



Appendix Two: Draft Callander South Masterplan Framework Consultation January-February 2023

Copy of Verbatim Responses (for all respondents that agreed that responses could be published)

Agenda Item 5

Planning and Access Committee Meeting

25 September 2023

Paper for information

All respondents were asked:

- Do you agree with the contents of the updated Callander South Masterplan Planning Guidance?
- Please provide reasons and any changes you wish to see in the document.

Responses to these questions are shown below.

No.

The drummond estate field has been listed as "development opportunities.

The community has made it clear that they see this as a site for the local youth and cricket clubs and should be protected as such

No.

I think it is mostly looking very positive but can we make sure the land adjacent to Camp Place is preserved for the activities of the local cricket and football clubs. There is also a newly refurbished play park on this site with many young families living adjacent to it.

Yes.

we need the bridge linking this end of town with the schools. this will keep all traffic away from town and provide the kids with a safer route.

we would also need traffic lights to provide a safe crossing at the road around the McLaren terrace/ Robertson way area so the children can get across the road

Yes.

Agree that the priority must be the bridge over the Teith as all else hinges on this.

Would be a critical step towards the 20 Mon neighbourhood.

Clear plan.

Would require a safe crossing point to the bridge.

Some concern re. flooding potential which at times makes Teith footpath unusable.

No.

I would like say I agree, to all the proposed developments but I don't...

such as extra housing schemes has a direct impact on my house n the Mollands were I will be disrupted by the building of houses in area / zone D.

The extra houses will put pressure on incr / school capacity, roads / impact to environment building close to SSIS, wild life bats / owls in local woodlands etc.. With increased traffic loads to the south how is the old bridge going to be impacted, traffic speeds..

I'm concerned that the area is going to be a building site for the next 10years.. does the town need more houses. When the new scheme was opened in the south end last year no one has come and discussed the impact / thoughts on how it was completed. The parking of contractors in the estate, the ongoing noise of construction in a national park, the pollution of light from security lights left on during nights . Speeding lorries / children nearly getting ran over due to hGV speeding and not being able to navigate the narrow roads.. I'm concerned it's going to happen again and it's going to drive me away from the area.

Or is money better spend supported giving the farmer an incentive not to selling off their land for self commercial gain..

The traffic to the school is already very busy and at times dangerous during school hours as well as access to the leisure centre . Not one hint of a crossing points or

pedestrian walk way fro those living in local houses.. it's all about connecting people to the hub / school / leisure centre from the other side of the Town..

A foot bridge is however a requirement and will join the two area of the town together very well.. giving people the opportunity to walk to school facilities etc.

Yes.

Yes

Yes

No.

Concerns over the additional housing and the impact on current services, schools, GP, etc. also concern over a hotel when there are several already empty within the town

No.

Extra vehicular traffic caused by developments will create a pressure on flow through Bridgend and across bridge. A road bridge should be considered across the Teith at Lagrannoch instead of the proposed pedestrian access .

Yes.

New bridge access would benefit the town

Yes

Yes

Yes

No.

There is no need for investment in changing a 25 minute walk into a 20 minute for a minority of Callander.

Promoting wellbeing and 'active transport' doesn't agree with this. More importantly there is money available that should be spent on upgrading the existing pathways and ensuring these are accessible and also in line with what is to be expected from a national park and tourist town.

As opposed to developing new land and bridges, invest in maintenance and true upgrade of those which exist.

The inaccessible pathway through the McLaren campus should have investment to be accessible and this will also tick the 20 minute neighborhood goal. This being on private land can still take investment from the council to either buy the land or upgrade the pathway. At the very least for court and legal fees to hold the landowner accountable for maintaining the land through the national park to accessibility and general upkeep standards (as they do to hold property owners responsible for things such as hedge height).

Yes.

Would be nice to see this actually being put in to action rather than just another consultation

Yes.

Clearer plans and timescales for the new primary school, playing fields and more 3g/4g pitches to allow all weather sports and avoiding flooded muddy fields.

Yes.

Supermarket - will additional housing the small coop and Tesco express will not be big enough to support the growing number of people in Callander. Public transport is not reliable.

Yes

No.

I strongly oppose the proposed industrial development zone on the Drummond Estate field next to the existing small playing fields in Camp Place.

This is one of the only recreational areas in the town and so should be utilised for sports and leisure activities such as football, rugby and other fitness pursuits.

There is nowhere else in Callander suitable for this so urbanising this land would be damaging for the town.

A development of an industrial area here would also harm the amenity of residents in Camp Place and Willoughby Place who did not sign up for a home backing onto an industrial estate when they moved in.

An industrial area would be better placed closer to the A84 where there is direct road access.

Elsewhere, I am in favour of a new bridge over the Teith on the east side of town. However, it is important that this is for pedestrians only because Geisher Road is not a suitable road for through traffic. It is too narrow for the volume of vehicles that would use it if the bridge was to be for vehicles.

Also, the bridge should be built regardless of any development on the south side of the Teith. This is a facility that is already needed so it should not be conditional on new housing.

Yes.

Yes, I am particularly strongly in agreement that the additional pedestrian bridge should be build

Yes.

I am strongly in favour of the new footbridge crossing and additional footpath routes along the south side of the Teith.

No.

Only one small area of concern. The sheet with plan titled 'Interface with flood plain', gives no suggestion of flooding within the Churchfields site, when in reality the low areas within this field is a ancient branch off the main river, rejoining further down. There is an subterranean stream still following this same route. (It runs a long the foot of my garden)

On any day, large pools of water lie in this field. These pools will expand and increase with rainfall and there are apparent changes when the Teith is in full slate.

While I have no objections to building homes within this allocated area, it contradicts the statement that no building would be considered in areas of flooding. It gave the unfortunate impression that leaving an area of flood water (or even standing water)out of the flood plan was perhaps a convenience.

Yes

Yes

| |
|--|
| Yes |
| Yes |
| Yes |
| Yes. The safe journey to school and connecting the upper part of Callander to the other side of the river is important and would provide a great opportunity to reduce traffic in the area and connect the town as a whole. |
| Yes. A community space, or village hall would be beneficial, if this is not already considered within the brackets of mixed use, and community growing. |
| Yes |
| Yes. A new primary school and playing fields are proposed (plot A). SportsScotland would be happy to provide any design guidance or feedback on proposals. |
| Yes. I would like the plan to be better connected in with the surrounding environment. For example, upgrades to "The Creep" path should be undertaken in conjunction with consideration of the connectivity to Coilhallan Woods - the existing entrance is at a dangerous road crossing point. Path 12 should extend out to the recently completed quarry workings ponds which should be developed as a wildlife watching facility, and ultimately linked to the Balvalachlan cemetery and the Deanston Road. I would like to see analysis of the impact that the master plan may have on existing infrastructure. For example, the expected additional traffic using the A81 / B822 via Thornhill to connect to Stirling and the motorway network. There is a private water main along the West side of the A81 supplying the properties along the road. Impact on telecoms connections, schools, doctors, etc |
| No. |

The draft Planning Guidance has taken on board Transport Scotland's previous comments. However, it is recommended on page 29 where a Traffic Assessment is mentioned, that this should be changed to Transport Assessment.

No.

While its is a good intention to improve non-vehicular access across Callander, not all paths should be wide, surfaced routes for all-ability access. Less developed, quiet pedestrian footpaths should be included where it is safe to walk without having to look out for bicycles. If a major intention is to get children safely to school then that does not need full spec cycle tracks to continue beyond that.

I disagree specifically with the planned route 11 along the river. This is proposed to be primary but I would request that is should be downgraded to at most secondary, preferably tertiary at least beyond route 5 to the High School. It should be narrower than 3m to retain its current characteristic of a lovely, quiet walk along the river. It should not have permanent lighting all along the river bank which will cause disturbance to many wildlife species, especially where it needs to be raised to avoid flooding. This stretch of the river currently provides a vital quiet area where wildlife and people can escape from other very public parts of the river with disturbance from people, dogs and traffic.

The river is a vital wildlife route for many species:

- it is an SAC primarily for sea, brook and river lamprey in secondarily for Atlantic salmon for which there are important spawning sites
- there are nest sites of dipper and kingfisher along the affected bank, the latter being Protected by Special Penalties year-round.
- on the river are breeding mallard and moorhen which are on the amber list along with wintering goldeneye which have protection.
- in trees along the current meadows are many small woodland birds including tree creepers which are protected.
- protected common and soprano pipistrelle plus daubenton's bats feed along the river and may well roost in old trees close to the river
- Strictly Protected otters are frequently seen along that stretch of river with beavers becoming increasingly obvious.

The inclusion of a community growing area is good but the area is very small, looking more like a very attractive space just for people living on its doorstep rather than serving Callander as sought by the Allotment Group

Generally, many excellent guidelines on building styles and landscaping have been included but there is room for more planting of trees and shrubs for green corridors and screening eg Plot D has planting for screening to the south and west

but more should be included as a buffer zone between the development and existing houses on the neighbouring Mollands estate. Water management is included but consideration should also be given to inclusion of permanent ponds to support the rapid declining local amphibian numbers. Also wildflower planting and its management. Housing should give consideration to inclusion of nest boxes for bats and birds at the building stage, fencing should allow wildlife corridors eg by use of hedges rather than fences and holes left at the bottom of fences eg for hedgehogs. Any planting must use native species, grown in the UK, not imported with the risk of bringing in plant diseases. Good inclusion of signage needs to be supported by maps, either paper or on-line to give the overall route - beneficial to both residents and visitors. Car Parking to access these paths also needs to be considered, especially for a potential increased number of visitors. Also control of the inevitable litter along paths, including dog poo, needs good coverage of bins which are emptied at frequent intervals.

Yes.

A long needed bridge would be beneficial for schoolchildren giving them a much healthier walk to school avoiding fumes from passing traffic. It would also enhance visitor experiences, letting them see more of Callander without the necessity of doubling back. It would also help people from the Mollands area to reach the South Callander area. Importantly, it would be a much shorter and safer journey for children from the southern of Callander to reach the town.

Yes.

Since the plan prioritise walking/cycling for commuting, it would be good to ensure a safe space for the bicycles that could be locked / sheltered to protect the bicycles from the elements and theft as not all residents will have the private space for that. Also bicycle infrastructure along the way of the route eg. space to lock it as you would not want to lock bicycles on random poles, fences etc.

No.

Community Growing Space

It is good to see that space has been allocated for community food growing in the Callander South Master Plan and good that the site appears to have vehicular access, which we consider an essential requirement.

However we are concerned that the space allocated is sufficient in size, or has a high enough designated priority placed on it.

Background

There is currently no provision for food growing space in Callander and the Callander Local Place Plan 22-32 recommends allocating two hectares of land for community allotments. There is currently a waiting list of over 30 names, who have

expressed interest in wanting to have an allotment in Callander. Callander has been without allotments for a very long time. Stirling Council has a Food Strategy which requires it to support food growing where there is an identified need, as is clearly the case here. There are duties regarding this under part 9, section 119 of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015. The National Park has a commitment to tackling the climate emergency and states that it will "Embed Mission Zero thinking and action across the whole organisation". Being able to grow food locally is a very important part of reducing our community's carbon footprint and so any master planning for future communities should adequately incorporate this aspect. Local food growing areas forms part of the "20 minute neighbourhood" planning philosophy. Currently Callander's nearest allotments are in Doune.

The changes requested:-

Given that there is no current provision in Callander and this master plan is creating more dwellings, the following changes are recommended:

1. The area allocated should be at least 2 hectares and preferably more, given existing pressures and have vehicular access.
2. The Shared Infrastructure Funding for the provision of a community food growing area, should be contributed to by Housing areas D and E in addition to the Mixed Use area C. The reason for this is because there is a direct correlation of need: the new housing areas will create further need for food growing increasing existing pressures and waiting lists.
3. The Shared Infrastructure Funding priority for community food growing be raised much higher than "5" given the above concerns and priority given to it in the Callander South Master Plan. Town folk have been asking for allotments for a very long time. Best practice planning calls for more local food production and falls within the ethos of the "20 minute neighbourhood".

On page 50, it would be good to see reference made to design standards for community food growing, given the statutory requirement to provide such spaces part 9, section 119 of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015. There is potential for Plot D to unlock land for allotments behind (or west of) the existing Mollands estate by providing vehicular access to it. Currently this site cannot be used for allotments as there is no vehicular access onto the land.

Yes.

The footbridge across the river is essential to this development. The school plans should be futureproofed to ensure it's has room to grow Concerned about how the development might affect existing medical services etc

Yes

Yes.

I support a balanced development - this was a major outcome of the Charrette, to support development for the future of the town and maintain a vibrant community.

The area should be a good mix of community and visitor facilities with enhancement of the natural environment - signage and information boards will be essential.

The area should have extensive natural flood management and sustainable drainage features e.g. permeable drives, soakaway verges, roof water butts and the existing surface water features (drains) should be restored to semi-natural watercourses.

I would like to see the area extended to the south so that a community outdoor events area could be included.

We looked at this previously and there is an area which could be considered. The events could include the annual Highland Games, motor bike rally, fairs, motor home parking. It should have a circle of hard standing with electric charging points.

I support the footbridge over the Teith and the upgrade of the existing footbridge - one other good reason for these bridges is safe routes to school.

Not directly related to the Callander South area but the new Primary School will be located in this area so a plan is needed for the current Primary School building so that the Callander South development does not leave abandoned buildings in other parts of the town. The proposed path/cycle track network with links to surrounding paths should be discussed with the community in more detail. It is usually members of the community who know what paths are the most important , where seats are needed and how links should be made. The paths and cycle ways should also consider security so appropriate lighting and avoiding dark areas. The maps e.g. should show areas of peat and explain what is "community growing space". Building design should include colour so that they are not all white and should include local puddingstone for walls and slate for roofs.

No.

Please provide reasons and any changes you wish to see in the document.

1) I fully support the premise that the installation of a new footbridge across the Teith near the Lagrannoch industrial estate **MUST** be achieved **BEFORE** any of the other developments are allowed to proceed (Priority 10). The location of the bridge will need to respond to technical surveys and design considerations **BUT** the bridge should be closer to the esker on the north side of the river and, thus, closer to the school on the south side of the river. This implicates a number of the following issues.

2) Although not directly part of the CSM - the plot of land identified on page 16 as ED1 MUST be designated as recreation ground within the Local Development Plan (also managed by LLTNPA) which has been called for in a number of the Charrette/CAP documents and our LPP. This land has been identified to be purchased by the Football and Cricket clubs and will allow the footways from Geisher Road and Camp Place to link to the new bridge and thus across to the school. ED1 cannot be left designated as commercial use. The new bridge cannot link through the untidy and dangerous Lagrannoch industrial estate (including the busy Council Depot and Fire Station with its emergency vehicle movements) as our children should be kept safely away from these premises and dangerous vehicle movements.

3) At pages 33 to 38 you identify the priority importance for completing the pedestrian and vehicular accesses into the new development plots. You correctly identify that the footways connecting to and from the new bridge are essentially as high a priority as the bridge itself and we concur. There is however no acceptance that Plot B should be designated for Hotel / Visitor Attraction / commercial use given that the new footways to the bridge and school will pass through this Plot. I suggest that any Hotels etc should be encouraged within Plot C mixed use development.

(3.1) Plot B should effectively be merged with Plot A to provide space for recreation, playing fields, new Primary school / nursery, multi-function space managed by the McLaren Leisure Centre for clubs and events such as Highland Games and Charity fund raisers.

(3.2) You correctly identify that any further Plot development must be predicated upon the extension of Hamish Menzies Drive as a spine access road down towards the river (linking to the new footbridge). This spine road should be used to also extend access through Plots A and B to the new Primary school and also into Plot E (see notes below). This will allow enhanced and safer access for parking at the new recreational facilities and school where staff and disabled access and parking is required.

4) The proposed access to Plot E from a new junction / mini-roundabout at the south west corner of Plot E is wholly inappropriate. The road and footpath at that location (including the junction onto the 'Creep') is too narrow and already dangerous for pedestrians and vehicles alike. As proposed above, the access to Plot E should be through Plots B and A. Not permitting a junction at the south west corner of Plot E will also further enables the introduction of a new safe pedestrian access to the new Primary school and McLaren High from this location and running along the boundary between Plot E and the High school (on land not currently in the ownership of the Plot E Landowner).

5) To be correct, the Plot C shown within the Masterplan should exclude the already developed area of housing managed by the Rural Stirling Housing Association and the ground between it and the Leisure Centre which is a SSSI and therefore not for Development.

No.

The Callander Community Development Trust and the Callander Community Council have been leading the development of the Callander Local Place Plan, including public consultation, through the appointed (and funded) Town Coordinator as a further development of the previous Community Action Plans and the Charrette of 2011. The Callander South Masterplan, in its currently proposed form, does not fully incorporate the requirements of these parallel documents. This questionnaire response from the Callander Community Development Trust identifies these elements that need to be corrected or included within the proposed Callander South Masterplan.

1) CCDT fully supports the premise that the installation of a new footbridge across the Teith near the Lagrannoch industrial estate MUST be achieved BEFORE any of the other developments are allowed to proceed (Priority 10). How is the bridge and approach routes to be funded? The location of the bridge will need to respond to technical surveys and design considerations BUT the bridge should be closer to the esker on the north side of the river and, thus, closer to the school on the south side of the river. This implicates a number of the following issues.

2) Although not directly part of the CSM - the plot of land identified on page 16 as ED1 MUST be designated as recreation ground within the Local Development Plan (also managed by LLTNPA) which has been called for in a number of the Charrette/CAP documents. This land has been identified to be purchased by the Football and Cricket clubs and will allow the footways from Geisher Road and Camp Place to link to the new bridge and thus across to the school. ED1 cannot be left designated as commercial use. The new bridge cannot link through the untidy and dangerous Lagrannoch industrial estate (including the busy Council Depot and Fire Station with its emergency vehicle movements) as our children should be kept safely away from these premises and dangerous vehicle movements.

3) At pages 33 to 38 you identify the priority importances for completing the pedestrian and vehicular accesses into the new development plots. You correctly identify that the footways connecting to and from the new bridge are essentially as high a priority as the bridge itself and we concur. There is however no acceptance from CCDT that Plot B should be designated for Hotel / Visitor Attraction / commercial use given that the new footways to the bridge and school will pass through this Plot. We suggest that any Hotels etc should be encouraged within Plot C mixed use development.

(3.1) Plot B should effectively be merged with Plot A to provide space for recreation, playing fields, new Primary school / nursery, multi-function space managed by the McLaren Leisure Centre for clubs and events such as Highland Games and Charity fund raisers.

(3.2) You correctly identify that any further Plot development must be predicated upon the extension of Hamish Menzies Drive as a spine access road down towards the river (linking to the new footbridge). This spine road should be used to also extend access through Plots A and B to the new Primary school and also into

Plot E (see notes below). This will allow enhanced and safer access for parking at the new recreational facilities and school where staff and disabled access and parking is required.

4) The proposed access to Plot E from a new junction / mini-roundabout at the south west corner of Plot E is wholly inappropriate. The road and footpath at that location (including the junction onto the 'Creep') is too narrow and already dangerous for pedestrians and vehicles alike. As proposed above, the access to Plot E should be through Plots B and A. Not permitting a junction at the south west corner of Plot E will also further enables the introduction of a new safe pedestrian access to the new Primary school and McLaren High from this location and running along the boundary between Plot E and the High school (on land not currently in the ownership of the Plot E Landowner).

5) To be correct, the Plot C shown within the Masterplan should exclude the already developed area of housing managed by the Rural Stirling Housing Association and the ground between it and the Leisure Centre which is a SSSI and therefore not for Development.

- We should require further consultation after we get the SC and LL&TTNP format responses to our LPP submission.
- The drop-in sessions in the Library may not be sufficient to gain wide enough local understanding of the importance of this consultation. We should require that the feedback from these sessions is published within a month for public consideration.
- There is a lack of strategic detail in the plan:
 - o No indication of how gas, water, electricity and sewerage services will be supplied.
 - o There are no target dates for development proposals.
 - o What will be the requirements for accessibility and inclusiveness?
 - o How will the development contribute to Net Zero aspirations?
 - o What design and space standards will new housing have to achieve? Particularly in speculative developments.
- The document refers to the '20-minute town' target and includes a new bridge so it must be considered a masterplan for all of Callander.
- From a climate change viewpoint, including how it would help meet the National Park's stated goal of net zero by 2030, (<https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/park-authority/publications/mission-zero/>) we do not believe the standards will be met by this outline as it lacks any real detail relating to climate change and its impact. We would expect a more fully formed plan which would contain strategies for energy and future infrastructure needs, flooding, woodland management, biodiversity etc. which would then dictate the more detailed use of the Callander South land. It is not clear to where the National Park will assign the carbon impact of any major development, if it is included as one of the developer's responsibilities, then that seems to be avoiding the statutory authorities own responsibilities.

No.

The Callander Community Development Trust and the Callander Community Council have been leading the development of the Callander Local Place Plan, including public consultation, through the appointed (and funded) Town Coordinator as a further development of the previous Community Action Plans and

the Charrette of 2011. The Callander South Masterplan, in its currently proposed form, does not fully incorporate the requirements of these parallel documents. This questionnaire response identifies these elements that need to be corrected or included within the proposed Callander South Masterplan.

1) I fully support the premise that the installation of a new footbridge across the Teith near the Lagrannoch industrial estate MUST be achieved BEFORE any of the other developments are allowed to proceed (Priority 10). How is the bridge and approach routes to be funded? The location of the bridge will need to respond to technical surveys and design considerations BUT the bridge should be closer to the esker on the north side of the river and, thus, closer to the school on the south side of the river. This implicates a number of the following issues.

2) Although not directly part of the CSM - the plot of land identified on page 16 as ED1 MUST be designated as recreation ground within the Local Development Plan (also managed by LLTNPA) which has been called for in a number of the Charrette/CAP documents. This land has been identified to be purchased by the Football and Cricket clubs and will allow the footways from Geisher Road and Camp Place to link to the new bridge and thus across to the school. ED1 cannot be left designated as commercial use. The new bridge cannot link through the untidy and dangerous Lagrannoch industrial estate (including the busy Council Depot and Fire Station with its emergency vehicle movements) as our children should be kept safely away from these premises and dangerous vehicle movements.

3) At pages 33 to 38 you identify the priority importances for completing the pedestrian and vehicular accesses into the new development plots. You correctly identify that the footways connecting to and from the new bridge are essentially as high a priority as the bridge itself and we concur. I do not accept that Plot B should be designated for Hotel / Visitor Attraction / commercial use given that the new footways to the bridge and school will pass through this Plot. I suggest that any Hotels etc should be encouraged within Plot C mixed use development.

(3.1) Plot B should effectively be merged with Plot A to provide space for recreation, playing fields, new Primary school / nursery, multi-function space managed by the McLaren Leisure Centre for clubs and events such as Highland Games and Charity fund raisers.

(3.2) You correctly identify that any further Plot development must be predicated upon the extension of Hamish Menzies Drive as a spine access road down towards the river (linking to the new footbridge). This spine road should be used to also extend access through Plots A and B to the new Primary school and also into Plot E (see notes below). This will allow enhanced and safer access for parking at the new recreational facilities and school where staff and disabled access and parking is required.

4) The proposed access to Plot E from a new junction / mini-roundabout at the south west corner of Plot E is wholly inappropriate. The road and footpath at that location (including the junction onto the 'Creep') is too narrow and already dangerous for pedestrians and vehicles alike. As proposed above, the access to

Plot E should be through Plots B and A. Not permitting a junction at the south west corner of Plot E will also further enable the introduction of a new safe pedestrian access to the new Primary school and McLaren High from this location and running along the boundary between Plot E and the High school (on land not currently in the ownership of the Plot E Landowner).

5) To be correct, the Plot C shown within the Masterplan should exclude the already developed area of housing managed by the Rural Stirling Housing Association and the ground between it and the Leisure Centre which is a SSSI and therefore not for Development.

- Further consultation will be required after we get the SC and LL&TTNP format responses to our LPP submission.

- The drop-in sessions in the Library may not be sufficient to gain wide enough local understanding of the importance of this consultation. Feedback will be required from these sessions to be published within a month for public consideration.

- There is a lack of strategic detail in the plan:

- o No indication of how gas, water, electricity and sewerage services will be supplied.

- o There are no target dates for development proposals.

- o What will be the requirements for accessibility and inclusiveness?

- o How will the development contribute to Net Zero aspirations?

- o What design and space standards will new housing have to achieve? Particularly in speculative developments.

- The document refers to the '20-minute town' target and includes a new bridge so it must be considered a masterplan for all of Callander.

- From a climate change viewpoint, including how it would help meet the National Park's stated goal of net zero by 2030, (<https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/park-authority/publications/mission-zero/>) I do not believe the standards will be met by this outline as it lacks any real detail relating to climate change and its impact. I would expect a more fully formed plan which would contain strategies for energy and future infrastructure needs, flooding, woodland management, biodiversity etc. which would then dictate the more detailed use of the Callander South land. It is not clear to where the National Park will assign the carbon impact of any major development. If it is included as one of the developer's responsibilities, then that seems to be avoiding the statutory authorities own responsibilities.

No.

I do agree with the new bridge and proposed & upgraded shared use paths, these will become ESSENTIAL when the new primary school is built.

I also agree that the existing footbridge is a key transport corridor and it should be upgraded to make room for walkers, cyclists, buggies and wheelchairs with lighting installed.

I have a number of points to make which explain why I have chosen to select No to the question 'Do I agree with the contents of the guidance':

1. The new primary school will only have capacity for the current school role. There is therefore no justification for building new houses when the school cannot accommodate more families.

2. The town Waste Water Treatment system is at capacity and it already struggles during times of heavy rain

3. Residents will endure significant noise, traffic and disruption from any new house building developments.

The new south road bridge (as was identified in the 2011 Charrette and subsequent Community Action Plan 2017-2022) might have alleviated this but instead all traffic will be using the existing roads and Bridgend while we are still in the unacceptable situation that there is still no pedestrian crossing at the high school - it is not safe! At least two pedestrian crossings from Mollands and the proposed new housing across to the Leisure Centre and school campus is essential. This is not even mentioned in the 'Improving Connectivity' chapter on P17 of the document.

4. The rationale behind the change of policy from road bridge to cycle/pedestrian bridge was explained to me at the meeting (I think it is disingenuous not to explain this in the document). If you want local people - families, women, children, older people - to use the new bridge to access the nursery/school campus and leisure facilities then it has to be safe and pleasant. These plans do not say enough about addressing this. The Geisher road end of the proposed bridge is an unpleasant area of industrial units, recycling depot, this land use needs to be addressed and the environment made safe with lighting, landscaping and walking & wheelable paths from the A84, existing cycle paths, and surrounding housing in the Bellway, Vorlich Crescent, Camp Place, Lagrannoch and Glen Gardens. Links from the other side of the new bridge also need to be accessible, safe, well lit with resting points and go to where people need/want to go.

5. Does Callander really need more housing? Times have changed and land would be better used for energy production - solar, ground source heat to supply the McLaren Campus - and growing food.

6. On growing food - It is good to see that space has been allocated for community food growing in the Callander South Master Plan and that the site appears to have

vehicular access, which is an essential requirement. However I am concerned that the space allocated is sufficient in size, and does not have a high enough designated priority placed on it.

There is currently no provision for food growing space in Callander and the Callander Local Place Plan 22-32 recommends allocating two hectares of land for community allotments. There is currently a waiting list of over 30 names, who have expressed interest in wanting to have an allotment in Callander. Callander has been without allotments for a very long time. Stirling Council has a Food Strategy which requires it to support food growing where there is an identified need, as is clearly the case here. There are duties regarding this under part 9, section 119 of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015. The National Park has a commitment to tackling the climate emergency and states that it will "Embed Mission Zero thinking and action across the whole organisation". Being able to grow food locally is a very important part of reducing our community's carbon footprint and so any master planning for future communities should adequately incorporate this aspect. Local food growing areas forms part of the "20 minute neighbourhood" planning philosophy. Currently Callander's nearest allotments are in Doune.

Given that there is no current provision in Callander and this master plan proposes creating more dwellings, the following changes are recommended:

1. The area allocated should be at least 2 hectares and preferably more, given existing pressures and have vehicular access.
2. The Shared Infrastructure Funding for the provision of a community food growing area, should be contributed to by Housing areas D and E in addition to the Mixed Use area C. The reason for this is because there is a direct correlation of need: the new housing areas will create further need for food growing increasing existing pressures and waiting lists.
3. The Shared Infrastructure Funding priority for community food growing be raised much higher than "5" given the above concerns and priority given to it in the Callander South Master Plan. Local people have been asking for allotments for a very long time. Best practice planning calls for more local food production and falls within the ethos of the "20 minute neighbourhood".

On page 50, it would be good to see reference made to design standards for community food growing, given the statutory requirement to provide such spaces part 9, section 119 of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015.

There is potential for Plot D to unlock land for allotments behind (or west of) the existing Mollands estate by providing vehicular access to it. Currently this site cannot be used for allotments as there is no vehicular access onto the land.

Yes.

ScotWays welcomes the Guidance's emphasis on the development of a 20-minute neighbourhood within the village and its commitment to the provision of new and upgraded active travel bridges over the River Teith, as well as its proposals for the creation of new, and the upgrading of existing, paths within and adjacent to the H3 and MU2 sites to form a sustainable active travel network. The proposals will safeguard and improve existing recorded rights of way CS239, CS240, CS241 and CS247

No.

The Mollands housing estate should not be further extended onto land currently used for agriculture, especially on elevated sites, as I think this will damage a beautiful landscape and environment.

If this is unavoidable, then the areas marked for residential use should be the absolute limit of urban encroachment into this area, and the adjacent field should be designated key green space.

No.

I do not feel the Master Plan takes sufficient regard of the climate emergency and Scotland's ambition to be a net zero nation. I would like the masterplan to have a measurable carbon metric: to be net zero or at the very least carbon neutral. I would recommend this be supported by an energy masterplan that includes opportunities for community energy generation.

No.

Priority 5 for the community allotments lacks urgency.

From a personal point of view, I live in a flat with my partner and two very young daughters. We do have access to a small communal garden. However I would love the girls to be able to enjoy meaningful garden and food growing experiences in their early years, and can't see this happening if the priority level is so-so.

We moved from Glasgow over 5 years ago, where community allotments were scattered all over the place. I am surprised, and disappointed for my girls, that Callander still lacks this.

We would love to see an enhanced commitment to the allotments by local government planners so that these green spaces can be enjoyed by all. With financial pressures facing many, the dream of owning even a small home with a modest garden is becoming ever elusive. These allotment spaces are now more important than ever.

No.

The Scottish Government declared a climate emergency in 2019 and has set an ambition to be a net zero nation by 2045. The Callander South Masterplan should exemplify its commitment to addressing the twin crises of the global climate emergency and biodiversity loss. Time is of the essence to take action through any opportunity that arises, including this masterplan.

As an architect, I would advocate for a commitment for the CSM masterplan to be carbon neutral and nature positive by introducing measurable commitments and more substantial ambitions. To support the above commentary, we would request that the following revisions be considered;

1. Review Plot use designation to include evidence/demand assessment.
2. Review infrastructure & phasing to align with NPF4 Policy 2 and 18.
3. Review 'Working with Flood Plain' to better align with NPF4 Policy 2, 3 & 22 and make reference to supporting studies e.g. Forth Local Flood Risk Management Plan, Callander Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
4. Review location and scale of community growing space (incl. allotments) referencing NPF4 Policy 15.
5. Make design guidance more robust, particularly on housing, green/blue infrastructure, sustainability & materials.
6. Provide clarification around public transport and provisions of EV charging infrastructure referencing NPF4 Policy 13.
7. Acknowledge the wider context the plan needs to respond to, particularly the area south east towards the cemetery.
8. Further key policy and best practice guidance is added/referenced.

Include provision for an energy masterplan/strategy for the entire site and wider context as is relevant, not plots in isolation to align with NPF4 Policy 11 & 19

No.

Include provision for an energy masterplan/strategy for the entire site and wider context as is relevant, not plots in isolation to align with NPF4 Policy 11 & 19.

No.

The existing link from the main town of Callander and the south of the town, is one very old bridge (1908). This single bridge does not provide sufficient resilience should damage occur from flood water or substantial maintenance/upgrading (inevitably) be required. To ensure vehicular access to school service provision a second vehicle bridge must be given consideration. This is most especially relevant given the predictable rise in regular traffic crossing as a result of

construction and the population increase to the south of the river, as detailed in the master plan.

There are no timescales detailed within the plan that ensure the necessary pedestrian access and pathways (new bridge and upgrade of the existing 'creep' path) will be in place before the opening of the new primary school. This is deemed essential infrastructure to make the commute to the new junior school safe for pedestrians and to encourage bicycle use. The plan does not give consideration to what is likely to be a substantial increase to primary school class numbers. Currently plans are in progress for a new school being built at the same capacity as the existing primary school. The existing primary school has no additional capacity. It is unclear how future school provision will be delivered to families within the planned new estate housing.

No.

Climate Action Callander

Consultation Response - Callander South Masterplan

Background

The Scottish Government declared a climate emergency in 2019 and has set an ambition to be a net zero nation by 2045. The Callander South Masterplan (CSM) should exemplify its commitment to addressing the twin crises of the global climate emergency and biodiversity loss. Time is of the essence to take action through any opportunity that arises, including this masterplan.

Climate Action Callander (CAC) is a group that has been formed to support the community of Callander to respond to the climate emergency and become more resilient. We aim to support and promote individual and collaborative opportunities for taking climate action working alongside the recently published Local Place Plan.

CAC Position & Response

We advocate that any future development, including this masterplan guidance, should rigorously commit to addressing the twin crises of the global climate emergency and biodiversity loss. There is potential for the CSM to positively contribute to Callander transitioning to a climate-conscious, ready and resilient place. However, we feel that the current draft proposal and guidance does not sufficiently set out a strong commitment to addressing these current and future challenges.

We are disheartened by the masterplan's lack of ambition and robustness given LLTNP's desire to "play a crucial role" and "lead by example" in addressing the above challenges. Whilst we welcome elements of the draft that help to address climate change and the 20-minute neighbourhood concept (e.g. active travel, new bridge infrastructure) we believe that commitments and ambitions need

to be raised further. The recent adoption of the National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) emphasises this need further particularly with reference to addressing NPF4 Policies 1 & 2.

Additionally, at a local level, Loch Lomond & Trossachs National Park National Park Partnership Plan 2018 -23 commits to a range of outcomes and priorities for action, which are not adequately considered or cross referenced in this guidance. Future development in Callander needs to clearly demonstrate support for the priority actions set out and also be shaped by the forthcoming revised iteration of this. Three examples of priorities we feel that should be particularly emphasised from the current plan (2018-2023) include:

- Priority 3.1 Climate Change
- Priority 10.3 Improved Resilience
- Priority 11. 1 Low Carbon economy

We do not feel that these have been adequately addressed and therefore would deem it not to be in alignment with the overarching vision set out in the Partnership Plan. We expect to see measurable targets and commitments defined to ensure responsible development which contributes positively across a range of criteria.

We do not believe this masterplan in its current form is adequately robust to address the challenges outlined above. We would recommend that revisions are made to the CSM to ensure the coordination and delivery of development achieves NPF4's ambition for creating a sustainable places.

CAC revision requests

Underpinning all other recommendations is advocating for a commitment for the CSM masterplan to be net zero (in line with Scottish Government commitments) or at the very least carbon neutral and also nature positive by introducing measurable commitments and more substantial ambitions. To support the above commentary, we would request that the following revisions be considered:

1. Review Plot use designation to include evidence/demand assessment.
2. Review infrastructure & phasing to align with NPF4 Policy 2 and 18.
3. Review 'Working with Flood Plain' to better align with NPF4 Policy 2, 3 & 22 and make reference to supporting studies e.g. Forth Local Flood Risk Management Plan, Callander Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
4. Include provision for an energy masterplan/strategy for the entire site and wider context as is relevant, not plots in isolation to align with NPF4 Policy 11 & 19.
5. Review location and scale of community growing space (incl. allotments) referencing NPF4 Policy 15.

6. Make design guidance more robust, particularly on housing, green/blue infrastructure, sustainability & materials.
7. Provide clarification around public transport and provisions of EV charging infrastructure referencing NPF4 Policy 13.
8. Acknowledge the wider context the plan needs to respond to, particularly the area southeast towards the cemetery.
9. Further key policy and best practice guidance is added/referenced.

Further explanation in relation to each of the nine points above is noted at the end of the response below.

The above revisions and comments would support the realisation of the CSM being a 'landmark development area' and as an 'important gateway site' which is currently not supported. There is an opportunity with this masterplan guidance to be ambitious and set out a framework which fosters place-based climate action which is currently not being realised. We insist that revisions are made, to set out substantial measurable commitments and references that can strengthen CSM to support a robust place-based response that embodies climate action.

Further information

1. Review Plot Use Designation

a. Before the commencement of any development, an assessment of the demand/need should be undertaken with justification of the numbers and types of housing and other buildings. We would welcome an approach which aligns with circular economy principles to support a refuse, reduce, reuse and recycle before new. We do not want to exploit further resources and investment unnecessarily in new development when for example, it could be redirected to support the regeneration of the existing built environment.

b. We would support closer references being made to the Local Place Plan in its designation and layout in addition to recognising possible future climate adaptation opportunities for nature-based solutions such as pocket parks/community fields (e.g. Plot B)

2. Infrastructure/Phasing

a. In light of the nature crisis and the need to respond to future flood risks and extreme weather, we would advocate for a landscape-led approach to the delivery and design of any associated infrastructure/ref blue- green infrastructure etc, including careful consideration of phasing.

3. Flooding / Working with the Flood Plain

- a. For clarity, we would ask that the type of flooding referred to is made clear, e.g. river or surface water, including delineation on associated diagrams.
- b. We would request on pg. 30, which notes a strategy for "working with the floodplain" that the diagram overlays SEPA's future river flood risk (2080) prediction. Reference to the future flood risk map is a more accurate representation of the future challenge we are likely to face, and this will have a consequential impact on land use and programming of the various plots.
- c. When SEPA's future flood risk is overlaid, there are concerns about the viability of this plot for development which is further compounded by access constraints. Any future development should not contribute to any additional flood risk. We would have particular concerns with plot E.
- d. There should be a reference to the Forth Local Flood Risk Management Plan, Callander Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (MNV, 2011) and other historic reports commissioned by Stirling Council.
- e. The proposed future footbridge's design must be robust and resilient to accommodate future flood risk and the increasing frequency of extreme weather events. Consideration should also be given to procurement supporting local design and supply chains where possible and consciously consider associated embodied and operational carbon.
- f. Reference should be made to Nature Scot' Developing with Nature' Guidance
- g. Include a reference should be made to Scottish Government's Water-resilient places - surface water management and blue-green infrastructure: policy framework. In particular recommendation 8 which states that 'a requirement for all sites/development proposals to be assessed and report on how they will contribute positively to the climate emergency and water resilience'.

4. Energy Network/Strategy

- a. There is no reference or allocation within the masterplan to safeguarding space for on-site renewable energy generation, district heating strategy or opportunity for community-owned energy solutions. We would advocate that before the commencement of any development, a feasibility study/energy masterplan is carried out to inform future development and potential infrastructural capacity constraints.
- b. Rather than assuming a business-as-usual approach, we would request a more integrated whole-system approach, which looks for a masterplan to deliver combined solutions rather than solely individual house responses.
- c. With the masterplan including the development of a new primary school and proximity to the High School and Leisure Centre, this should be considered in any energy masterplan and reference made to any forthcoming LHEES strategy by

Stirling Council. Considering the potential around sites in proximity, such as the sewage works, may also be of benefit.

d. The above must be part of the infrastructure phasing considerations and an underpinning principle.

e. Is there potential for the siting of an energy park? For example, hilltops or raised land in Callander South facing in a southerly direction.

5. Community Growing Space (incl. Allotments)

a. The currently assigned space for the community growing area is not situated in a location which could realise the educational benefits that this could offer. We would welcome a revision of this siting within plot B to allow for future connections with the school estate and enhanced connection north of the river via the future footbridge.

b. Growing food within the local area is a significant part of reducing our community's carbon footprint and plays an important role in supporting mental health & wellbeing. . We welcome the inclusion of a community growing space; however, we would advocate for a larger dedicated space to be allocated and a review of its location within the masterplan.

c. We align with the further recommendations set out by the allotment group.

6. Amendments to Design Guidance

a. Housing - In response to NPF4 Policy 16 we strongly request a measurable commitment to the delivery of housing which is fit for the future and are designed to be resilient for both people and the planet. We would advocate that any development adopts a fabric-first approach and considers both embodied and operational carbon and also circularity in its principles, for example, greywater recycling integration.

b. SUDS/ General Green/Blue Infrastructure / Landscape - In response to NPF4 Policy 20, reference should be made to best practices and guidance for example, Scottish Governments' Water-resilient places – surface water management and blue-green infrastructure: policy framework guidance particularly Recommendation 13.

c. Sustainability - Suggest this page is renamed to 'Energy & Performance' as sustainable principles should be embedded throughout the masterplan. NPF4 strives to deliver sustainable, productive and liveable places.

Delivery of sustainable places is described as one where we reduce emissions, restore and better connect biodiversity. We do not feel sufficient measurable targets or overarching vision are included within the masterplan guidance. We need to go beyond 'encouraging'. For example, we would advocate for a

commitment to a target of a zero carbon or net positive masterplan that considers the whole lifecycle of the development.

We would welcome reference to be made from best practices elsewhere, including measurable metrics, e.g.

introduction of a biodiversity net gain commitment or that the Net Zero Public Building Standard is adopted for delivery of the new primary school.

We welcome the reference to standards such as Passive House and Platinum Building Standards; however, this also needs to be considered alongside the embodied carbon of selected materials, as Passive House does not exclude the use of materials with vast amounts of embodied carbon.

d. Materials - We would welcome stronger references to the need for careful consideration of material choice to acknowledge any embodied carbon and the associated impact on the landscape, particularly regarding future path networks and any other hard landscaping.

7. Moving Around

a. We welcome the consideration of new and improved active travel routes to encourage walk/wheel-ability to reduce reliance on car use, including the priority of the new footbridge.

b. We would request a more robust commitment and explanation concerning public transport and electric vehicle charging infrastructure for clarity of approach.

8. Wider Context

a. It would be welcomed if there could be a page/ section in recognition of the wider context that this masterplan is situated within, particularly with reference areas south towards the cemetery and quarry.

9. Additional Guidance References In addition to NPF4, now that it is adopted, we would welcome reference also being made to:

- Scottish Government 'Update to the Climate Change Plan 2018 – 2032 Securing a Green Recovery on a Path to Net Zero' underpins its approach.
- Nature Scot' Developing with Nature' Guidance
- Scottish Government's Water-resilient places - surface water management and blue-green infrastructure: policy framework
- Scottish Government 'Housing to 2040'
- The National Park Partnership Plan 2018 – 2023 and any forthcoming updates.

No.

There are some out of date details regarding the positioning of the pedestrian bridge (north side approach should be from the land next to Camp Place Play Park on Drummond Estate land). There are negotiations for the sale of the land to local sports groups which will need to be re-designated recreational land, from light industrial. The current site from the Lagrannoch Industrial Estate down Geisher Road is dangerous for numbers of pedestrians, and cyclists as it is on an emergency exit for fire engines, ambulances and medical staff. The land on Drummond Estate is in a much better position for a river crossing as it is on higher ground and the river is narrower than the current proposed site

There should be a hierarchy into other National Park plans, so one can see the overall strategy with regard to planning for climate change, resilience, improved energy and heat efficiency, infrastructure and biodiversity. Currently there is no specific reference to any standards to be adopted. Further detailed plans for each of these strategies in relation to the specific Callander South area covered by the CSMP must be forthcoming. Infrastructure improvements need to be holistic not on an application by application basis, so this needs to be clearly spelt out. Also there is little about inclusion of consideration to people with accessible needs. Whilst the pedestrian bridge will provide a better access to the medical centre and the east end of town for those in wheelchairs, the access to the west end through Bridgend is still very poor, as the pavement down to the bottom of the A81 where it meets the Invertrossachs roundabout is too narrow for a wheelchair and the wall leans outwards, further reducing the pavement width. People with buggies are also similarly disadvantaged and it is a busy road. There is no path on the other side, so people are forced to take to the road in some cases, which means any access road off that area into the school campus makes it even more dangerous for this group of pavement users. Bridgend itself and the bridge is also not wheelchair friendly. Given some of the houses for Rural Stirling have been designed for wheelchair users, the A81 pavements are unacceptable and need to be addressed.

No.

Please provide reasons and any changes you wish to see in the document.

1. Access to the new footbridge should not be through an industrial estate - this is dangerous, especially for children walking /cycling to school. The bridge should be built BEFORE any other developments are considered on the south side.
2. Land on the north of the river should be recreational, not light industrial - this land should be used by the schools and sports club as additional recreational space.

3. Infrastructure of Callander including medical, dental, sewerage and primary school numbers are already at breaking point - no new housing developments should be considered until this has been addressed.

No.

1 access to new bridge through industrial estate would lead to a danger for children and problems to industrial units.

Redirect through adjacent fields

2 Land north of the river has for many years been identified as recreational following requests from cricket and football.

Redesignate recreational.

3. Infrastructure of callander inadequate for new housing developments.

Medical , dental, primary school sewerage services all unable to cope with present housing numbers. No further expansion until infrastructure investment / development complete and in place.

Yes.

I agree it n principal with the contents of the CSMP. I support the site of the new footbridge away from Geisher Road, as this is used by emergency vehicles and should not encourage heavy pedestrian traffic on Geisher Road.