

Appendix 2 Summarised consultation comments and responses on the Callander South Masterplan Framework Planning Guidance

Scottish Government (Rep. 185): Historic Scotland asks for early consultation on development proposals affecting Claish Farm sites MU2 and LT2.

Modifications requested:

- a) that the Masterplan Framework make specific reference to the need for historic environment impacts to be a key consideration in the development of road access proposals as part of the development of these sites.
- b) that Historic Environment Scotland are named as sources of advice for integration of ecosystems approach into the planning process.

Officer recommended response:

a) Historic Environment Scotland is concerned over the potential adverse impacts of development on scheduled monuments on the long term Claish Farm site LT2 (including impact on setting from MU2 site), especially over the creation of new roads and wish for this point to be raised in the guidance. Include final sentence under title 'Road access' on p19 to read:

'Formation of new roads or upgrade of existing tracks require careful consideration of impacts on cultural heritage assets.'

b) Agree amendment to include Historic Environment Scotland;

i) within 2nd last paragraph - 2nd sentence on p18 alongside Scottish Natural Heritage and Scottish Environment Protection Agency, and

ii) on list of contacts for advice on Ecosystems Services Approach within section 7 'Further information' on p25.

Sportscotland (Rep. 188): Query site identified for pitch expansion at High School due to proximity of water feature, however, appreciate indicative location at this stage. Further work required to determine optimum location. Note guidance document on provision of school sports facilities.

Modification requested: Ensure suitable location for sports pitch extensions.

Officer recommended response: Agree that the exact location of areas of open space will be determined at the planning application stage subject to various factors including flood risk assessment, existing natural and cultural assets. Amend sentence 'Land should be made available to the south of the existing playing fields to accommodate an extension if required.' in paragraph below title 'Open space' to read: 'Land should be made available to accommodate various forms of open space including playing fields and children's play area.'

Gwenda Condon (Rep. 691): New developments have increased traffic volumes in Callander. Major development gradually destroys attractions of natural beauty and pleasant towns and villages. Increased traffic will be detrimental for residential, education and commercial buildings close to pavement along A81 at Bridgend and A84 Main Street due to noise, vibration and air pollution.

Modification requested: no new development in Callander until a by-pass and a new road link at the south of the town.

Officer recommended response: A by-pass is highly unlikely given extensive costs which would come with such a proposal. The new road link to the south would also face challenges of sourcing suitable funding and is more likely to be a long term project. It is impossible to

have significant new infrastructure without development to help fund them. The Claish Farm and Churchfield sites have both infrastructure requirements to accommodate development. The south road bridge will not be funded solely from development and will require financial support from other sources.

Stuart and Val Gray (Rep. 693): Object to 33% affordable housing as not in accord with Scottish Planning Policy 25% and would have a significant effect on viability of proposal. Commuted sum example of £900,000 would make development unviable when other infrastructure requirements and economics of development in Callander are taken into account. Scottish Planning Policy and Circular 3/2012 require that development viability is properly accounted for in requirement for developer contributions.

Modification requested:

a) Amend final paragraph on p22 to state 'sites will provide 25% affordable housing.'

and

b) Delete 2nd paragraph on p23 and replace with: *'Discussions between the Council and Transport Scotland have confirmed that existing A81/A84 junction has potential capacity to accommodate the proposed 120 homes and 60 bed hotel. The current junction capacity is not a fixed threshold. The scale of additional capacity beyond will be determined by a transport assessment which will identify the point at which a road bridge or other mitigation measure will be required.'*

Officer recommended response:

a) The 33% affordable housing requirement is above that set by Scottish Planning Policy, however the reasons for this are set out within document 'Proposed Plan Population and Housing Background Paper'. This paper states; 'Within the accessible rural Stirling area – which includes Callander, Aberfoyle and Gartmore – a requirement of 33% is identified. This acknowledges the housing pressures in these villages, which are within commuting distance from Glasgow, and also ensures consistency with the neighbouring Stirling Council Local Development Plan and Local Housing Strategy.'

Every site is different and faces challenges in terms of viability. It is too early in the development process to determine the overall costs involved. At the pre-application and planning application stages, developers have the option of discussing any concerns of viability with Development Management.

b) In terms of the trigger by which development will be constrained prior to a south link road bridge being built, there has been work undertaken in partnership with the landowner, Transport Scotland and Stirling Council to examine this and further work will continue to be undertaken to establish this. Therefore, the text has been amended to now state *"There has been work undertaken which has shown there is capacity on the existing A81/A84 junction for an additional 120 homes, beyond this there could be capacity issues. Further work is underway to better understand the traffic movements in Callander and its impact on the capacity of the junction."*

John Murphy (Rep. 705): Additional urban development should not be allowed adjacent to the existing Mollands housing estate as the rural atmosphere would be adversely affected.

Modification requested: Assume remove area of land for development adjacent to Mollands on the west side of the A81 public road.

Officer recommended response: Appreciate there are landscape sensitivities on this site along with the majority of sites in the National Park. The site lies adjacent to an existing housing estate. The proposed development would be a natural extension of it and with suitable mitigation measures would be acceptable in the wider landscape. There are various

design measures which can help mitigate this concern including layout and design of buildings and road access, landscaping measures and choice of materials. The guidance clearly advises which landscape documents are available for advice on Callander landscapes. No changes proposed.

Scottish Natural Heritage (Rep. 712):

- a) p22 suggests the existing pedestrian bridge has a limited lifespan. We note the requirement for developers to submit Active Travel Plans that would consider the potential closure of the bridge.
- b) Although active travel routes within the framework are identified, the masterplan does not identify how those networks link with wider networks.
- c) Unclear from the maps how the small water body to the south of the leisure centre will be incorporated into the development. The map on p24 suggests there will be an extension to a football pitch at this location. This does not appear to be in line with the aspiration for natural sustainable urban drainage system and flood mitigation measures.
- d): Since the riparian corridor is a key site feature, the framework should set out a minimum width that would enable the functions set out on p20 (biodiversity, public amenity, habitat for wildlife) to be fully accommodated.
- e) Green space 'buffer' to the south: Is the proposed green space buffer to the south there to contain the development, or could it also incorporate an active travel route that would link with the other paths on the diagram? If land to the south is developed in the longer term, could this green space buffer become more of a green network through a larger development?

Modifications requested:

- a) Given that the pedestrian bridge is critical to the success of the first phase of development, developers should be asked for a contribution towards a replacement bridge. This is especially important given the uncertainties over how and when the proposed road bridge to the south will be funded/ delivered.
- b) Opportunities for connections to wider active travel networks (Coilhallan Wood/ Cock Hill within 5-10 minutes' walk of the western edge of this site) should be highlighted in the framework, even if at this stage it is 'indicative'.
- c) Revise how the small water body south of the leisure centre will be incorporated into the guidance.
- d) Accommodate riparian corridor 10m either side of Mollands Burn (based on SEPA's Controlled Activities Regulations guidance). The buffer would help to provide an opportunity to enhance the biodiversity value through e.g. riparian planting, and help to avoid further loss of biodiversity. It would also be helpful if an indicative cross section/ sketch of the riparian corridor/green space was included. This would serve to illustrate the required distance/ relationship between this corridor and nearby housing/ road access and better support the delivery of a multifunctional green network.
- e) Include more detail of the required green space buffer.

Officer recommended response:

- a) Generally, planning cannot ask for funding for replacement of existing infrastructure. Section 19 of Circular 1/2010 'Planning Agreements' states:

'Planning agreements should not be used to resolve existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision or to secure contributions to the achievement of wider planning objectives which are not strictly necessary to allow permission to be granted for the particular development. ...It is generally inappropriate to grant planning permission for a development which would demonstrably exacerbate a situation which was clearly already unsatisfactory.'

Stirling Council is responsible for the management of the pedestrian bridge.

- b) Agree that connections to existing and likely wider active travel networks should be made clear in the guidance.
- c) Agree that existing water bodies on site should be clearly shown on maps on pp9-11 and on p.24. Amend key for SAC to cover Special Area of Conservation and blue shading to cover existing water bodies (Mollands burn, river and ponds)
- (d) Agree that a buffer area should be allocated to ensure the riparian corridor is restored. This would tie in with the Ecosystems Services Approach. Also agree that an illustrated indicative cross section detail would help explain what is meant by a riparian zone either side of the Mollands Burn. Benefits include: Habitat, habitat connectivity, strengthens banks, diffuses pollution mitigation, reduces risk of flooding and provides open space amenity and recreation.
- e) Yes, the greenspace buffer is designed to contain the initial phases of development although it should be designed to incorporate an active travel route to connect to other paths on site. Annotation should be added to map on p24 to state: 'greenspace buffer along riverside and between sites to include active travel route with connections to other pedestrian/cycle links'.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (Rep. 713): Within the master plan framework are a number of aerial photographs taken during December 2006 flood event which would suggest that the risk of flooding shown on our flood maps are slightly under predicted, particularly regarding surface water flooding. The framework highlights that a flood risk assessment will be carried out. The flood risk report should assess the risk of flooding from all sources.

Modifications requested: Replace statement recommending using natural mitigation measures to ensure future development to: 'all development should be located outwith the 0.5% annual probability (200 year) flood extent determined by the flood risk assessment.'

Officer recommended response: Agree to replace 2nd and 3rd sentences within 3rd paragraph under heading 'Drainage and flood risk' on p20 with 'All development should be located outwith the 0.5% annual probability (200 year) flood extent determined by the floor risk assessment.'

Cambusmore Estates (Rep. 720): 'Transport Scotland and Stirling Council have confirmed that there is a limit in the capacity in the Main Street (A84) and Bridge Street (A81) junction; requiring a new road bridge beyond 120 homes, a 60-bed hotel, activity centre and start-up business units. The allocation of the long term housing and visitor experience policy at Auchenlaich site rather than at Claish Farm would not require a new bridge and therefore would not put pressure on new development in Callander to pay for a new bridge within a strategic infrastructure fund. A new road bridge link will have a negative visual impact upon the River Teith Special Area of Conservation, Conservation Area and National Park due to the introduction of traffic, noise and air pollution where there was none before.'

Modification requested: The Auchenlaich site should be used when carrying out an Appropriate Assessment as an alternative solution. Auchenlaich is recognised as being suitable for tourism and also suitable to include the aspirations of policy LT2 long term housing and Visitor Experience allocation.

Officer recommended response: An Appropriate Assessment was undertaken during the development of the Local Development Plan and it was demonstrated that appropriate mitigation could be undertaken to prevent adverse effects. Auchenlaich is not part of this Masterplan Framework area.

McLaren Community Leisure Centre (Rep. 721):

The community would benefit greatly from a flexible games space which could accommodate larger events such as the Highland Games. 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 an area (1.2ha) separate to the mixed use allocation there is a risk that any developer will interpret that as being sufficient. We attach some possible layout options.

Welcome the existing river walk adjacent to the River becoming a formal pedestrian and cycle path suitable for disabled access for Claish Farm and Churchfield sites.

In relation to the long term bridge route - All new development in Callander will contribute towards a strategic infrastructure fund (road bridge only). This should be extended to include any improved linkages and should be made clear in the Local Development Plan. We feel there should be a clear statement that developer contributions from all sites in Callander would be appropriate and that they could be made towards any such links as the benefits are to the entire town's connectivity.

Modification requested: Simply highlighting the requirement for sports pitches etc. at this location, within a mixed use allocation, rather than specifying an area extent may be preferable and is consistent with the MU2 allocation plan. Amend strategic infrastructure fund not solely for road bridge but also for improved linkages. The strategic infrastructure fund should be clear in the Local Development Plan as well.

Officer recommended response: Agree that ‘...of 1.2Ha for possible...’ should be deleted from caption to state ‘Allowance for sports pitch expansion’ on map on p24 and the specific area shaded white to be covered by the pink shading for ‘mixed use’ thus allowing the most suitable location for open space pitch provision to be determined at the planning application stage. This coincides with response to concerns over flooding in this area.

In terms of the long term bridge route, agree that this should be made clear on the Plan and this matter has been included as part of the examinations process. In terms of strategic fund going beyond the requirement for the long term bridge, disagree that this fund should be used for other purposes as the costs of the long term bridge will be high compared to the limited funds likely to be achieved from developer contributions. The road bridge is likely to require funding sources from various sources. In terms of improved linkages, both Churchfields and Claish Farm sites require to include pedestrian /cycle links within and from the site, and adjacent to the river for the Claish Farm sites as part of the masterplan and subsequent planning application(s). It would be unreasonable to request additional contributions for links off site.