site is free of infrastructure constraints, but further review will be undertaken, should the site be allocated.

Land use - New housing would seem to be the best use for the site. Not only does the Proposed Plan suggest that there is a need for new housing in the Park generally, but the settlement statement for Gartmore in the Main Issues Report alluded to a need to identify appropriate small-scale development sites, and the Gartmore Action Plan has a priority action to identify areas of land for potential development for cheaper/affordable housing.

Conclusion
The Community Action Plan and Main Issues Report suggest that there is a need for appropriate small-scale housing sites on land close to Gartmore, which would support local services and facilities. Mrs Brisbane owns land on the edge of the village, and is willing to explore part of that land being developed for housing, with the extent being indicatively shown on the enclosed Site Plan.
This is the only site being promoted for new housing for Gartmore and is considered to be ‘effective’.

**please see attachment 8 and 9 for supporting information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Gartocharn</td>
<td>Gartocharn H1</td>
<td>3.15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment
A minor watercourse runs through this site, this poses a potential risk of flooding. A basic Flood Risk Assessment will be required either prior to, or in conjunction with any planning application. This will need to define the areas at risk of flooding, the relative vulnerability of the proposed use and confirms design layout and levels. We would be likely to object to the development of this site unless appropriate additional information is submitted / the site plan is amended to remove the sections thought to be at risk.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On | Topic | Section commented on
--- | --- | ---
**Place - Killin** | Killin ED1 | 3.16.2

Responder Name/Organisation | Customer Reference
--- | ---
Scottish Water | 00145

Verbatim Comment

Killin: ED1- There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works, however, early engagement is recommended with Scottish Water when final development flows are known.

---

Part of Plan Commented On | Topic | Section commented on
--- | --- | ---
**Place - Killin** | Killin ED1 | 3.16.2

Responder Name/Organisation | Customer Reference
--- | ---
SEPA | 00713

Verbatim Comment

SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the River Lochay and small watercourse which flows along the boundary of the site. Consideration should also be given to any interaction between the Lochay and the Dochart. As a road depot is proposed we do not object in principal. As the area is at significant flood risk, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk. We would only support redevelopment of a similar use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. The Flood Risk Assessment is required to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, and ensure that the development has a neutral impact on flood risk. Development will likely be constrained due to flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment requested in Proposed LDP.
There are uncertainties with the flood map in this area. The proposal is for a rural activity and no further information is provided. As such we require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow to the east and west of the allocation. Consideration should also be given to the River Dochart depending on how far the site extends as there is uncertainty over the site allocation size. We commented on a wood fired Combined Heat and Power plant within this allocation (PCS112713, 2011/0011/DET) and did not object. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment requested within Proposed LDP.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Kilmun, Strone and Blairmore</td>
<td>Kilmun H1</td>
<td>3.17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
Scottish Water

**Customer Reference**
00145

**Verbatim Comment**

Kilmun H1- There is currently sufficient capacity at Loch Eck Water Treatment Works to serve the proposed development. There is currently insufficient capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended and on receipt of the 5 growth criteria, Scottish Water can initiate a growth project for the Waste Water Treatment Works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Kilmun, Strone and Blairmore</td>
<td>Kilmun H1</td>
<td>3.17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
SEPA

**Customer Reference**
00713

**Verbatim Comment**

Approximate 1/200 Coastal Flood Boundary level is 3.9mOD. Minor watercourse also flows through site and should be assessed.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Kilmun, Strone and Blairmore</td>
<td>Strone H2</td>
<td>3.17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

Strone H2 - There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works to serve this proposed development and There is currently sufficient capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works to serve this proposed development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Kilmun, Strone and Blairmore</td>
<td>Blairmore VE1</td>
<td>3.17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

Approximate 1/200 Coastal Flood Boundary level is 3.84mOD.
Proosed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On

**Place - Lochearnhead**

Responder Name/Organisation

Mr Nick Kempe

Customer Reference

00662

Topic

Lochearnhead Settlement Map

Section commented on

3.18.1

Verbatim Comment

Lochearnhead

There is considerable space around the village that could be used for campsites and very high demand as there are no public campsites around the Loch.

I wish to object to the lack of camping provision around Lochearnhead given the demand for camping around the loch which the National Park wishes to ban.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Lochearnhead</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lochearnhead H1</strong></td>
<td>3.18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scottish Water</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

H1: There is currently very limited capacity at Lochearnhead Waste Water Treatment Works. There are also network issues in this area and therefore drainage impact assessment may be required. There is currently sufficient capacity at Lochearnhead Water Treatment Works, however, there are potential network issues in the area and flow and pressure tests may be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Lochearnhead</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lochearnhead H1</strong></td>
<td>3.18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEPA</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from Loch Earn and the small watercourses which flow through/adjacent to the site. Site will likely be constrained due to flood risk. There is a Controlled Activities Regulations licence for this site which would require consideration. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment requested within Proposed LDP.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Lochearnhead</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lochearnhead MU1</strong></td>
<td>3.18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>00185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in document requested: Include 'access to be discussed with Transport Scotland' within the 'actions required' column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Scotland recommend including them within the 'actions required' column to ensure that developers are aware they will require to consult with Transport Scotland on the access strategy for the site as it is adjacent to the A85 trunk road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Lochearnhead</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lochearnhead MU1</strong></td>
<td>3.18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lochearnhead: MU1- There is currently very limited capacity at Lochearnhead Waste Water Treatment Works. There are also network issues in this area and Therefore drainage impact assessment may be required. There is currently sufficient capacity at Lochearnhead Water Treatment Works, however, There are potential network issues in the area and flow and pressure tests may be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On  Topic
Place - Lochearnhead  Lochearnhead MU1

Responder Name/Organisation
SEPA

Customer Reference
00713

Section commented on
3.18.3

Verbatim Comment
SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the Ogle Burn and small watercourse which is shown adjacent to the site and may be culverted through the site. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges which may exacerbate flooding. PAN 69 states that "buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active". Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment requested within Proposed LDP.

Part of Plan Commented On  Topic
Place - Lochgoilhead  Lochgoilhead H1

Responder Name/Organisation
Scottish Water

Customer Reference
00145

Section commented on
3.19.2

Verbatim Comment
Lochgoilhead:
H1- There is currently sufficient capacity at Lochgoilhead Waste Water Treatment Works. There is currently limited capacity at Lochgoilhead Water Treatment Works and early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.
Verbatim Comment

H1- There is currently sufficient capacity at Finlas Water Treatment Works to serve the proposed development. There are no Scottish Water sewers in the vicinity of this development.
**Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Luss</strong></td>
<td><strong>Luss H2</strong></td>
<td>3.20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
Scottish Water

**Customer Reference**
00145

**Verbatim Comment**

H2- There is currently insufficient capacity at Luss Waste Water Treatment Works. On receipt of Scottish Water’s growth criteria being met, Scottish Water will initiate a growth project to upgrade the Wwtw. There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss potential network issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Luss</strong></td>
<td><strong>Luss H2</strong></td>
<td>3.20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
SEPA

**Customer Reference**
00713

**Verbatim Comment**

SEPA would be supportive of the Flood Risk Assessment requirement.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Luss</td>
<td>Luss MU1</td>
<td>3.20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

**Support**

MU1- There is currently insufficient capacity at Luss Waste Water Treatment Works. On receipt of Scottish Water’s growth criteria being met, Scottish Water will initiate a growth project to upgrade the Wttw. There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works; however, further network investigations may be required. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - St. Fillans</td>
<td>St Fillans</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>00203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

St Fillans is in Perth and Kinross but is outside the area for which the Council is Planning Authority. We have reviewed the Proposed LDP and have no comments or representations to make.
Amendment to the St Fillan’s settlement boundary to allow a small scale infill opportunity to be identified as shown on the attached supporting plan. The amendment to the settlement boundary at this point would also reflect the national park boundary at this point so would therefore seem to be entirely appropriate and logical.

Whilst supporting the retention of the H1 site allocation in St. Fillan’s, Drummond Estates consider that the settlement boundary has been drawn tightly and thereby limits the potential for other small scale infill opportunities or windfall development to take place. Infill sites within or at the edge of existing settlements can make an important contribution to the supply of housing land particularly where proposals respect the scale, form and density of the surroundings and enhance the character and amenity of the community. In this case it is considered that the ground lying to the north of the 'a' frames at the Girron, Station Road should be included within a revised settlement boundary which aligns with the national park boundary at this edge of St. Fillan’s. Development is already located to the north of the former railway line as confirmed by the fact that the conservation area boundary includes the existing property at Sunnybrae which should also be included within a revised settlement boundary. The suggested alteration to the settlement boundary could allow small scale individual plots to be developed (i.e. An alternative to the proposals for the one identified housing site H1). Allowing appropriate infill development within this area would promote the principles of sustainable development of the area’s communities. The land can be easily serviced and there would be opportunities to capitalise on wider footpath network improvements along this northern edge of St. Fillan’s. (Attachment)

**please see attachment 10 for supporting information**

St Fillan’s H1- There is currently sufficient capacity at the Water and Waste Water Treatment Works to serve this proposed development. There may be network issues, Therefore, early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On

Place - St. Fillans

Responder Name/Organisation

Dennis Garnett

Verbatim Comment

I am concerned at the position that you have shown the boundary of the site for consideration.

You have shown the boundary on the line of the boundaries to the 4 house plots in The Girron.

I would like to point out to you that there is a wide strip of land from these boundaries, that has been retained by Drummond Estates, and therefore the boundary line which is for any future development, varies from approximately 12 meters at house No 1 and 18 to 23 meters from the boundary at House No 4.

I enclose a copy of the site plan, indicating the boundary line, which I understand is the line for any future development.

Will you therefore please adjust this site boundary accordingly, on your plan of "Boundary of allocated site"

*Please see attachment 11 for supporting information

SEPA

Verbatim Comment

Commented on part of site (PCS136170, 2014/0237/DET) and did not object. From previous consultation, site visits indicate the site is a sufficient distance from the Struie Burn and the Flood Map is erroneous in this areas. However, we have not commented on the entire site allocation. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. We support the provision of a Flood Risk Assessment in the LDP. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment requested in Proposed LDP.
Area designated as TR1 for 'transport' around boat yard and mouth of the burn. 'Transport' is a bit vague - whilst I believe that increased water bus services would benefit both locals and tourists, it isn't clear why this can't be achieved using the current pier. It is my concern that creating a new slipway/pontoon would lead to the potential for increased use of Tarbet Bay by individual motorised leisure craft.

The 'visitor experience' at Tarbet should capitalise on the tranquility and views of the loch and Ben Lomond, which would be jeopardised by extensive use of the area by motor boats.

It should also be taken into consideration that there is a significant resident population in Tarbet, and the nature of the bay means that vehicle noise is amplified and audible throughout most of the village. Whilst individual craft may not make a significant amount of noise, constant use of the bay by vehicles throughout the day/season can significantly impact on the quality of life of local residents, as well as on visitors coming to walk/relax in what is perceived to be a peaceful, natural environment.

The designated area also includes the shore around the school and the mouth of the burn, which is currently a popular spot for parents with small children to use for paddling etc., as well as being used by the school. As with all developments, it is essential not to promote tourism at the expense of the quality of life of the residents of the communities that the said tourism is supposed to be supporting.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Furness</td>
<td>00671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

Area designated as VE2 is currently open space used extensively by locals and visitors for relaxing, enjoying spectacular views of Loch Lomond and Ben Lomond, picnicking, walking dogs and children, paddling, and for school and community events. It is imperative that this open space be preserved in any future plans for the area. This area should therefore be marked as green on the proposed plan. Although its current designation does not preclude its remaining open, it also allows for the possibility of it being developed in other ways for tourist-related facilities (e.g., buildings, car parking etc). This open area is currently a vital, year-round facility for the residents of Tarbet, as well as allowing visitors to gain spectacular, unimpeded views of the scenery that they've come to experience. Whilst appreciating the importance of visitors to the local economy, it is essential that tourist-related developments should not detract from the quality of life of local residents by removing access and facilities within their community. This open space is a visitor attraction in itself and should be protected as such.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On  Topic  Section commented on
Place - Tarbet  Tarbet Settlement Map  3.23.1

Responder Name/Organisation  Customer Reference
Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council  00037

Verbatim Comment

Tarbet Open Space.

The five open spaces highlighted in Tarbet are all privately owned and it has to be assumed that the owners have highlighted their request for this?

The crux to Tarbet is the proposals at PP. There are many issues in a small area:

1 Remodelling of junction A82/ A83
2 Road alignment A82 through the village to the North.
3 Road alignment A83 through the village to Arrochar and the West.
4 Retail development at V1, V2, V5 this could have drastic consequences for Tarbet Tearoom and the Slanj restaurant. It is also seen by the Community Council that Arrochar would lose out, in view of the Retail Policy 1 create no significant adverse impact on vitality and viability of the overall centre” should the NP support any development here.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On  
**Place - Tarbet**

Topic  
**Tarbet Settlement Map**

Responder Name/Organisation
Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council

Customer Reference
00037

Section commented on
3.23.1

Verbatim Comment

Tarbet TR1. It is noted that it looks like a pier or such is being introduced? Does the volume of boat trips require two piers in such a close proximity? Particularly as extensive renovation has already been completed on the existing pier/embarkation point here.

Part of Plan Commented On  
**Place - Tarbet**

Topic  
**Tarbet Settlement Map**

Responder Name/Organisation
Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council

Customer Reference
00037

Section commented on
3.23.1

Verbatim Comment

The Community Council would like to see the cemetery at Tarbet, be afforded open space status like the cemetery at Arrochar. Open Space 2.
We want to object to the proposed Open Space site on Clanreoch Road, Tarbet, Loch Lomond, that has been displayed in the 'Live Park Proposed Development Plan'. The area of land that has been deemed as Open Space is private property and owned jointly by three residents, Coilach East, Coilach Begg and Coilach West.

We are all concerned and unhappy that our private property has now been classed as Open Space without our consent and unsuitable for future development. At the present time it is not our intention to develop the land, but it may restrict our future plans.

Please note our objection and consult with us directly regarding this matter.

3.23.1 PLACE - Tarbet

As a local resident, ex-parent of pupils at the local primary school, and lover of the natural environment, I request there be no licences for noisy water sports in this tranquil area.
**Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Tarbet</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tarbet H1</strong></td>
<td>3.23.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

- Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council

**Customer Reference**

- 00037

**Verbatim Comment**

This housing proposal should be located along with the other Luss Estate Housing site on the land opposite the Cadet Centre. Reason already stated as at Arrochar H2. Half the area allocated for housing is outside the village boundary. The other part is in mature mixed hardwood corpse. There were plans in the not too distant past for the A83 remodelling through this area. Overarching Policy 2/Natural Environment Policy 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Tarbet</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tarbet H1</strong></td>
<td>3.23.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

- Scottish Water

**Customer Reference**

- 00145

**Verbatim Comment**

Tarbet:
H1- There is currently sufficient capacity at Belmore Water Treatment Works and there is currently sufficient capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works to serve this proposed development.
Change in document requested: include 'discuss access with Transport Scotland' within the 'actions required' column.

It is recommend to include reference to Transport Scotland within the 'actions required' column to ensure that developers are aware they will require to consult with Transport Scotland on the access strategy for the site as it is adjacent to the A83 trunk road.
Change requested: Remove Tarbet H1 from Plan

Reason: I notice that as part of the new local plan you have indicated a site in Tarbet for housing adjacent to the old petrol station. The site is covered in very mature trees and also seems to be shown on old maps as woodland.

http://maps.nls.uk/view/74940877#zoom=4&lat=4960&lon=7295&layers=BT

Your policy (Natural Environment Policy 8) still seem to shown that the National park wish to protect ancient woodland from loss due to development.

I do not understand how development of this site can be undertaken in line with the park’s policy to protect ancient woodland.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VE1</td>
<td>3.23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrochar &amp; Tarbet Community Council</td>
<td>00037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

This site is strategically positioned at the entrance to Tarbet via the A82 from the south. The site we believe has had various owners and now is void of any planning permission. Currently appears to be used as a ‘yard’ to house heavy machinery overnight/sometimes the week by all sorts of authorities and contractors.

No relevant permissions on this site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VE1</td>
<td>3.23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td>00145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**

VE1 Engagement with Scottish Water is recommended when final flows for this proposed development is known.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VE1</td>
<td>3.23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Responder Name/Organisation

| Scottish Government | 00185 |

#### Verbatim Comment

Change in document requested: include 'discuss access with Transport Scotland' within the 'actions required' column.

It is recommend to include reference to Transport Scotland within the 'actions required' column to ensure that developers are aware they will require to consult with Transport Scotland on the access strategy for the site as it is adjacent to the A82 and A83 trunk road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VE1</td>
<td>3.23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Responder Name/Organisation

| Ms Fiona Jackson | 00655 |

#### Verbatim Comment

I recognise that this site is a prime 'Visitor Experience' site, but as a local resident involved in the local Arrochar & Tarbet Community Development Trust, I would like to raise my concerns over the potential damage a 'Tourist Information Centre' (an additional designation for this site) could have on the viability of the proposed social enterprise, community-led Heritage Visitor Attraction development in Arrochar. To support the sustainable development of the local economy and local community, I feel the social benefits afforded by a proposed social enterprise visitor facility in Arrochar should take precedent over any proposed visitor facility by a private developer in Tarbet, unless the functions of both facilities were clearly complementary and not in competition with each other. We also need to encourage visitors to travel on to Arrochar!
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Tarbet

Responder Name/Organisation
Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council

Verbatim Comment

Tarbet VE2

The Community Council’s reflexion to this piece of land is that the area should remain an open space for recreation and tourism only; any new building should be kept to a minimum. This is the site of the annual village gala which is attended by many stakeholder agencies in the village and on a dry day a well-supported tourism event in a prime location on the banks of Loch Lomond.

Part of Plan Commented On

Place - Tarbet

Responder Name/Organisation
Scottish Water

Verbatim Comment

VE2 - Engagement with Scottish Water is recommended when final flows for this proposed development is known.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Tarbet</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tarbet VE2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.23.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**  **Customer Reference**
Scottish Government  00185

**Verbatim Comment**

Change in document requested: include 'discuss access with Transport Scotland' within the 'actions required' column.

It is recommend to include reference to Transport Scotland within the 'actions required' column to ensure that developers are aware they will require to consult with Transport Scotland on the access strategy for the site as it is adjacent to the A83 trunk road.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Tarbet</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tarbet VE2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.23.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**  **Customer Reference**
Ms Fiona Jackson  00655

**Verbatim Comment**

Please ensure this space remains an open space providing public and local community access and views to Loch Lomond and Ben Lomond. Should it have green annotation over it to show it's an open space?
**Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Tarbet</strong></td>
<td>Tarbet VE3</td>
<td>3.23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responser Name/Organisation**

Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council

**Customer Reference**

00037

**Verbatim Comment**

Tarbet VE3. Concerns regarding our local primary school, that one of our village's most valuable assets, attracting young families to settle in our area being subjected to an invasion by tourism, are not a vision we embrace. We recommend that the school frontage remains clear of any tourism elements. Given the Loch frequently floods into the playground, substantial work would be required before any additional use of this area could be achieved. By leaving the school with a free aspect to the Loch and Ben Lomond beyond, this gives the children a unique opportunity to observe and identify with the diverse climate and habitat on their doorstep. This has indeed helped the school become one of the best primary schools in Argyll and Bute, a factor the Park does not take cognisance of when promoting the Tarbet area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place - Tarbet</strong></td>
<td>Tarbet VE3</td>
<td>3.23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responser Name/Organisation**

Scottish Water

**Customer Reference**

00145

**Verbatim Comment**

VE3 - Engagement with Scottish Water is recommended when final flows for this proposed development is known.
### Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VE3</td>
<td>3.23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
- Scottish Government

**Customer Reference**
- 00185

**Verbatim Comment**

Change in document requested: include 'discuss access with Transport Scotland' within the 'actions required' column.

It is recommend to include reference to Transport Scotland within the 'actions required' column to ensure that developers are aware they will require to consult with Transport Scotland on the access strategy for the site as it is adjacent to the A82 and A83 trunk road.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VE3</td>
<td>3.23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**
- Ms Fiona Jackson

**Customer Reference**
- 00655

**Verbatim Comment**

Retaining public access and the natural environment of these areas is important both for locals to freely enjoy the shore line, for primary school pupils to use it as an outdoor learning area (which they do on a regular basis) and for the wildlife that enjoy the peaceful area. I accept access to the loch for 'non-invasive' recreation such as launching row boats, canoes, kayaks etc. is to be encouraged, however large buildings would be detrimental to the area, as would restriction of public access.
Site of an old garage situated on the A82 at the northern end of Tarbet that greets motorist entering and leaving the area. It is a complete rusting eyesore, hopefully not used as the foreground for photos of the majestic Ben Lomond.


VE4 - Engagement with Scottish Water is recommended when final flows for this proposed development is known.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VE4</td>
<td>3.23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>00185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

Change in document requested: include 'discuss access with Transport Scotland' within the 'actions required' column.

It is recommend to include reference to Transport Scotland within the 'actions required' column to ensure that developers are aware they will require to consult with Transport Scotland on the access strategy for the site as it is adjacent to the A83 trunk road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VE5</td>
<td>3.23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation | Customer Reference
Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council | 00037

Verbatim Comment

Tarbet VE5. The rear of the Tarbet Hotel a site often flooded and/or damaged by careless driving - the site would need a drainage plan before any development could take place. With two proposed visitor experiences or visit centres in close proximity, this would be better used for a small retail outlet/gift shop type business rather than any food retail outlet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VE5</td>
<td>3.23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation | Customer Reference
Scottish Water             | 00145

Verbatim Comment

VE5 - Engagement with Scottish Water is recommended when final flows for this proposed development is known.
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place - Tarbet</td>
<td>Tarbet VES</td>
<td>3.23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>00185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Comment

Change in document requested: include 'discuss access with Transport Scotland' within the 'actions required' column. It is recommend to include reference to Transport Scotland within the 'actions required' column to ensure that developers are aware they will require to consult with Transport Scotland on the access strategy for the site as it is adjacent to the A83 trunk road.
Change requested: That woodland is a consideration for Tyndrum MU1

Reasons:

1. Any buildings should not encroach too closely to the banks of the Crom Alt and the trees currently growing there should be retained.

2. The areas of any buildings along side the river should not be storage areas etc which, in my experience, rapidly become depositories for rubbish, junk etc. It needs to be remembered that many hundreds of visitors use Clifton, including West Highland Way walkers. Visitor's experience of Tyndrum should be better than the back of a shop or whatever.

3. The proposed development will encourage more visitors to Tyndrum and increase traffic. Parking, and especially the speed limit through the village, will require rather better than the current free for all which makes this entrance to the National Park so hideous, dangerous and hardly enhances the visitor experience.

4. More businesses, if they are permitted to erect roadside signs as the current concerns are, will make the village look even more like a fourth rate Blackpool than it does already. English National Park businesses seem to survive without this intrusive advertising so why cannot our Park? (And while on this subject, are you aware of the enormous new signs erected by the caravan park at Inveruglas and by the Ardlui Hotel. I would be interested in your view of their legality. In my view such signs will degrade one of the main reasons people come to a National Park i.e. its natural beauty.)

I do not want the area removed from the development plan. I also understand that there is, as yet, no detail on what developments might take place. I was simply putting up a marker that whatever is done should improve the village and visitor appeal. The visual appeal of recent developments such as the increased motor cycle parking at the Green Welly, the removal of the trees in front of the Tyndrum Lodge Hotel (if that's what it's called this week) and the mess of the car park adjoining the Information Office, especially at the north end, are not good omens. I must admit that the changes to the Real Food shop are rather good however.

Regarding the trees, I am concerned that those on the bank of the Crom Alt opposite Clifton are retained for their screening value, appearance and for the degree of consolidation their roots provide for the water courses bank.

I also believe that action needs to be taken to slow traffic through the village, and protection given to pedestrians where the West Highland Way crosses the A82 by Brodie's shop. Because there has not been a death (as a neighbour was told some years ago) hardly seems to be an excuse for doing something about a foreseeable risk.
There is currently sufficient capacity at Tyndrum Water Treatment Works and Tyndrum Waste Water Treatment Works. However, depending on final flows from the development, network investigations may be required. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended.

Flood Risk Assessment was submitted as part of the development of this site (PCS104531, 2009/0311/PP). Should the proposal change from what was previously agreed we would require a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the risk from the Crom Allt burn. There is a culvert adjacent to the site. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment requested in Proposed LDP.
Inclusion of European Designated sites on proposal maps
We consider that it would be useful to highlight to the planners and developers where the European protected sites are located on the proposal maps where possible and where the proposal map allows. This will highlight that it is an issue that needs to be considered. Below is a list of proposal maps which we recommend that should have the European site included. The sites below are those highlighted in the HRA where development proposals will need to be accompanied with information to inform a project level HRA.

Proposed Local Development Plan Natura Icon on Proposal Maps
The 16 sites below have been identified in the HRA as requiring a specific mitigation measure in the plan to demonstrate that the development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site.

Currently there is no specific mitigation provided in the plan. We recommend that the specific mitigation highlighted in the HRA is incorporated into the plan. The mitigation that is identified in the HRA is to insert a ‘natura icon’ on each of the relevant proposal maps listed above and states that the following wording is included in the plan:

"The icon states that an expert appraisal of the potential impacts on the qualifying interest will be required to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal. It also highlights that a pre-application enquiry would be recommended to help assist in the scope of the information to be submitted with the application."

To ensure that the proposed plan provides the suggested wording we recommend the following wording is inserted into the “icon meaning:

"A Natura designation icon indicates where proposals have the potential to have an adverse effect on a European protected site’s qualifying interests including migrating fish species, geese, otters that support these species. Proposals for development must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). Pre-application discussions will clarify the level and detail of appraisal that must be submitted. A range of mitigation measures should be identified where potential impacts arise including a construction method statement or species protection plan."
Change in document requested

Change 1: Details of the locations and types of developments that will be required to make contributions, to be included in the LDP.

Change 2: Details of the level of contributions to be sought and the methodology used to calculate these to be included in associated statutory Supplementary Guidance.

Remove ‘Planning Guidance’ text box on Page 95 and replace it with a statement that Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance will support Overarching Policy 3, which will include details of the level of contributions to be sought and the methodology used to calculate them.

Change 3: The following sentence should be added to Overarching Policy 3: ‘Where planning obligations are used to secure developer contributions, these will be sought in line with the requirements of Circular 3/2012’.

Change 1 and 2 reason
Circular 3/2012: Planning obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements states that:
‘Broad principles, including the items for which contributions will be sought and the occasions when they will be sought should be set out in the SDP or LDP, where they will have been subject to scrutiny at examination. Methods and exact levels of contributions should be included in statutory supplementary guidance’.

Circular 6/2013 sets out what should be included in the Plan itself: ‘items for which financial or other contributions will be sought, and the circumstances (locations, types of development) where they will be sought’. It also sets out that the ‘exact levels of developer contributions or methodologies for their calculation’ are suitable for inclusion in Supplementary Guidance, provided there is appropriate context in the Plan.

Change 3 reason
Page 95 of the Proposed Plan states that ‘where an identified need has been demonstrated development proposals will help contribute towards:’

This could suggest that contributions will be required to resolve existing deficiencies, which, if planning obligations were being used to secure such contributions, would be contrary to guidance in Circular 3/2012. Paragraph 21 of Circular 3/2012 states that planning obligations should not be used to resolve existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision.
Pro
posed
Local
Develo
ment
Plan - Comments Received

On that basis, clarification should be given in this policy that the requirements of Circular 3/2012 will be met where planning obligations are being used.

Part of Plan Commented On

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies - Overarching Policies</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Policy 2</td>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation: SEPA
Customer Reference: 00713

Verbatim Comment

Overarching Policy 1: A low carbon place

Overarching Policy 1 encourages waste reduction, reuse and recycling. We support the promotion of waste reduction within the Plan area however we recommend that this policy is updated to encourage waste hierarchy principles in line with the Zero Waste Plan objectives and Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), paragraph 176. We would suggest the following modification to the policy wording:

Supporting the provision of waste reduction and waste hierarchy principles including prevention, reuse (e.g. composting) or recycling;’
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies - Overarching Policies</td>
<td>Overarching Policy 3</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responder Name/Organisation: Scottish Government
Customer Reference: 00185

Verbatim Comment

Change in document requested: The policy should specify a proportion of the greenhouse gas emissions reduction required by the 2015 Scottish Building Standards to be met through the installation and operation of low and zero-carbon generating technologies. The policy should include at least one increase in the proportion.

Examples of how the policy has been approached elsewhere are listed in the Scottish Government’s ‘Fifth Annual Report on the Operation of Section 72 of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009: http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Built-Environment/planning/Policy/Principal-Policies/Sustainability/Section72Report .

Section 3F of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires local development plan policies to be designed to ensure all new buildings 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. The policy currently does not specify an initial proportion of greenhouse gas emissions to be saved. The policy does not specify that the emissions savings should come from the use of low and zero-carbon generating technology (rather than other measures). It is suggested that reference is made to 2015 building standards, as revised building standards are due to come into operation in October 2015 and will be operational during the lifetime of the local development plan.
Overarching Policy 2: Development Requirements

The requirement that buildings incorporate low and zero carbon generating technologies should help to ensure that new buildings contribute to the reduction of carbon emissions. This is in line with Scottish Government targets within SPP (paragraph 154) which seeks to reduce emissions and energy use in new buildings. We therefore support this approach.

Change requested : Pg 95
Add ..."and services (were appropriate)" after transport infrastructure

Reason : This change would reflect the text under the heading "transport infrastructure (including public transport and outdoor access)" which is clear that contributions may be sought for public transport services and facilities which reduce the need to travel by car.
Part of Plan Commented On: Policies - Housing Policies

Responder Name/Organisation: Luss Estates Company

Topic: H Policy 1 - Providing a diverse range of housing

Section commented on: 4.4.1

Customer Reference: 00113

Verbatim Comment:

Ratio of Affordable Housing to Open market:
A huge increase in the provision of family housing to the area is key to the future sustainability of the village. Whilst I understand that you intend to adopt a flexible approach I would reiterate that a punitive ratio of affordable housing to open market will make the overall commercial foundation to your proposals fail. A 50% ratio is too great, and will make the whole scheme at best very marginal indeed. It is vital that the flexible approach you refer to is adopted. In saying this, I would emphasise that I fully understand and accept the importance of delivering a sizable element of affordable housing.

I would also reiterate that we consider the construction of amenity space equal to the provision of affordable housing, given how unlikely it is to be delivered by any public body.
The general approach to new housing and detailed housing policies is supported insofar as it seeks to direct new housing development to towns and villages and to deliver affordable housing.

It is noted that housing development out with towns and villages (i.e. adjacent to towns and villages; within small rural communities and the Countryside) is restricted to affordable housing only, or in the case of the Countryside, where necessary to support the sustainable management of an established rural business or newly formed croft.

With regard to affordable housing provision, it is agreed that the Loch Lomondside area (including Drymen and Croftamie) and ‘Stirling area villages’ (Callendar, Aberfoyle and Gartmore) are accessible pressurised areas and that all housing development should make a contribution to the provision of affordable housing, either one affordable home or a financial contribution where the development is 3 or less dwellings or of 50% (Loch Lomondside) or 33% (Stirling area villages) of the total number of homes where 4 or more dwellings are proposed.

The plan should allow for self build or custom built housing. The national planning framework endorses this category. Given the Park is popular as a retirement location and seeks craft workers and self employed business development this category of housing should be incorporated. The affordable homes policy should be amended to restrict requirement for affordable homes contribution for developments up to 3 homes. It is impractical to build an affordable home for 3 or less units.
Change requested: Reduce affordable housing requirements in all locations to 25% in accord with the provisions of SPP. This requires amendments to the map on page 26 as well as the text in paragraph 2. Proposed amendment is set out below.

The proposed plan seeks to provide affordable housing through the imposition of a percentage quota on private housing developments. The percentage of affordable housing sought ranges from 25% in remote rural areas, 33% in accessible rural areas such as Callander, and up to 50% in the Loch Lomondside villages. This scale of affordable housing is not in accord with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy.

SPP (paragraph 129) states that "planning authorities should consider the level of affordable housing contribution which is likely to be deliverable in the current economic climate, as part of a viable housing development. The level of affordable housing required as a contribution within a market site should generally be no more than 25% of the total number of houses. Consideration should also be given to the nature of the affordable housing required and the extent to which this can be met by proposals capable of development with little or no public subsidy."

SPP paragraph 126 defines some of the forms in which affordable housing may be provided as follows: "affordable housing may be provided in the form of social rented accommodation, mid-market rented accommodation, shared ownership housing, shared Equity Housing, housing sold at a discount (including plots for self-build), and low cost housing without subsidy."

Circular 3/2012 requires that planning authorities have due regard to development viability and cash flow in implementing developer contribution policies and considering requirements.

In the National Park area, where land values are typically low and development costs are high, the imposition of a requirement for affordable housing at 33% and 50% of site capacity will significantly affect development viability. In most cases it is likely to render much needed housing development and investment in the area unviable.

Accordingly, the following modifications are proposed:

Map on page 26 - all affordable housing requirements within the park area to be set at 25%.

Delete paragraph 2 on page 26 and replace with the following text:

All sites of 4 or more homes are required to make a contribution towards affordable housing provision, with the preference being on site provision. The level of affordable
contribution will be 25% of the total number of homes being provided. In accord with the supplementary guidance 'housing' (section 8), there is scope for the relaxation in the percentage of affordable housing to be provided where it is demonstrated that there is a genuine need to reduce the affordable housing requirement to ensure the development is viable and maximum community benefits are gained.
Change in document requested: chapter 4 policies transport policy 1: safeguarding sites to improve the transport network, p99

The proposed plan is recommended to include reference to the proposed works on the A82 as part of the transport Scotland A82 Tarbet to Inverarnan upgrades within transport policy 1 'safeguarding sites to improve the transport network'.

The Scottish Government's Strategic Transport Projects Review identified a number of measures to reduce congestion and improve traffic flows along a number of sections of the A82. The A82 Tarbet to Inverarnan study will consider issues including:

- the impact of widening the road
- opportunities to improve visibility and reduce the levels of accidents
- improving drainage
- pedestrian and cycle access
- car parking and lay-by provision
- delivering journey time reliability

The £2 million design and survey work started in summer 2013 and is programmed to take around two years to complete. The outcome of this study will be to identify a preferred upgrade option for the route. A range of issues will be looked at as the study progresses.

An assessment of the engineering challenges, environmental effects and traffic and economics concluded that option 1 (A82) is the preferred corridor. The stage 2 assessment will conclude with the identification of a preferred road alignment.

Development Planning Circular 6/2013 states in paragraph 78 that: 'the proposed plan should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change, be clear about the scale of that anticipated change and in particular identify opportunities for development and set out the authority's policies for the development and use of land.' Additionally it states: 'the content of the proposed plan should be developed taking account of placemaking principles, environmental impact and deliverability'.

It is therefore, recommended that the information on the A82 upgrades is included within the proposed plan as it is considered the proposed plan cannot fully adhere to the above paragraph within circular 6/2013 without fully detailing the the works to be undertaken. The works on the A82 may have implications for development in the area in terms of timing and deliverability. Therefore, this is an important infrastructure scheme which developers, other stakeholders and members of the public should be aware of.
### Verbatim Comment

In general terms the Proposed LDP policies are in line with RTS aims. The transport policies in the proposed LDP are supported.
I object on these grounds as follows:

a) In general:

It is clear that the sovereignty of the 1st aim of the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 is now dead and buried as it may be "outweighed", "overridden" and therefore overruled by this Proposed Local Plan. Compared to previous plans this new charter of disaster has reached new levels of shallow generality. Therefore, the Plan is meant to support the most extreme interpretations of what’s "natural" i.e. Clown Fish aquariums and like forms of artificial human interference with the natural order. Anything goes. Of course a political purpose is incorporated into this Local Plan. It’s meant to support the creation of up-market islands of ruling class opulence in a sea of working class austerity, foodbanks, cuts and sanctions. Team evil, according to our cultural heritage, have produced a glorified travel brochure for debt fuelled property speculators. It is a vehicle to support vested interests who may be registered in the Cayman Islands, etc. There’s nothing "local" or "local economy" about that.

b) Objection in the fisheries interest:

I support provisions for a fisheries policy in the L.P. You don’t. No matter how unreasonable I think you are, because you are the local planning authority. It would require a legal ruling from a higher local authority than you to make you comply and provide for the fisheries.

One of the first people I contacted in connection with "The NP; in 1998, was Gordon Watson, when he was with West Dunbartonshire Council (WDC). Then, I was a member of the N.P. Fish and Fisheries Forum for about 10 years until you disbanded it. I’ve been raising fisheries issues with you for nearly 20 years. I’ve done my homework and I can’t say the same for you.

Previously, both you and the Reporters have misrepresented me by confusing the fisheries interest with the natural heritage interest. For the avoidance of any doubt, let me explain the difference. No one ever saw a salmon (natural heritage) out of the water using a rod and line or a net to catch fish. The fisheries interest is a human one. Of course, that won’t stop you putting this fisheries interest objection under a natural heritage heading. Previously, you said the Reporter was sent a copy of my original objection in addition to your doctored version, but the Reporter took your lead and rejected my objection on natural heritage grounds, falsely, by referring to "salmon". Salmon don’t fish. I do not want this objection to be misrepresented and ignored again.

Since 1965, I have had a long term interest in the R. Leven salmon and freshwater fisheries. I do not represent the Loch interest, as such. Do not confuse me with Loch
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Lomond Angling improvement Association. They have a two-tier permit system. R. Leven permits don’t include LLAIA membership and R. Leven anglers are not allowed to take part in any of LLAIA’s official proceedings.

Under common law and statutory law the legal right to fish includes a territorial ownership right, a right of access and a right to operate the fishery. These are rights in land. The erection of permanently fixed pontoons is an offence against all these fishing rights, as recent court cases have shown, i.e. The Tummel Case.

From the start the NP should have cleared the R. Leven of all permanently fixed structures that interfere with the fishing right. Instead, to serve the Loch interest, you have supported to illegal forced eviction, land clearance and social cleansing of the R. Leven fisheries interest.

Clearly, “Best practice” in your book means the destruction of the fisheries.

c) Objection in the natural heritage interest.

You are aware that the R. Leven natural heritage interest has inherited a legacy of over 200 years of industrial dereliction. In the 70’s the Barrage was built and now, thanks to you, the loss of natural heritage has been multiplied in support of the Loch boating interest.

Under the River Basin Management Plans the R. Leven is defined as severely modified. But no one knows what the impacts have been on the R. Leven. Flora and Fauna, and their habitat, precisely. No research has been conducted to find out what the requirements of habitat restoration, enhancement and conservation on the R. Leven might be.

Previously, I have been a member of the Tweed Foundation, amongst others. Also I have just received word from the Tweed Forum - who have just won the UK River Prize for “innovation” and best practice in river restoration and catchment management. They know what they’re doing and you couldn’t care less. Counting the interim Committee you’ve spent the last 20 years ignoring and wrecking the R. Leven.

Previously, on one pontoon application you claimed your approval was “evidence based”. I FOI’d you to have sight of this “evidence”. There was no evidence from any research conducted on the R. Leven directly. You included an item about powan from the Loch and the rest was sundry information based on no scientific information whatsoever (see, Scottish Information Commissioner, Decision Notice, decision 081/2011, pontoon moorings on River Leven, Reference No. 201100110, 21 April 2011. The Commissioner was unable to comment on whether the information was fit for purpose; paragraph 11. P4).

The R. Leven is included in the official management strategy for the Endrick Water SAC for salmon - EU protected species.

In this case, although there are Natural Environmental Policies in this Proposed LP, I find they are not fit for purpose on the R. Leven because they do not meet the needs of the natural heritage interest there. Instead they would never be enforced in any event under the current NP regime.

To conclude

In general the Proposed LP is a vehicle to meet the economic imperatives of the ruling class - those with legal ownership and control of the land, labour and capital. The 1st Sovereign Aim of The NP has been abandoned. The term "National Park" has become a PR, Sales and Marketing work of fiction.

The fisheries interest is under attack from every angle. The planners don’t want to know. By way of contrast, on the Tweed salmon fishing alone raises £18 million for the local economy and supports 500 jobs (Tweed forum). Many local anglers have left to fish the Tweed, saying "it’s one of the best managed salmon rivers in Scotland". Actually it’s the world and I told them that decades ago.
Finally, I don’t get the point of Natural Environmental Policies when planning decisions are not scientifically evidence based and they’re not implemented or enforced - even in the Endrick Water SAC context and the fact that this is supposed to be a National Park.

This proposed LP should be scrapped and replaced with another Proposed LP that does meet with the public interest that is stated in the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000. There, under statutory law, the public interest is clearly and explicitly expressed in the 1st Aim - to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area. There is no mention there of the whims of NP Planners. The economic imperatives of the ruling classes or any like free-for-all. That Act was democratically mandated by the people of Scotland.

Also, there should be Fisheries Policies in the LP to provide for conflicts between the established fisheries interest in land and new developments. New development should not present any obstacle to the ownership, access to, operation of and the enjoyment of these fisheries.

The Natural Environmental Policies must demand that only proper scientific evidence based advice, in line with the standards of best practice, is applicable for planning purposes in the NP, not some crummy consultants report that’s been bought off the peg for PR, Sales and Marketing and Promotional reasons. It is an absolute disgrace, in a National Park, that provision is made for "Aquaculture" and not for the wild fisheries interest (NEP 14 p104).

More than anyone I have charted the massive escapes of farmed salmon into this river system. Once again the NP Planners are posing an existential threat to our wild salmon, our natural heritage, and the wild fisheries interest in the NP.

This isn’t a National Park - it’s a national joke.

These objections also apply to the failures of Reporters. And don’t tell me about NBAPS, SNH, SEPA and fisheries trusts. That’s hot air on the River Leven.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy - Natural Environment Policies</strong></td>
<td><strong>NE Policy 1 - National Park Landscapes, seascapes</strong></td>
<td>4.8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

**Scottish Government**

**Customer Reference**

**00185**

**Verbatim Comment**

The Scottish Planning Policy applies to wild land areas as identified in the Scottish Natural Heritage 2014 wild land areas map. It is important that the plan is clear that reference to wild land, in accordance with the Scottish Planning Policy, only refers to the mapped wild land areas to avoid any ambiguity over what the Scottish Planning Policy applies to. We understand that areas of wild land character could extend beyond the boundaries of the mapped wild land areas. In such circumstances it needs to be made clear that the Scottish Planning Policy is only applicable to the wild land areas and not to any areas of wild land character beyond such areas.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy - Natural Environment Policies</strong></td>
<td><strong>NE Policy 1 - National Park Landscapes, seascapes</strong></td>
<td>4.8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responder Name/Organisation**

**Sportscotland**

**Customer Reference**

**00188**

**Verbatim Comment**

Change requested: That reference be made in Natural Environment Policy 14 to the adverse effects of aquaculture on recreational and leisure activities as a policy criterion - we suggest that this be included in criterion b), to read as follows: navigational, fishing, and recreation and leisure interests;

Reason: The advice of Paragraph 251 Of Scottish Planning Policy is that Development Plans should outline the issues to be considered when assessing proposals for aquaculture, and one of these issues is interaction with other users of the marine environment, including recreational and leisure activities. The main conflicts are likely to relate to navigation and sharing of recreational space, but safety issues may also exist. We therefore request that the policy be modified to take account of this as per our requested change above.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy - Natural Environment Policies</strong></td>
<td><strong>NE Policy 10 - Protecting Peatlands</strong></td>
<td>4.8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim Comment</td>
<td>Natural Environment Policy 10: Protecting Peatlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We support this policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy - Natural Environment Policies</strong></td>
<td><strong>NE Policy 11 - Protecting the Water Environment</strong></td>
<td>4.8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Customer Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim Comment</td>
<td>Natural Environment Policy 11: Protecting the Water Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We support this policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scottish Water is committed to enabling development within Scotland and will continue to work with Loch Lomond and the Trossachs to highlight where there is available capacity within Scottish Water’s network. This allows development to occur in areas where the need to upgrade existing infrastructure is minimal, therefore reducing developer costs. However, insufficient capacity should not be seen as a barrier to development. Scottish Water is able to provide increased strategic capacity once the developer is able to provide evidence of meeting 5 distinct criteria. These criteria are:

1. Confirmation of land ownership
2. Confirmation that the development is supported in the local plan or has full planning permission
3. Confirmation of time remaining on current planning permission
4. Confirmation that plans are in place and agreed with Scottish Water to mitigate any local network constraints that would arise as a result of the proposed development
5. Notice of the developer’s reasonable proposals in terms of annual build rate.

On receipt of confirmation of meeting all of these criteria, Scottish Water will progress to the design and delivery of the necessary strategic infrastructure to support new development. Developers should be aware of this rule set and be encouraged to engage with us at their earliest opportunity. It should be noted that where new development necessitates infrastructure developers will be required to fund this. Scottish Water is funded to provide new capacity at our strategic ‘part 4’ assets (Water and Waste Water Treatment Works) however all other infrastructures is the responsibility of the relevant developer to provide.

Developers remain responsible for meeting the costs of all ‘local’ network infrastructures required to support development. This extends from items such as on site infrastructure through to water mains, pumping stations and treated water storage tanks. Scottish Water does however make a contribution toward such costs under the provision of water and sewerage services (reasonable cost) (Scotland) regulations 2006. We are also committed to reducing such costs by working with developers to identify the most practical and efficient scope and phasing for solutions. This approach will be particularly important in helping enable large strategic developments however are reliant on early and productive dialogue with developers.
Natural Environment Policy 12: Surface Water and Waste Water Management

We object unless a modification is made to part (a) of this policy. The use of the phrases ‘small settlement’ and ‘limited number of dwellings’ does not adequately explain the situation. The issues are not the size of a proposed settlement or the number of dwellings but the impact of additional flow and load on the water environment (and from Scottish Water’s perspective, on network and works capacity). It is our opinion that if the development is in a sewered area (or area served by Scottish Water’s sewer) then any new development must be connected. While there may be constraints, this would be for Scottish Water to comment on. Sites where connection to the public sewer is constrained or there is a detrimental impact on the environment should be avoided.

Further, it is unclear what is meant by the phrase ‘to a suitable capacity’. We suggest a modification to the policy:

If the public sewerage system cannot be developed due to technical constraints or the connection is unacceptable to Scottish Water, then a private system may be permitted. This would be subject to the system not creating or exacerbating an environmental risk, including cumulative impacts with other developments. Any private wastewater treatment system must be designed to meet SEPA’s requirements for authorisation and receiving water quality.

In part (b) of the policy, there is no reference to SEPA’s role. We suggest it would be useful to modify the policy to include wording such as a reference to the need to meet our requirements.

With regard to the paragraph ‘Private water supplies will only be supported where a public water supply system and/or capacity are unavailable and where there is no adverse effect on the water environment or the lawful interests of other land and water users.’, there are implications regarding authorisation under The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended) (or CAR regs) and therefore we suggest a modification to include reference to meeting our requirements.

We suggest a modification removing the word new in the paragraph ‘Development should minimise the areas of impermeable surface and consider the impact of managing additional surface water arising from developments. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) will be required for all new development except single dwellings where the surface water discharge is made directly to coastal waters and will be incorporated into the overall design of the development. There may be cases in which changes to existing developments may require construction phase or completion phase SuDs. We also suggest a modification to include a reference to construction phase or completion phase SuDs.'
### Verbatim Comment

**Natural Environment Policy 13: Flood Risk**

We support this policy. We are concerned however that for some of the allocated sites, no reference has been made to the detailed information we previously provided during the consultation process. Further detailed comment on this matter is included in the attached spreadsheet which contains the site allocations. At this stage of the plan process, we would have expected our comments to have been fully incorporated and we therefore object unless a modification is made which takes account our previous comments.

The Site Map Icon explanation for the ‘raindrop’ in Appendix 4 states In the odd occasion a flood assessment may result in the FRA being required. We suggest clarification is required regarding this wording.
## Part of Plan Commented On

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy - Natural Environment Policies</th>
<th>NE Policy 14 - Marine and Island Aquaculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>00185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Comment

**Minor drafting change:**
Section 4 Page 104. Policy 15(A) should read:
‘Is in alignment with the National and Regional Marine Plan policies and objectives.’

**Minor drafting change:**
Reason – for accuracy of the Proposed Plan policy.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy - Natural Environment Policies</th>
<th>NE Policy 14 - Marine and Island Aquaculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Comment

**Natural Environment Policy 14 (and 11)**

Natural Environment Policy (NEP) 14 is not clearly linked to others. For example, perhaps there could be a link to NEP 11. However, as NEP 11 relates only to new development it may be simpler to make a modification by adding new text under NEP 14 such as;

(d) on the water environment
The Scottish Government is committed to ensuring that the whole of Scotland is well placed to take full advantage of all the economic, social and environmental opportunities offered by digital technologies. This commitment is supported by the ongoing delivery of the Scottish-wide Digital Scotland Superfast Broadband programme which is now benefiting homes and businesses in the National Park. The “Supporting Digital Connectivity” policy in Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) sets out the role that the planning system should play to support this programme through strengthening digital communications capacity and coverage across Scotland. This includes requirements for local development plans to include policies relating to the provision of digital infrastructure in new buildings.
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Part of Plan Commented On: Policy - Natural Environment Policies

Topic: NE Policy 16 - Contaminated Land

Section commented on: 4.8.16

Responder Name/Organisation: SEPA

Customer Reference: 00713

Verbatim Comment

Natural Environment Policy 16: Contaminated Land

Our remit is concerned with radioactive contaminated land and contaminated land Special Sites. There are currently no statutory identifications of Radioactive Contaminated Land or Special Sites currently within the National Park boundary.

We note and support the Overarching Policy 1 for reusing brownfield land or vacant property where possible. We also note and support the content of Natural Environment Policy 16: Contaminated Land.

We note that some allocations in Section 3 indicate ‘Contaminated Land’ is present. We would caution the use of the term ‘Contaminated Land’ in the Local Plan both in the maps in Section 3 and Environmental Policy 16 as this term has specific implications under Part IIA of the Environment Protection Act 1990.

To avoid confusion and distinguish from statutorily identified ‘Contaminated Land’, we would suggest a modification to the policy to utilise the term ‘Land Contamination’ instead. We would also recommend consultation with the appropriate Local Authorities whose area these sites are in for suggested alternative descriptions.
## Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

### Part of Plan Commented On

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies - Open Space and Community Facilities Policies</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies - Retail Policies</td>
<td>4.11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responder Name/Organisation

| Sportscotland                              | 00188                |
| Arrochar & Tarbet Community Council        | 00037                |

### Verbatim Comment

#### Policies - Open Space and Community Facilities Policies

**Change**: Clarification as to the policy implications of the green 'open space' designation that is shown on the settlement plans, and consequently possible modification of the designation in relation to outdoor sports facilities.

**Reason**: The designation appears to cover some outdoor sports facilities, for example, in Aberfoyle, a football pitch is identified as an area of open space, and policy OS2 implies that this policy is applicable/linked to these identified areas of open space. If this is the case then we would request that the designation be modified, as we consider that Open Space Policy 1 is the policy that should be applicable to outdoor sports facilities, and that the criteria in Open Space Policy 2 do not fit with the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy 226 in relation to the protection of outdoor sports facilities.

#### Policies - Retail Policies

**Retail Policy 3 - Display of Advertisements**

The CC would like to see this wording expanded to include a Park-wide policy on the display of business advertising signs frequently illegally nailed to local trees. Each potential village centre should be served by a central, ergonomically designed board which lists all of the businesses in the village. This will alleviate the unsightly positioning of signage.
The final paragraph is unnecessarily restrictive.

The control afforded through parts (a) to (c) ensure that each application is considered on its merits and allows an appropriate judgement to be made in relation to likely impacts and the acceptability of any proposal in its given location.

The statement that a site is required to facilitate the enhancement and maintenance of the National Park's built environment implies a policy presumption that sites within the Park should primarily/only serve markets within the Park. If minerals may be extracted within the Park in compliance with (a) to (c) there is no reason why a site should not serve a local market, even if entirely outwith, the Park's boundary.

We agree that a site being located within the National Park has implications in terms of assessing the significance of any potential impacts.

Change in document requested: In relation to the minerals policy I note that my reference to the ‘final paragraph’ is incorrect it is in fact the bottom paragraph in the first column of text, starting “New mineral extraction”, my apologies if this has caused confusion.

The requested change relates to this third paragraph. How you redraft it is surely for you to determine but if you are asking me to suggest specific wording, the minimal change requested would be one of the following:

remove the word ‘only’ or preferably, to be absolutely clear replace the word ‘only’ with ‘also’.

As I noted previously if a proposal is able to meet parts (a) - (c) there is no reason for it not to be supported. This remains the case whether or not it is a new site and whether or not it meets the criteria of the paragraph which follows (New mineral...).

The additional flexibility for extensions is appropriate and common practice as would be additional support for material which is required locally or where there is overriding national need etc. The issue as it stands is that a proposal which meets (a) - (c) should be supported, as the policy states at the outset, but the paragraph in question then contradicts this position, the wording of the draft policy suggests that only where the material is required in the park would any new site be supported. This is unnecessary as any proposal would already have to demonstrate no adverse effect etc.
LDP policy: MEP1 - Mineral Extraction

To reflect the findings of the HRA and ensure no adverse effect on a Natura site there should be a caveat added into the minerals extraction overarching policy which states:

"Proposals must not have an adverse effect on the qualifying interests of the European protected sites within or adjacent to the National Park boundary. Where a potential effect has been identified the application must be accompanied by an expert appraisal to inform a project-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA)."

We support this policy however as there are implications regarding authorisation under The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended) (or CAR regs) and the Waste Management Licensing (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (or WML regs.). We would therefore suggest a modification to the policy which makes reference to meeting SEPA requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Customer Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>00713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbatim Comment**


We support the principle of this policy requiring the provision of proportionate on-site waste, recycling and composting facilities within new development sites. This should seek to encourage waste minimisation both during construction and operation. This is considered to be in line with SPP (paragraph 176-177) seeking to achieve Zero Waste Plan objectives and promoting waste minimisation.
Waste Management Policy 2: Waste Management Facilities

We object to this policy unless modifications are made to part (b) of this policy, removing a requirement for new waste facilities to be supported solely on the basis of local operational need. SPP requires that LPAs consider the potential for new waste infrastructure based on a Scottish-wide capacity, whilst there is still significant operational shortfall in capacity. Therefore, we recommend that this policy is modified to remove any reference to local need, replacing this with a statement supporting the provision of waste management facilities to meet shortfalls in waste capacity. This position is in line with SPP paragraph 182 requiring Plans be ‘mindful of the need to achieve the all-Scotland operational capacity’ and complimented further by stating that ‘achievement of a sustainable strategy may involve waste crossing planning boundaries’. Our interpretation of this issue is that it is acceptable for waste arising from any location within Scotland to be treated in any waste management facility and we would not require information or comment on the origin of the waste to be treated in a particular facility.

This policy does not specifically identify where new waste facilities would be supported. We would therefore object unless this policy was modified to make reference to employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses’ being acceptable for waste infrastructure. This is considered to be in line with SPP (paragraph 185) which requires that LDPs ‘make provision for new infrastructure, indicating clearly that it can generally be accommodated on land designated for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses’.

We suggest this policy could be modified to include wording stating that:

Waste management facilities would be supported on land allocated for employment, industrial or storage and distribution uses.

Part (c) of this policy in relation to safeguarding existing waste management facilities is supported. We consider this to be in line with SPP (paragraph 184) which seeks to facilitate the successful operation of such facilities. We also welcome the identification of local waste management infrastructure sites within the settlement strategies for Callander and Killin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementary Guidance - Draft Supplementary Guidance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rural Development Framework West Lochlomondside</strong></td>
<td>6.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responder Name/Organisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Customer Reference</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luss Estates Company</td>
<td>00113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim Comment</td>
<td>Pedestrianisation / exclusion of visitors cars from Luss:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You will be aware of the current importance of this issue in Luss. Luss Estate Company fully support the objectives listed on page 8 of the document. The presence of too many cars in the village represents a real threat to pedestrians, and is a real burden for both residents and visitors. In the strongest possible terms, Luss Estates Company urge the National Park to do all they can to deliver this objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Part of Plan Commented On</strong></td>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementary Guidance - Draft Supplementary Guidance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rural Development Framework Buchanan South</strong></td>
<td>6.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responder Name/Organisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Customer Reference</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr And Mrs S Simmers</td>
<td>00063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim Comment</td>
<td>Page and Site/Policy Reference No: 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Sub-Division of Garden Ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We seek the same positive statement in the Draft Buchanan South RDFA which has a general resistance in the Estate for such Sub-Division, which is inconsistent with the Housing Guidance and is subject of a separate objection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We support the recognition on page 20 that the Sub-Division of garden ground can be appropriate and note the links to the Draft Design Guidance on this Issue, again, which we support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The draft Development Plan was approved by the LLTNP Board on 27th April at the same meeting as the Your Park recommendations which included a proposal that the National Park should produce a Camping Development Plan. The latter has been generally welcomed in principle although there are serious concerns about the number of places being proposed, their location and their design. The lack of clarity about this is reflected in the Development Plan which has sections on camping but apart from a reference to the Your Park proposals on P15 of the Visitor Experience paper appears to have been developed in isolation from the Your Park proposals. There is an urgent for LLTNP to join up the two.

1. Terminology

While the two documents both refer to "formal campsites" they use significantly terminology to describe other camping provision, particularly in respect of the new types of camping provision proposed in Your Park. The Your Park recommendations paper referred to low cost campsites with "basic" facilities (para 5.4) and that camping would be allowed under permit in places with "limited" or no facilities. It did not define what "basic" and "limited" facilities were or the differences between them. The lack of clarity is increased further on (Para 5.11) where the recommendations states "The development of basic low cost campsites will provide opportunities for visitors looking for a slightly more managed facility" but goes on to say the National Park "will also develop a small number of seasonal sites of similar style to those at Sallochy and Inchcailloch". It is unclear if Sallochy is regarded as a "basic" campsite or not. The Draft Development Plan, in its draft Visitor Experience Planning Guidance (P16) categorises campsites as formal, semi-formal and informal. Informal sites are described as temporary, seasonal, having no lighting, water or drainage but they may have temporary or composting toilets while semi informal sites are described as the same as informal ones except they may have low level lighting. How this categorisation relates to the description of basic and limited informal sites in the Your Park recommendations paper is totally unclear and in planning terms it seems that there will be NO water provided at informal or semi-formal campsites which did not appear to be the intention of the Your Park paper which allowed for a range of facilities.
2. Visitor Experience Planning Guidance - caravan sites

The Guidance refers to existing static caravan sites (P9) but makes no reference to the fact some of these still have a small number of places for touring caravans, an example being the site at the SE corner of Loch Earn. This section states the National Park will not allow existing static caravan sites to convert to residential accommodation, saying it wishes to retain places, but makes no reference to maintaining or creating more places for touring vans and tents in these caravan parks.

This is likely to result in further loss of touring places and therefore I wish to object.

While I support the commitment of the National Park not to allow static caravans to chan and no mention this. Want retain existing caravan parks P9 says some caravan parks in too remote locations for residential housing - really?


The Guidance on Visitor Experience states "We are likely to support tourism development within towns, villages and land allocated for tourism" and "We are likely to support small scale tourism development with good access to the existing network of paths, infrastructure or visitor facilities the red shaded areas on maps" (P11). It goes on to state "an informal touring caravan or campsite would be likely to be considered small scale"(P12). Apart from an area around Glenbranter and between Crianlarich and Tydrum all the red shaded areas are on the east side of the National Park and while covering the Trossachs lochs do NOT cover west Loch Lomond, east Loch Lomond or Loch Long. So, what this means in terms of the Local Development Plan as worded is the LLTNP is NOT supporting new "informal" campsites in the west side of the National Park. This is totally wrong and I wish to object. The National Park Authority needs to allow small scale sites in the west of the National Park area.

It is not clear how this position fits with the statement that follows (P15) "THE NPPP is particularly supportive of camping provision in East and West Loch Lomond and the Trossachs". In view of the statements on P11-12 it appears this only refers to "formal" campsites but this is unclear. That this is so is suggested by the statement that "This would need to be in the right locations with appropriate access, parking and no adverse environmental impacts including visual and landscape impacts".

I therefore object to the Development Plan unless it is made very clear that the support for additional campsites throughout the National Park refers to all types of campsite, formal, semi-formal or informal.

"There is growing demand for camping and overnight motorhome provision in the Park and we consider that camping and caravan sites provides valuable inexpensive
Proposed Local Development Plan - Comments Received

I object to the Development Plan as it fails to give sufficient guidance on siting of campsites, whether formal, semi-formal or informal. The guidance on siting should encourage provision of campsites around settlements which are popular tourist destinations.

4. Visitor Experience Planning Guidance - Toilets

Toilets are covered in the Guidance on the Visitor Experience, Page 21, in a short section on toilets and parking. No assessment or reference is given on the demand for public toilets in the National Park or the issues that arise as a consequence despite this being the number one concern in visitor surveys. The statement supports developments in what it calls settlements and key recreational sites. It is unclear whether popular sites for camping at present are regarded as key recreational sites or not and the absence of maps for areas outwith settlements does not help with this. It is therefore unclear if the National Park still supports the development of toilet provision which was set out in its own 5 Lochs Management Plan. There is no mention of the planning framework or what the National Park’s policy is in respect of temporary toilet provision to meet peak demand – in contrast to camping where P15 usefully sets out the legal framework for camp and caravan sites.

I wish to object to this section of the Local Development as being totally inadequate and failing to reference the Park’s own Five Lochs Management Plan which included several proposals to include toilet facilities at specific sites.

5. Planning Conditions.

The Visitor Experience Guidance Page P26 give examples planning conditions to accompany planning permission. These include conditions specifying the maximum places for tents, caravans, yurt and that pods and requirements that places will not be changed from say camping to caravans. The restriction on change of type of place is to be welcomed as it could help stop the loss of camping places in the National Park.

Also included in the conditions is a requirement that seasonal/informal camping sites can only be used 1 March to 31st October and for a maximum stay of four weeks. No rationale is given for the seasonal restriction and it makes no sense in terms of the Park’s other objectives. While numbers are much lower, there are people who want to camp over the winter and keeping facilities such as toilets open will help reduce the type of impact the National Park raised such a fuss about in the Your Park consultation. Its unclear from the letter to Ministers accompanying the Your Park Proposals whether the LLTNP has decided that ALL the new camping places it is proposing should be seasonal and whether the Development Plan is also saying this.

I therefore wish to object to proposal from the Park for seasonal restrictions to be applied to informal camping sites

6. Specific locations

The Development Plan includes site maps for towns and villages “which we have allocated for specific development uses such as housing, economic development and visitor
experience” (SECTION 3.2). The LLTNP has developed a set of icons to illustrate uses - these do NOT include camping. It may be because of this there are no proposals in the plan for new campsites around settlements. Some examples of where campsites are needed are given below. I wish to object to the failure of the Local Development Plan to illustrate any plans for new campsites in the section of the plan that deals with Places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Plan Commented On</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Section commented on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Guidance - Draft Planning Guidance</td>
<td>Visitor Experience</td>
<td>6.3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) Design Guidance - Boundaries (P42).

The section of the Design Guidance on boundaries rightly states that boundary barriers should be designed in accordance with the character of the National Park. There is NO reference to deer fencing, which although sometimes a permitted development, can be put up around houses in settlements or for non-agricultural or forestry purposes. The need for this is illustrated by the example below, the new boundary fence for Loch Venachar House, currently the residence of the convener of the National Park Authority, which appears to have replaced the wall which was included in the original site plans for the adjacent car park (Five Lochs Visitor Management Plan):

To support the Park’s access objectives the section on boundaries should include a statement about the importance of boundaries being compatible with access rights, provisions of gates and styles etc.

I wish to object to the section in the Site Guidance on Boundaries in the Local Development Plan as it should refer to deer fencing (undesirable and unacceptable for residential properties) and access rights.

8) Design Guidance - Caravan and Campsites (P71)

As pointed out above this contains no guidance on the siting of campsites. It should do. There is some generally sound advice in this section but this is not related to the categories of formal, semi formal and informal campsites for which there are likely to be different design considerations. This needs to be made clearer. There is no mention of the impacts of tents on ground vegetation which is strange given Your Park makes considerable play of impact camping on vegetation and how campsites might avoid this given that they tend to concentrate use on particular pitches.

There has been a failure to join up the design guidance in the draft Development Plan with the Your Park proposals. LLTNPs’s illustrative campsite design, which accompanied its letter to Ministers, shows a campsite built on a hillside with wooden platforms. This appears to have been done by someone who has little experience of camping and is hardly a low key development. How campers will put in pegs to platforms is not
shown and there are a number of health and safety issues relating to ensuring the platforms remain in sound condition, have sufficient means to secure tents etc. The campsite created at Sallochy is a much better example of the type of facility needed and according to information provided by the LLTNP is extremely well used.

I object to the Design Guidance as it should include guidance on siting, as stated elsewhere in the Plan, and clarify the design considerations of the different types of campsites.

The LLTNP’s thinking about campsite design appears to be at a very early stage despite its experience at Sallochy and Loch Lubnaig where there have been considerable challenges and costs associated with providing electricity and flushing toilets.