

Strathblane Community Council

Local Development Plan

Main Issues Report Comments

Stirling Council has requested comments on 6 aspects of their Main Issues Report (MIR). The Local Development Plan (LDP) will establish the land use for our villages for the next 20 years and will be available for comments in spring 2011. Comments on the Main Issues Report will inform the Local Development Plan. Below are the comments from Strathblane Community Council. Residents are encouraged to make their own comments as well.

Extracts from the MIR are included to aid understanding of the comments made.

The community council comments are indented between vertical lines like this.

1. Vision and key objectives

This section covers what the Stirling area will be like 20 years into the future. For the villages it says:

- Small infill or peripheral housing developments
- In a few locations, more substantial new housing and new primary schools, and an improved physical/regenerated village centres.
- More local business, tourism.etc premises.
- Some local renewable power generation such as communal biofuel boilers
- Local waste management and recycling sites
- Local food production-more allotments, community orchards etc.

We have a very clear view from the public that most wish the villages of Strathblane, Blanefield, Mugdock and Carbeth to stay the same as they are. We recognise that being on the periphery of the Stirling area we will not be an area with substantial new housing. We do however recognise the importance of being a mixed community and allowing small growth for smaller affordable houses for local people at either end of the age spectrum. Our preference is to contain that within the village envelope wherever possible. Small infill sites are preferable to releasing land from the green belt. We also wish to ensure that, if sites/buildings become available over the years careful consideration is given to the use of those sites to ensure the sustainability of our area. E.g. 2 business premises have been lost from the village when they were converted to housing.

We strongly agree with paragraph 5 on page 13 about the promotion of a strong sense of place.

“The benefits of good ‘place-making’ are many and varied. A good ‘place’ is a neighbourhood, village, town, or city that people want to live in, because they like its distinctive identity and find it welcoming, safe, easy to move around in, and adaptable to their needs. There is also added value in terms of reducing the long-

term costs of energy, maintenance and management, and achieving social, economic, health, and environmental goals.”

“The LDP will consider whether the commitment to good place-making and quality design and their expected social, economic and environmental benefits (helping to meet the Council’s wider aspirations outlined in the SOA) should in places override the more statistical approach to housing and other land use ‘needs’.”

We think that good place-making should override all other considerations

We are concerned that the explosion of building houses in gardens in our area is having an adverse impact on the character and sense of place of our villages.

2. Main Issues questions

Main Issue 1

How do we manage the strategic land use changes required by a growing population and local economy?

How to meet forecast housing need and demand in the Stirling housing market area?

We agree with the medium growth proposal where land will be allocated on a 5 year effective supply at all times. We understand that the housing market area for the Strathblane area is more likely to be that of the greater Glasgow area. This gives demand pressures at the higher end of the market and therefore strong controls are required to curb development through the use of the Greenbelt. Land allocated to housing in our villages must be clearly identified for the use required to make us a more sustainable and mixed community i.e. smaller houses for the young and ageing population. We agree that most if not all of this should be affordable housing for rent and low cost home ownership We look forward to seeing the more detailed results of the Local Housing Strategy, as further input to the LDP process.

How to protect existing employment land and provide for growth in business space?

We welcome the study to better understand the demand for business space in the rural area as well as opportunities for further tourism and development of the forestry industry sector, to maximise benefits to local communities and contribute to the Scottish Economy. It is important that the results of this study be available at the same time as other inputs to the LDP process, such as the Local Housing Strategy. The Community Council would like to know who will be doing this research and how we could participate, along with the Strathblanefield Community Development Trust. Business space for our residents might be provided at sites outside the immediate area, for example the Killearn Hospital site.

How to accommodate the demand for modern retail and leisure space?

“Village and Local Centres – Existing centres as identified in the settlement plans, which generally serve a residential neighbourhood or passing trade. They have a more service based and local convenience retailing role rather than a wider retail function. Further work will be undertaken to identify new village centres, moving away from a solely ‘Rural Centres’ approach.

The LDP policy should seek to resist any commercial or retail developments outwith the identified centres and support for such developments within them consistent with the centre’s role and function.”

We agree with the preferred approach as it affects our villages. There is an appetite within the villages to create a centre or a number of hubs. Safer car parking is required, particularly for passing trade to help sustain local shops and for weekend walkers and tourists. Our village is blessed with a good range of local businesses, in spite of our proximity to larger centres like Milngavie and Glasgow. We consider these businesses make an important contribution to community life.

Main Issue 2

How best do we address the problem of supplying the necessary infrastructure to support future development?

We agree with the preferred approach to securing developer contributions to infrastructure costs; however that may not address costs in the rural village areas as development will only be on a small scale. Consideration should be given to addressing the issue of how small scale developers who develop one house at a time could contribute to costs.

Main Issue 3

How can development be concentrated in sustainable locations?

We agree that the spatial strategy should be based on the city corridor and nearby towns and villages where travel demand can be better met by walking, cycling and public transport, with only local needs met in the more distant villages such as Strathblane and Blanefield. We also agree that generous safety margins should be reserved around flood risk areas.

Main Issue 4

How can development be achieved in ways that

- (a) maintain and create high amenity;**
- (b) conserve historic environment, natural heritage and biodiversity;**
- (c) support social inclusion and mixed communities**

Approach to maintaining high levels of amenity

“Support the Open Space Strategy and the outcomes of the process which will seek to protect and enhance valued open spaces, set out new space requirements in new developments, need for allotments etc.

Adopt the Green Network concept - Implementation at the local and more detailed level will be through development management policies, and masterplanning, design guidance, etc for individual sites and neighbourhoods. Further explanation of the aims and objectives of the Green Network and its translation into projects and developments on the ground will require SPG. At all levels the basic objectives will be to secure the protection, restoration and enhancement of existing green infrastructure, while increasing its functionality; the creation of new green infrastructure, and the linking of green infrastructure assets.

Managing landscape change

the LDP aims and objectives and spatial strategy should continue to include obligations for safeguarding landscape quality and securing positive landscape change. In addition to the issues raised above, further policies and SPG could be introduced dealing with:

-
- **Managing change in designated landscapes:**
 - hierarchy of national and local designations to be reconfirmed
 - local landscape areas (LLAs) to be defined and agreed
- **Managing landscape change to be positive in effect:**
 - all landscapes require consideration and care
 - maintaining/enhancing landscape character, distinctiveness and diversity
 - recognising the potential cumulative effects of small-scale development
 - respecting landscape capacity
 - ensuring that new development delivers high quality and well maintained landscape Infrastructure”

We strongly support the preferred approach as set on page 42 of the report. In particular we support planning briefs and design statements that are appropriate to local context and location. Open space and green space is particularly valued by our community and we are interested in learning more about the “green network”. We consider it important that our local cycle paths and walks are connected with local cycle path networks as well as to nationally recognise Sustrans cycle routes and walks such as the West Highland Way .

Managing our landscape is very important to us and we are keen to learn more about the pros and cons of creating The Campsies as a regional park. They are already an Area of Great Landscape Value.

The green belt surrounding our villages is of huge importance to us. We are concerned that incremental, small scale permitted developments of the type seen already in the green belt between Strathblane and Milngavie will lead to a perception of coalescence. We are interested to explore if planning controls could be stronger in this specific area to prevent spurious “agricultural business” justifications resulting in large houses in each field in this precious area of green belt. We have read the green belt review with interest and note that it is recommended that each area should be monitored annually by taking photographs. We support this approach.

We note with concern that no mention is made of the alien leylandii trees/hedge planted alongside the A81. Perhaps upcoming legislation on the planting of such species, and/or Regional Park status would provide better protection for the landscape.

We agree that the green belt in the Mugdock area is of strategic importance, to preserve the setting of Strathblane-Blanefield and to prevent even the slightest perception of coalescence between Milngavie and Strathblane. While the village areas of Strathblane and Blanefield nestle in a valley, Mugdock is on higher ground, and visible from main tourist routes and nature/leisure areas. We are opposed to drawing a settlement boundary around 'Mugdock Village', as this would inevitably invite further housing development where a large collection of houses already exists (see separate comment below). We are also concerned about the loss of garden ground from the village as more and more houses are being built in gardens.

No comment on the approach to conserving the historic environment.

We support the preferred approach to conserving the natural heritage and biodiversity. The area already has nature conservation sites and sites of special scientific interest.

Care should be taken not to encourage landowners to neglect or degrade their land, for example through policies permitting housing development on 'brown field' sites. In the greenbelt locations, the current 'Housing in the Countryside' policy is correct as it stands and should only be strengthened and clarified in this respect. Currently applicants are able to appeal, citing ambiguities in the wording (DPEA reference PPA-390-2001). The council should stand firm.

Support social inclusion and mixed communities

Meeting local housing needs and affordability

"The high house prices reflected in certain areas have impacted on the ability of local people to be able to afford to live there. This is creating particular conditions (including a demographic imbalance in terms of population) and is likely to be a continuing trend unless specific interventions are used.

In the same vein, planning for particular needs housing requires a specific response that ensures the right housing is matched with the intended client group.

The ratio between house prices and average incomes is recognised as a good measure of affordability of an area. The affordability gap is an issue for many households. In the Stirling urban area, around 68% of people cannot afford to buy or rent on the open market and around 50% in the Rural area. There are pockets of significant house price pressure in the SW rural area (Killearn, Strathblane and Blanefield) and Dunblane.

Although new housing cannot be reserved to people from that immediate local area, recent research by the Council to inform the LHS has revealed that the Council / Registered Social Landlord (RSL) sector is more successful in meeting local housing need rather than the owner occupation sector.

Highly pressured locations: These are areas where access to social rented housing and affordable owner occupation is limited and includes all the areas with a Pressured Area designation. In these locations it is expected that a quota significantly in excess of the default 25% affordable housing would be set on identified housing sites.”

We agree with the approach to affordable housing and presume that Strathblane and Blanefield would be classed as a highly pressured area, with quota significantly in excess of 25% affordable housing. If new building is to be justified on the little land available, we would like to see ways of ensuring >50%, even 100% affordable housing, rather than exacerbate the existing imbalance in property types. How this can be delivered is of course a separate question: the important thing is to defend in the meantime the land that might be needed, i.e. to resist the pressure for general housing land. We would like to see a broader definition of ‘affordable housing’ in the current economic climate. It is our understanding that affordable housing in the Main issues report refers to rented housing. We are keen to see ways of helping local young people to afford their own home through some form of shared equity scheme. We are keen to understand what options are available to keep the houses affordable in perpetuity.

Meeting the housing needs of an aging population

“It is a well-publicised fact that our population as a nation is getting older, and this trend is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. A recent report⁴¹ highlights the need to investigate new ways of providing assisted living for elderly people. More and more people wish to stay in their own homes and communities as opposed to needing to move into nursing or care homes.

The push to shift the balance of care is about increasing the length of time people live in ordinary or specialist housing in the community with maintained quality of life, ensuring that care homes, especially those providing nursing care, are only used where other forms of care have been considered and found to be inappropriate. From a housing perspective the need to build sufficient new stock to meet the demand for accessible, affordable housing for the growing number of older people poses no lesser investment and planning challenges.

This has implications for the LDP in terms of the provision of housing designs that either allow for this opportunity, or that can be adapted to at some point in the future. However it is not only the buildings themselves that are important to maintaining independence, a local environment with accessible shops and services are also vital.

It is important to note that accommodating an ageing population in a rural area where there are fewer facilities is potentially storing up a significant problems for the future. Reduced access to basic facilities for individuals may lead to increased pressure on public sector social and health services, and the level of support required for supported public transport.”

We have concerns about the approach to the provision of particular needs housing where the policy would be to concentrate provision in urban areas.

This could mean in practice that people would have to move from villages where they have lived all their lives, and where friends and family can share the care burden. We would strongly encourage schemes such as telecare to be used to help people to remain in their own home for as long as possible. As a community we are interested in seeing some sheltered housing being developed within the village. Healthcare/warden cover for particular needs housing could be shared/bought in from the neighbouring authorities, who are not so remote from us as Stirling is. The villages already have a number of local services which the elderly in the community help to support. Some services are provided by volunteers which would provide additional support for sheltered housing. There is a care home north of the village (Blanefield House).

Main Issue 5

How can development and land use be managed in ways that reduce, rather than increase, greenhouse gas emissions?

“Preferred approach

Support for renewable energy developments should be retained, but policies need to stress that this is within the context of the local environment. The natural and cultural heritage resources in the Plan area are such that there will be situations where energy developments are not appropriate or where particular scales of energy development cannot be accommodated.

Adopt the recently approved SPG on wind turbines, with some division of the content to form specific policy for the LDP and supporting advice as SPG.

More promotion for and potential of small-scale hydro and large-scale biomass, particularly in terms of combined heat and power schemes and district heating as much as energy generation.

The incorporation of micro-renewables into Listed Buildings and Conservation areas may be an appropriate subject for SPG. Also making use of embodied energy in our existing building stock - especially our historic buildings - and encourage their fuller use eg upper stories in the City Centre, and re-use of redundant buildings, and promotion of restoration of buildings in buildings at risk register.

New policy reflecting the content of SPP and PAN 84 with a link to statutory Supplementary Planning Guidance on how to implement the standards set out in the policy. The policy could also be supportive of passive energy efficiency measures and small-scale renewable energy developments in general.”

Generally we support the preferred approach. However we are concerned that the SPG on Wind Turbines adopted by the Council on 13 May 2010 was materially altered after extensive consultations, removing safeguards which were put in place.

Preferred Approach to supporting low input food production and self-sufficiency

“Introduce a policy supporting the development of allotments and encouraging the provision of community gardens and orchards in appropriate locations and in association with new developments.

Consider introducing a new policy which ensures that the density of proposed development continues to maintain the prevailing character of the immediate area, whilst allowing for variations in the plot ratio (gross floor space to site area) which allows opportunities for more local food production – for example – larger plots in countryside settings.”

We support this approach but wonder how this could be done for affordable housing. Our preference is for development to take place only within the village boundary so we are interested to see if this approach could be used for infill development and small plots. We repeat our point that we are concerned at the loss of garden ground from the village which reduces opportunities for garden sharing, especially as the Council is now promoting a garden share scheme. Also the large houses being built in gardens currently take up a large % of the plot.

3 Spatial Strategy and options

Some extracts

Page56

“It is important to stress that the City Visioning exercise always had in mind the needs and contribution of the wider rural area, the villages and small towns.

Page58

- Controlled, appropriately scaled development in the villages. This should be informed by a clear and robust analysis of sustainable communities. A hierarchy of settlement structures is promoted, with development being allocated on the basis of this settlement hierarchy.

Page 59

Sustaining Rural Communities – the option of dispersal, breaking large amounts of development into smaller pieces and spreading the development across smaller settlements was considered. However locating all development within the villages with minimal change to the city is considered unsustainable and would have significant impacts on the character and function of the settlements, and the surrounding landscape.

Wider opportunities for development in the rural area is however being considered, in order to help sustain local services and reflect the shift in national policy towards the promotion and facilitating of rural development. New development can help support services ie. better provision of bus services, cycle and footpath links, better drainage etc, to make settlements more sustainable. The whole of the rural area has also recently received Pressured Area Status and therefore the delivery of affordable housing within particular locations will be paramount. It is not considered however that the rural area will have a significant role in terms meeting market housing demand, but a range of options are under consideration to allow for housing choice and ensure that much needed affordable housing can be delivered.

The Rural Villages Area west of Stirling covered all the remaining villages now in the LDP area. This is a generally accessible rural area where development pressure is

high (and planning policy previously opposed housing in the countryside) but service provision varies. The Structure Plan defined Balfron and Doune as 'Rural Centres' where most of the rural housing development was to be focused. The larger scale housing allocations at Balfron and Doune have still not been implemented, but will be retained in the new Plan. However, rather than continue with this version of a 'key centres' policy **the new strategy looks to a wider dispersal of affordable and other housing across the villages, and on a smaller scale, in the countryside.**

Page 68

Development in the Rural Villages

The retention of Balfron and Doune as Rural Centres was considered. However, given that Callander would no longer have the role of a Rural Centre in this new Stirling LDP strategy (as it now features in the National Park), only including Balfron and Doune would appear to be at odds with the aims of that strategy. There are also allocated sites still to be developed in these two communities, and further substantial allocations would adversely affect the character, identity and setting of these settlements. It is considered that the two settlements be considered as rural villages for the purposes of the proposed strategy.

All rural villages are being considered for small-scale development for housing (between 10-40 housing units) and business development in order to meet the overall vision to sustain rural communities.”

We agree that wider opportunities for development in the rural areas should be considered in order to help sustain local services, deliver much needed affordable housing and reflect the shift in national policy towards the promoting and facilitating of rural development. We would like to see small scale new development in our area limited to affordable housing for local people located within the village boundary where possible. Depending on the outcome of the study on needs for local business space, and the limit land available, business space might need to take priority over general house building.

Green belt

We are pleased to see that the green belt between Strathblane and Milngavie is not proposed to change. As stated earlier we are keen to see a policy that strengthens the presumption against development for this particular part of the greenbelt.

We are particularly concerned that the wording of the presumption is ambiguous, encouraging determined applicants to appeal as in the case of 5 houses East of Balauchan Lodge at Mugdock. This could be improved in one or two changes of policy wording. Instead of saying “presumption against *inappropriate* development in the green belt”, it should simply say there will be a “presumption against development”. Where exceptions are listed (permitted types of development for agriculture etc.), it should be made clear that these are the *only* types of development that are appropriate in the green belt. The present wording invites challenges.

We oppose the change to the green belt to the north and west of the village (MIR page 77). This is a very sensitive area linked to the Carbeth huts. We would wish to have a further dialogue about the Conservation Area around the huts and the proposed large expansion of the number of huts and its effect on the area mentioned in the local development plan.

We have commented earlier about the importance of annual monitoring of the green belt and the prevention of planting of non native species in the green belt. We hope these annual photographs will be made widely available within the council they can be an aid to policy for the control and elimination of aggressively invasive non-native species.

4. Main Issues Report Site options

Horses' field STRA01

SC - Considered unsuitable as it is highly visible and rural in feel and character and would be difficult to integrate with the village. Significant planting would be needed to create a new permanent village boundary.

Community Council agrees. Community feeling against development on this site is very strong. In the recent past and very serious campaigns have been fought at public inquiries to preserve it as it is.

Field on Old Mugdock Road STRA02

SC - The site was beyond the GB limit, remote, not safe to walk to school, it would continue the pattern of undesirable development that did not fit well into the landscape.

This site was discussed at a public inquiry at the same time as the horses' field (STRA01) and the Reporter had agreed that it should not be developed. SC supports this view and considers there are better sites close to the settlement. The community council agrees with the view that no development should be allowed.

The Community Council disagrees with the arguments put forward by the landowner in his EOI. The land has valuable recreational potential, and is an important part of the perceived gap between Strathblane and Milngavie. That is not altered by the fact that some isolated properties are beyond it. On the contrary the existence of those properties makes it even more important to preserve green space such as this, to prevent the settlement sprawling across the greenbelt.

The Community Council has a long-established policy to oppose new housing anywhere along Old Mugdock Road, including Moor Road. This is to limit loading of Old Mugdock Road, which cannot be improved without damaging its rural character. Half a dozen permissions exist already for new housing on

Moor Road and Milndavie Road, which have not yet been built. Even if this stretch of the road were improved, additional housing would add to commuter and shopper traffic passing through Mugdock to Milngavie, which causes grief to Mugdock residents at peak times already. At one point in time, Stirling adopted or came close to adopting a restrictive policy here, and this should be revived and enshrined robustly in the LDP.

Campsie Dene Road STRA03

SC - The countryside policy should be altered to include the new house currently under construction.

The CC is opposed because the house (not necessarily under construction yet) is permitted only for a farm worker and is tied to the agricultural business by a Section 75 agreement. It should therefore be retained as green belt to ensure that there is no incremental growth, and no encouragement for the applicant to seek relaxation of the agreement terms.

Campsie Road (Singh field) STRA04 STRA.A

SC - Seen as one of the best opportunities for new housing in close proximity to local amenities and meeting some affordable needs. GB strong here and development would appear as intrusion into the countryside. Any development would need to be low density and additional tree planting would be required to create a permanent new boundary.

This site had been considered by numerous Reporters and rejected as too visible. The site provides a beautiful/perfect aspect when coming into the village from Lennoxtown and should be left as it is. There is currently a natural boundary here. If an artificial one can easily be created then there is nothing to stop it being moved repeatedly. Low density housing does not fit with Housing Association homes. We are concerned that even if this site was defined for affordable/particular needs housing the authority would not be able to resist pressure from developers to commercialise it.

The field has previously been earmarked for an extension to the cemetery, which is still needed.

For these reasons, the Community Council at this stage is opposed to development here. Any proposal from the authority would require robust answers to the concerns above.

Triangle behind public toilets.STRA05

SC – Difficult to develop because of steep gradients and building would have an overbearing effect. Good site for woodland planting.

Any woodland planting should be sensitive to the views that are currently enjoyed from this central part of the village.

Although sloping The Community Council feels that this could be a good area for car parking for walkers, and for visitors to the shops fronting the Main Road.

Green space at Park Place STRA06 STRA.B

SC – Suitable for infill but constrained by road access and on-street parking.

This green area is much valued by neighbouring residents and used by children for recreation. The open aspect currently provides views onto the horses' field and also onto the play park. The view onto the play park is seen as helping with security for children playing, as well as acting as a deterrent to vandals. Currently there are plans to trim woodland to further improve this view, which could be compromised if building occurs.

This site might accommodate a few units and it may be a good site for family affordable homes being close to the school, play park and other amenities, or housing for the elderly.

Field next to Ballewan Crescent STRA07 STRA.C

SC – Well contained site but distant from amenities and constrained by road access

This site is seen as undesirable ribbon development which extends the village. The site is prone to serious flooding. The steep field on the opposite side of the A81 has a high standard of drainage and the water feeds down into this site. Traffic is very fast at this point.

The Community Council opposes this site.

Other sites that could be considered

The forested area below Glenarden between the A81 and Old Mugdock Road, where trees are currently being cut down, has been mentioned as a site more suitable than the others. Viewing the greenbelt/settlement boundary, the site actually looks like an anomaly. Development might be accompanied by improvement of the Old Mugdock Road/Milndavie Road junction, which is currently very difficult to negotiate for both vehicles and pedestrians.

Other sites may emerge.

The Community Council is not in favour of any of the large development sites identified and would wish to understand more how any of the sites could be protected for affordable housing without the well known large housing developers who are just waiting for land to be released bringing forward their own proposals.

Smaller sites within the village envelope with a modest number of affordable houses are considered more suitable. This would present fewer risks to

attracting the major housing developers given the high market prices that our area attracts.

5. Settlement and site assessment

Key issues

“Strathblane, although within the Stirling area, is likely to use Glasgow for the majority of its services and trips. Although served by public transport connections, a large percentage of journeys will still be made by private car. Local employment opportunities are limited, leading to a large amount of out-commuting. Strathblane does not have a Conservation Area but is surrounded to the east, south and west by Green Belt and to the north by an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). There is limited capacity in the sewage treatment works although the water quality is not affected by this. The village has Pressured Area Status, highlighting the need for affordable housing. The primary school has some capacity but capacity is limited at Balfron High and any development would have to be carefully phased. There is also a perceived lack of open space in Strathblane for the residents and this would be exacerbated if additional development took place on existing open space areas. The NHS have advised that there are no capacity issues with the general medical practice and that there is a pharmacy available.”

Suitability for development

“It is considered that Strathblane and Blanefield are not the most sustainable locations for development due to their remoteness from places of employment and other main services and the reliance on the private car. The landscape and Green Belt constraints also make it unsuitable for large-scale expansion outwith the current settlement boundary. Combined with sewage constraints there is limited reason to allocate a strategic housing allocation at this location to meet the demands of the LDP. However, there may be scope to identify some land for housing mainly to provide a better tenure mix and affordability.”

We agree with the points made around the key issues and suitability for development. We are strongly of the view that any small scale development should be within the village boundary to provide better tenure mix and affordability. We are keen to understand whether this would mean that no more large houses would be permitted, particularly in garden ground unless they were small for down-sizing.

We are not sure if it is correct to say that Strathblane has no conservation area as we understand that the Carbeth huts are in a conservation area.

Mugdock

Mugdock is currently a group of 40 houses without a defined boundary, within the green belt. This has the advantage of restricting further development, particularly in garden ground, and any other proposed new development is

constrained by the rules covering the greenbelt which is a presumption against development.

We understand the Mugdock Association and the majority of residents are in favour of maintaining the status quo. Contrary proposals are driven entirely by financial gain. Currently, Mugdock's houses currently are well shielded and not really visible from the main A81. Any foreseeable development would spoil that. The area is also troubled by being used as a 'rat run' for commuters and shoppers, as well as being on the main traffic route to Mugdock Country Park. Further development would exacerbate this. Scottish Water currently has trouble supplying the houses that exist,

The Community Council concurs with the conclusion of the green belt study that there should be no change to the current position of the green belt boundary. In addition we do not support drawing a boundary around the existing houses.

6. Supplementary planning guidance

We understand that supplementary planning guidance will play a greater role than in the past as the LDP will be a more strategic document. If not all policies are to be in the plan then it is presumed that it will be easier to review them as circumstances require. We note that there will be further consultation when the LDP is published next year.

We welcome the proposed Development Advice Notes on the design of housing in the countryside, Quality design/place-making, low and zero carbon developments and planting on new developments/landscape quality. We value good design and landscaping very highly and would be happy to contribute to the development of these advice notes. We would hope that quality design and place-making will include infill property as well as new housing developments.

--- END ---

APPROVED AT STRATHBLANE COMMUNITY COUNCIL MEETING
2 AUGUST 2010