

# Comments - PLDP Stage

Contributor Name

Robin

Campbell

Organisation

Scottish Government

Contributor Reference

00185

Comment Reference

LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00185/5/018

Comment Type

COMM

Allocated To

LDP\_AL

Analysed By

OLDP Section Reference

6.3.4

Plan Section

Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin

Plan Topic

Callander South Masterplan Framework

Comment

Historic Scotland welcomes that the Draft Callander South Materplan Framework (CSDMF) acknowledges the range of historic environment assets which must be taken into consideration in the development of a Materplan for the Callander South area. In view of the historic environment assets potentially affected, early consultation and discussion with Historic Environment Scotland on the development of a Materplan and proposals for these sites, particularly MU2 and LT2, is recommended. We consider that the following recommendations would improve the ability of the draft Materplan Framework to guide appropriate development in line with national and local policy on the historic environment:- The CSDMF sets out predicted locations of road links between sites MU2 Claish Farm and LT2 Claish Farm, and from the A81 to LT2 Claish Farm. Development of road infrastructure in these locations has the potential for significant adverse direct and indirect impacts on scheduled monuments located within LT2 Claish Farm. In view of this we recommend that the Materplan 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. Early consultation with Historic Environment Scotland would be expected and the CSDMF could indicate this. - The CSDMF places emphasis on the use of an ecosystems planning approach to the development of these sites, and recognises that historic environment assets are a key element in this approach. SEPA and SNH are named as sources of advice for integration of ecosystems approach into the planning process. It is recommended that Historic Environment Scotland are also included as a source of advice, in relation to the integration of historic environment into the ecosystems planning approach.

# Comments - PLDP Stage

Contributor Name

Elaine

Organisation

Fotheringham

Sportscotland

Contributor Reference

00188

Comment Reference

LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00188/3/001

Comment Type

Allocated To

Analysed By

LDP\_AL

OLDP Section Reference

6.3.4

Plan Section

Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin

Plan Topic

Callander South Masterplan Framework

Comment

Change requested : No specific change requested but seek to highlight/query the suitability of site identified for pitch expansion at High School. Reason : We support the suggestion that there is an allowance made within the site to accommodate any future expansion of pitches at the high school, but question the suitability of the site chosen in terms of ground conditions. This view has been arrived at from a review of the site using aerial imagery only, but it is suggested that proximity to the water feature may mean this is not the most suitable location for new pitches. However, we appreciate that this is an indicative location only at this stage and that further work will be required to determine the optimum location. Please note that we have published guidance on the provision of school sports facilities, both indoor and outdoor, which can be used to determine what the future requirement for new provision would be based on school roll numbers. It can be accessed at the following links:  
[www.sportscotland.org.uk/resources/facilities/schools/design\\_guidance\\_for\\_secondary\\_school\\_sports\\_facilities](http://www.sportscotland.org.uk/resources/facilities/schools/design_guidance_for_secondary_school_sports_facilities)  
[www.sportscotland.org.uk/resources/facilities/schools/school\\_playing\\_fields\\_planning\\_and\\_design\\_guidance](http://www.sportscotland.org.uk/resources/facilities/schools/school_playing_fields_planning_and_design_guidance)

# Comments - PLDP Stage

Contributor Name

Gwenda

Condon

Organisation

Contributor Reference

00691

Comment Reference

LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00691/1/001

Comment Type

OBJ

Allocated To

LDP\_AL

Analysed By

OLDP Section Reference

6.3.4

Plan Section

Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin

Plan Topic

Callander South Masterplan Framework

Comment

Support : New road bridge and gardensReason: A new road link to the South of Callander would ease the volume of traffic along the A81 into Callander.A new riverside park would develop a natural feature and be of benefit to both residents and visitors.Change in document requested : No new building development of Callander.Reason:1. The National Park's economy relies heavily on visitors attracted by natural beauty and pleasant towns and villages. Major development gradually destroys these attractions and Callander has already had several new building schemes over recent years.2. Residential and commercial buildings along the A81 at Bridgend and along the A84 Main Street adjoin the pavement. The close proximity of these buildings to traffic make them particularly vulnerable to noise, vibration and air pollution. Any new building development will increase the volume of traffic along these routes to the detriment of both residents and workers.Throughout the year visitors use the pavements in Callander, especially on the Main Street and at certain times of the year become very crowded. Any increase in traffic is not only hazardous but also unpleasant. Callander relies on its visitors. Their experience should be enhanced not decreased.In addition there is a youth centre and two schools along the A81. Any development, especially on the west side of Mollands Road will greatly increase the volume of traffic along this route.An earlier Stirling Council Local Plan recommended a By-pass for Callander. Since that time there has been several new developments that have increased traffic volume. There are four new housing schemes; a sports centre; and a new health centre which is away from the centre of town. All there and a general increase in vehicles on the road have increased traffic in the Callander area.Until Callander has a by-pass and a new road link at the south of the town then no new building developments should happen in this area.

# Comments - PLDP Stage

Contributor Name

Stuart And Val

Gray

Organisation

Contributor Reference

00693

Comment Reference

LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00693/2/001

Comment Type

COMM

Allocated To

LDP\_AL

Analysed By

OLDP Section Reference

6.3.4

Plan Section

Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin

Plan Topic

Callander South Masterplan Framework

Comment

Mr and Mrs Gray welcome the allocation of land at Claish farm, South Callander in the Proposed Plan for the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park LDP (LDP ref MU2 and LT2). Mr and Mrs Gray welcome the production of the Draft South Callander Masterplan Guidance and are generally supportive of its requirements, subject to the proposed amendments set out below. On page 22, the final paragraph seeks provision of affordable housing at 33% of site capacity. The imposition of a 33% requirement is not in accord with paragraph 129 of SPP as set out in Mr and Mrs Gray's separate representations. Its imposition would have a significant effect on the viability of the proposal. Should there be a need to exercise the commuted sum equivalent instead of onsite provision; this sum of almost £900,000 renders the development unviable, when other infrastructure requirements and the economics of development in Callander are taken into account. SPP and circular 3/2012 require that development viability is properly accounted for in the requirement for developer contributions. The final paragraph on page 22 should be deleted and replaced as follows: Sites will provide 25% affordable housing. On page 23, the second paragraph should be deleted and replaced as follows: 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.

# Comments - PLDP Stage

Contributor Name

John

Murphy

Organisation

Contributor Reference

00705

Comment Reference

LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00705/1/001

Comment Type

OBJ

Allocated To

LDP\_AL

Analysed By

OLDP Section Reference

6.3.4

Plan Section

Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin

Plan Topic

Callander South Masterplan Framework

Comment

I do not think additional urban development should be allowed adjacent to the existing Mollands housing estate. I think the rural atmosphere would be adversely affected.

# Comments - PLDP Stage

|                             |  |                           |             |
|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|-------------|
| Contributor Name            | Organisation   | Contributor Reference     |             |
| Janice                      | Winning  | Scottish Natural Heritage |             |
| 00712                       |  |                           |             |
| Comment Reference           | Comment Type   | Allocated To              | Analysed By |
| LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00712/2/024 | COMM   | LDP_AL                    |             |
| OLDP Section Reference      | Plan Section   |                           |             |
| 6.3.4                       | Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin   |                           |             |
| Plan Topic                  | Callander South Masterplan Framework   |                           |             |
| Comment                     | <p>We welcome the masterplan and the inclusive process involved in developing it. We note and welcome the infrastructure requirements set out on page 10, namely the local paths/ routes, riverside park, 'biodiversity enhancements', 'natural' sustainable drainage systems and natural flood mitigation measures. Below we have made suggestions on the masterplan which we believe would help the masterplan provide greater clarity and certainty. 30 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. However given that this is critical to the success of even the first phase of this development, we suggest that instead developers should be asked for a contribution towards a replacement for this bridge. This is especially important given the uncertainties over how and when the proposed road/foot bridge to the south will be funded/delivered Although active travel routes within the framework are identified, the masterplan does not identify how those networks link with wider networks. There are extensive footpath networks in Coilhallan Wood/ Cock Hill within 5-10 minutes walk of the western edge of this site, but it isn't obvious how residents would access those opportunities. We therefore advise that these opportunities for connections are highlighted in the framework, even if at this stage it is 'indicative'. It isn't clear from the maps how (or whether) the small water body to the south of the leisure centre will be incorporated into the development. The map on page 32 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 SUDS and flood mitigation measures. We advise therefore that a revised masterplan sets out how this feature will be incorporated into the framework. Riparian Corridor: We welcome that this feature has been incorporated into the framework. However, we would suggest that since this is a key site feature, the framework should set out a minimum width that would enable the functions set out on page 25 (biodiversity, public amenity, habitat for wildlife) to be fully accommodated. In this context, we would suggested that the width should be at least 20 metres. It would also be helpful if an indicative cross section/ sketch of the riparian corridor/greenspace 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. Greenspace 'buffer' to the south: Is the proposed greenspace 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 greenspace buffer become more of a green network through a larger development? Again, it wold be helpful to include in the framework some more detail of the required function of this buffer which would in turn influence the more detailed masterplans.</p> |                           |             |

# Comments - PLDP Stage

Contributor Name

Lynn

Anderson

Organisation

SEPA

Contributor Reference

00713

Comment Reference

LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00713/1/015

Comment Type

COMM

Allocated To

LDP\_AL

Analysed By

OLDP Section Reference

6.3.4

Plan Section

Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin

Plan Topic

Callander South Masterplan Framework

Comment

Callander South Masterplan Framework  
The site encompasses Churchfields which was subjected to an earlier planning application, (LT/2008/0376/OUT/S) in which we originally objected to the application, but subsequently removed our objection, subject to conditions. Review of the SEPA flood maps shows that there are small areas at risk of with fluvial or surface water flooding. Included within the master plan framework are a number of aerial photographs taken by SEPA during the 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. This report should assess the risk of flooding from all sources. The framework recommends using natural mitigation measures to ensure future development. We would recommend that this statement is changed and that all development should be located outwith the 0.5% annual probability (200 year) flood extent determined by the flood risk assessment.

# Comments - PLDP Stage

|  |   |   |                      |
|--|---|---|----------------------|
| Contributor Name   | Organisation  | Contributor Reference                           |                      |
| <input type="text" value="Paula"/>                       | <input type="text" value="Baillie-Hamilton"/>   | <input type="text" value="Cambusmore Estates"/> |                      |
| <input type="text" value="00720"/>                       |   |   |                      |
| Comment Reference  | Comment Type  | Allocated To                                    | Analysed By          |
| <input type="text" value="LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00720/1/001"/> | <input type="text" value="COMM"/>   | <input type="text" value="LDP_AL"/>             | <input type="text"/> |
| OLDP Section Reference                                   | Plan Section  |   |                      |
| <input type="text" value="6.3.4"/>                       | <input type="text" value="Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin"/>   |   |                      |
| Plan Topic   | <input type="text" value="Callander South Masterplan Framework"/>   |   |                      |
| Comment  | <p>This document states: '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. A capacity assessment of this junction confirmed that a limitation on development would be appropriate prior to a new road bridge being required for development beyond approximately 120 homes, a 60-bed hotel, activity centre and start-up business units. There are additional limitations with existing pedestrian and road bridges summarised below.' 'All new development in Callander will contribute towards a strategic infrastructure fund. Details will be provided in an update to this Guidance. This is programmed to be on finalisation of this Guidance and Adoption of the Local Development Plan. The assessment will include the provision of a future road bridge, including the projected costs and how much contribution is required per house in Callander.' It appears that a new road bridge is only required after the capacity levels of the A84/A81 junction has been reached through the implementation of policies HE3 and MU2. 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 onto the A84 use will have a negative visual impact upon the River Teith, the Conservation Area and the National Park due to the introduction of traffic, noise and air pollution where there was none before. Development of the Claish Farm and Claish site has the potential for significant in-combination negative effects on the River Teith SAC. 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</p> |   |                      |



# Comments - PLDP Stage

|                             |   |                       |             |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------|
| Contributor Name            | Organisation  | Contributor Reference |             |
| Rob                         | McLaren Community Leisure Centre  | 00721                 |             |
| Latimer                     |   |                       |             |
| Comment Reference           | Comment Type  | Allocated To          | Analysed By |
| LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00721/1/005 | COMM  | LDP_AL                |             |
| OLDP Section Reference      | Plan Section  |                       |             |
| 6.3.4                       | Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin  |                       |             |
| Plan Topic                  | Callander South Masterplan Framework  |                       |             |
| Comment                     | <p>Support: recreational and educational opportunitiespg.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)</p> |                       |             |

## Comments - PLDP Stage

Contributor Name

Rob

Latimer

Organisation

McLaren Community Leisure Centre

Contributor Reference

00721

Comment Reference

LDP01/PLDP/CONS/00721/1/008

Comment Type

COMM

Allocated To

LDP\_AL

Analysed By

OLDP Section Reference

6.3.4

Plan Section

Supplementary Guidance - Draft Plannin

Plan Topic

Callander South Masterplan Framework

Comment

That the existing river walk adjacent to the River should become a formal pedestrian and cycle path suitable for disabled access for Claish Farm and Churchfield sites is welcomed. In relation to the long term bridge route the DPG states that - All new development in Callander will contribute towards a strategic infrastructure fund. This only relating to the long term road bridge and is only mentioned in the DPG and should be extended to any improved linkages and should be made clear in the LDP; currently it is not apparent with respect to other development sites even if it were only to apply to the long term bridge route. 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.

## Comments - PLDP Stage