

Flamingo Land Limited & Scottish Enterprise c/o Mark Johnston Peter Brett Associates 160 West George Street Glasgow G2 2HG

ing .

Dear Mark

Application Number: 2018/0133/PPP

Development Proposed: The erection and operation of a tourism and leisure led mixed

use development including hotel, bunkhouse accommodation and self-catering holiday lodges; self catering boathouse accommodation; residential development; leisure and

recreational facilities including swimming pool, water park, visitor reception and education/interpretation facilities; hot food/café restaurant uses; brewery; ancillary uses including retail; façade retention of Woodbank House and conversion of existing

retention of Woodbank House and conversion of existing outbuildings; public realm enhancements including public square

improvements, footpaths and cycleways; external activity areas including forest adventure rides, tree top walkway, monorail, events/performance areas, picnic areas and play areas; staff and service areas; landscaping; new access from Ben Lomond

Way and Pier Road; and site development infrastructure

(including SUDS, and parking).

Land At Pier Road, Ben Lomond Way And Old Luss Road,

Known As West Riverside And Woodbank House, Balloch

Thank you for submitting the above application for consideration. The majority of consultations have now been received and an initial assessment of the proposal has been undertaken. Under the provisions of Section 23 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 I am writing to advise that additional information is required.

Please note that the extent of additional information requested is in part, a result of the very specific development parameters that are being sought. While details regarding heights, scale and density could in some instances be conditioned as a matter specified in conditions (if the application were to be approved), you are seeking approval for specific building heights and unit numbers within your parameters plan. Consequently the Environmental Statement should contain sufficient information that assess the likely significant effects of the development parameters. Currently the information provided is not considered sufficient for us to assess likely significant effects or assess the proposals against relevant policies within the Local Development Plan.

The further information requested is summarised as follows:

Woodland

Consent is sought for a specific number of holiday lodges within wooded areas including the wooded edge of the River Leven, Drumkinnon Wood and Woodbank House. Whilst the principle of some development within these wooded areas may be acceptable, the scale of the development must be assessed against Natural Environment Policy 8 of the Local Development Plan as well as the Scottish Governments Control of Woodland Removal Policy. To enable us to make that assessment the following information is required:

- Details as to how the proposed woodland loss would be distributed between the different woodland areas;
- The core areas of woodland for retention should be mapped (along with species list) and areas of bluebell should be target noted. Our ecologist/woodland advisor would welcome a discussion to agree the scope of this work.
- Details of compensatory planting (shown on a plan) to demonstrate there is no net woodland loss.

I have attached our Tree and Woodland Officer's response as this outlines the further information requirements in more detail.

As referred to in my e-mail of 19 June the document named "Tree and Woodland survey" appears incomplete. Please submit the final document.

Landscape

Large areas of the application site are sensitive in landscape terms and from the information provided it is not possible to fully assess the likely significant environmental effects on the landscape. The following additional information is therefore required:

- A Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA) that considers proposed tree loss. The
 "vegetated ZTV" includes existing vegetation but not trees/woodland that will require to be
 removed to allow development. Photomontages with and without proposed tree cover
 should be submitted along with an updated assessment that considers the landscape and
 visual impact of the development with associated woodland loss (please note that this is
 relevant to all parts of the site).
- Mono-Rail Please confirm the anticipated overall height of the mono-rail and provide a
 photomontage that shows the height of the mono-rail in relation to existing trees and to
 buildings (at Station Square).
- Landscape Capacity You are seeking consent for a specific number of dwellings/chalets within the site and you should therefore demonstrate that each part of the site has the capacity to sensitively accommodate the number of units proposed (along with associated infrastructure and parking). The landscape capacity assessment can be informed by the conclusions of your LVIA but should also take account of proposed tree loss (both within and adjacent to these sites), proximity to trees, heights of proposed buildings and other existing constraints. It should be accompanied by an indicative layout plan of the proposed chalets and dwellings (as requested during our pre-application discussions). Our Landscape Advisors would welcome the opportunity to discuss and advise on the scope of this work.
- Photomontages Maximum heights are given for a number of the proposed buildings however the landscape and visual impact of these building heights cannot be fully assessed from the information provided. Whilst it is noted that paragraph 12.2.47 of Volume 1 of the ES states that "as this is currently only a Planning Permission in Principle the visualisations produced focus on the likely mass of the buildings within the Proposed Development and are not intended to be photo-realistic interpretations.", as you are

seeking consent for buildings of specific heights, these heights should be more accurately reflected within the massing study photomontages (or alternative photomontages/ section plans). If it helps I can provide you with examples of other applications (within other Authority areas) where a high quality of information relating to viewpoints showing the massing of proposed buildings was provided (please note that a sectional elevation at Station Square and at the Pierhead would be particular useful). For Station Square photomontages or cross-sections through the site should be submitted that accurately show the height of proposed new buildings in relation to existing and proposed (i.e. Swenneys Cruises) buildings. Sections should demonstrate the height of existing buildings in relation to the Visitor Information Centre and dwellings and flats located directly to the west. Similarly, at the Pierhead, photomontages/cross-sections should show the height of the proposed new buildings in relation to existing buildings (namely the Slipway, Winch House, Drumkinnon Tower and Loch Lomond Shores Retail Development). These should also demonstrate the distance of the proposed buildings from the beach and listed Winch House. Where buildings are to have a variety of building heights this should be reflected in the information provided. As indicated above the photomontages provided should show proposed tree loss.

- Additional viewpoints there has been no assessment of the proposed development from Drumkinnon tower (including existing viewing area) or the retail development at Loch Lomond Shores. These are both main receptors for this area.
- Special Landscape Qualities (SLQ) Assessment this assessment considers impact on the National Park as a whole however it should also consider local impacts (for example at the Pierhead the beach provides an opportunity to enjoy the loch shore experience as part of the SLQ's).
- Boathouse there appears to be no detailed assessment of the landscape/visual impact
 of the proposed boathouse or a justification for the boathouse with regard to relevant LDP
 policies.

Cultural Heritage

The proposal raises a number of issues relating to cultural heritage and a summary of additional information required to fully assess the environmental effects in this regard is summarised below.

Imapact on Setting of Heritage Assets

A more detailed analysis regarding some of the heritage assets including the impact of the proposal on their setting should be provided – this is particularly relevant in relation to Woodbank House, The Winch House, Balloch Pier and Station Square. Further guidance on defining and analysing setting can be found in Historic Scotland's guidance Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting. Our built heritage advisor would also be happy to advise further on the scope of this work. This work should inform the landscape capacity studies referred to above.

Woodbank House

- The Barham Glen Architects Inspection Report provides some additional information to compliment that of the Structural Inspection Report. The submitted Design Statement refers to this Barham Glen Report as being an 'outline conservation report'; however, it seems limited on heritage appraisal/assessment with respect to Woodbank House. The application submission would benefit from further information objectively assessing and reporting on the significance/key characteristics of the heritage assets of Woodbank House and providing an objective assessment of the heritage impacts or benefits of the development proposals on that asset.
- The documents submitted have a number of conflicting statements relating to the proposals at Woodbank House and the full extent of the façade retention is not clear. Further clarity is required on the proposals for Woodbank House and similarly those of Woodbank House Stables/Outbuildings and any other remains of walled garden/glasshouses to the rear of Woodbank House. Details that explain more clearly (in

outline at least) the proposed downtakings/demolitions/extensions, the proposed final appearance of the retained structure (including window/door openings) and also details of any proprietary façade retention system and where this would be located. It is considered that a level of detail in this regard is required at this stage to be able to understand and assess the acceptability of the principle of what is being proposed (including the financial justification for the enabling housing).

- On the basis of the information submitted, the application does not appear to meet the requirements and criteria set out in LDP Historic Environment Policy 1(b) to justify substantial demolition of the remaining structure of this Category A listed building or associated buildings. Similarly there is insufficient information to justify support under Historic Environment Policy 1(c)) for the proposed extent of enabling development (20 houses) to support financing of what appears to be the substantial demolition with preservation of the east façade of Woodbank House only and conversion of part of the stables. An options appraisal is required to demonstrate why the extant structure of Woodbank House, as the principal listed building on the site, cannot be retained, reconstructed (where required) and reused to meet the aforementioned policies.
- The extent of enabling works seems excessive in relation to the works proposed to listed Woodbank House. The proposal for enabling development to secure works to Woodbank House & associated listed buildings, requires further detailed financial justification and supporting information. This is necessary in order to justify the extent of enabling development proposed (and profit return resulting from this) to overcome any resultant conservation deficit from these works. We require further financial information that provides more detail and specific breakdown of the costs (including those costs relating to the proposed demolitions) for all of the existing buildings on the site and how the returns/profit from the housing might offset the conservation cost deficit.
- Subject to the outcome of the enabling justification (i.e. what is the minimal development required to secure the long term future of the building) you should provide indicative layouts/scale of the proposed housing and the proposed visitor accommodation within the grounds of Woodbank House. The impacts of the proposed siting/layout on the setting of Woodbank House should then be assessed in more detail.

Station Square development & Hotel/Apartment/Water Park Development

Further assessment and detailing of the height and scale of existing buildings in these locations and comparison with the indicative height and scale of proposed buildings (see reference to Photomontages/cross-sections as outlined within the landscape section above) should be provided. An assessment of the potential impact that these proposals might have on the setting of nearby listed buildings, and other local cultural heritage assets (e.g. Winch House, Balloch Pier, Tullichewan Hotel and Balloch Old Station building) should be provided.

Traffic/Parking

Neither West Dunbartonshire Roads or Transport Scotland have raised any issues in relation to the proposals. We have met with representatives from WDC Roads and requested that they further confirm that the transport assessment is robust based on the proposed parameters and that the parking proposed (in relation to the proposed parameters) meets their standards. I will let you know when this further advice is received.

Paragraph 3.2.25 of the Planning Statement confirms that a total of 330 spaces will be provided across the site (excluding Woodbank House) – this is 97 net additional spaces discounting the existing 233 spaces that currently exist at Balloch Pier and the Old Station. Please confirm if the proposed provision includes the 44 displaced Park and Ride Spaces requested by WDC or consider the potential impacts of the loss of existing parking associated with the Slipway or Maid of the Loch? Can you please provide a parking plan showing the numbers of parking spaces proposed in each area and distribution across the site (to ensure that a sufficient number of parking spaces are provided in the locations it will be required to service the uses). Please also demonstrate that the areas shown for parking have capacity for the numbers proposed (to ensure

we can be satisfied that no additional parking within the site will be required).

Please give consideration and respond to the comments contained within the consultation response received from ScotRail which can be viewed on the on-line file.

Flooding

As outlined within my e-mail of 2 July 2018 SEPA has objected to the proposal and has requested further information. I understand that your consultants have been in touch with SEPA and I would be grateful if you could keep me updated of progress.

Water

As previously indicated Scottish Water has requested further information from you relating to the Pre Development Enquiry. They will not be able to provide us with a detailed consultation response until this information has been provided. I would be grateful if you could let me know when this has been submitted to Scottish Water.

Access

A number of popular paths and walking routes exist within the site. Clarification regarding public access would be helpful, particularly along the beach at the Pierhead (where no footpath seems to be proposed) and within and adjacent to the chalet sites along the Riverfront and within Drumkinnon Wood. Whilst the supporting information states that public access will be maintained it is noted that Section 6.2 of the Design Statement states that within the chalet areas "semi public access track with discrete attractive signage to discourage public access" is proposed. Can you please clarify? I note it is stated that the proposed boathouse would not impede public access to the nearby promontory, however please confirm if public access along this part of the loch shore would be maintained?

There are no details of specific improvements to pedestrian/cycle routes outwith the site. Please clarify your intentions in this regard.

As has been previously highlighted a priority outcome of the Balloch Charrette was providing a Riverside walkway along the River Leven. SEPA has indicated that some options for a walkway may be acceptable and I would welcome further discussion on this matter at our meeting.

Bats

A transect survey has been undertaken but this does not determine the trees which have bat roost potential. At this stage it will be necessary for you to identify areas of woodland that contain trees (i.e. semi-mature/mature trees) which may have bat roost potential (please note that this work is required to be carried before the end of September). At any MSC stage it would then be necessary to identify those trees to be felled and survey them for bat roost potential (and include species of bat and numbers). Please note no initial assessment or transect survey work appears to have been carried out for the area of woodland that is proposed to accommodate the staff servicing area (Area 10) and this should be covered in the work referred to above.

Cross-Boundary Issues with West Dunbartonshire Council

As outlined in my e-mail of 2 July WDC Planning has requested further information prior to considering the proposals at their Full Council. Please confirm when you intend to submit this information (please note given their timescales it is now unlikely the proposals will be presented at their August Meeting).

Phasing

It would be helpful at this stage to have an idea of your proposed phasing (including any infrastructure delivery).

Section 75

We are currently considering the scope of any potential legal agreement. As advised at the preapplication stage, clarity on your proposed approach to any developers contributions would be preferable (including any intentions to support/contribute funds for a co-ordinated approach with other partners in relation to Station square Public realm improvements). As previously advised there is an expectation that your client will pay our solicitors expenses in relation to any Section 75 Agreement and independent specialist advice considered necessary to assess the proposals (i.e. we may require an appraisal of the financial information submitted to justify the enabling the development). You requested to discuss this at our next meeting.

Processing Agreement

On receipt of the above information, re-consultation and advertisement of the proposals will be necessary. We can discuss likely timescales and the updating of the Processing Agreement at our meeting. With regards to the additional information provided please provide 3 hard copies and confirm the cost of obtaining copies (required for the public advert).

Land Ownership

As previously advised part of the application site at the Slipway is within the ownership of the National Park. Can you please send me an updated Land Ownership Certificate as well as notifying Emma Yendell our Estates Manager of the proposal.

I look forward to discussing the above at our meeting of the 13th August. Please note that following our initial discussions there may be requests for additional information.

Yours sincerely

Vivien Emery **Development Management Planner**

Tel: 01389 722619

Email: vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org