



17/00434/PPP


**Land 160 Metres South Of Broadgate House,
Campsie Road, Strathblane**

Representation by Strathblane Community Council

7 August 2017


**Appendix 3 – Strathblane CC community survey results (residents only)
June-July 2017**

Q1 Were you aware of Gladman’s pre-application consultation in October-December 2016?



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	85.19%	184
No	11.11%	24
Don't Remember	3.70%	8
Total		216

Q2 Do you believe that the pre-application consultation was conducted fairly?




Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	23.70%	50
No	44.55%	94
Don't Know	31.75%	67
Total		211

#	Comments	Date
1	Lack of clarity about the eventual size of proposed housing.	7/27/2017 9:10 PM
2	They did not consult me - and I'm pretty aware of what's happening in village. So I can't see how that counts as "fair".	7/26/2017 11:45 PM
3	Consultation dates appear to have been chosen for minimum response, ie Halloween and school holidays	7/26/2017 11:20 PM
4	I recall the pre-consultation drop-in at the Village Club being publicised at short notice and on Halloween when many would have alternative commitments.	7/26/2017 11:17 PM
5	We thought that Gladmans was the developer and now know that the the plan is not binding on any developer which leaves it all as an unknown	7/26/2017 10:55 PM
6	Was enough time given for residents to respond? Misleading language was used in the proposals.	7/26/2017 10:34 PM
7	The community council organised meetings and. Onsuiktstions. However Gladman appear to have been evasive and disingenuous	7/26/2017 8:16 PM
8	I am unaware of any aspect of the pre-application process which may have prejudiced the interests of the residents in Strathblane.	7/26/2017 4:55 PM
9	The drop in session was organised for Halloween. Some of the questions were phrased to get a particular answer.	7/26/2017 12:27 PM
10	Gladman representatives could not come up with any positive benefits for the village population. We need sheltered accommodation for the elderly, and affordable accommodation for first time buyers and people seeking a house to rent.	7/25/2017 2:51 PM
11	I have to qualify the above answers. I did not drop in to Gladman's session, so cannot comment on the fairness of their presentation, but I did attend two Community Council meetings where the matter was discussed. At the second of these, two of Gladman's representatives were present by invitation and given ample opportunity to explain and enlarge on their proposals, and there was a lively but courteous debate.	7/25/2017 1:21 PM

12	I had no notification of it.	7/24/2017 9:54 PM
13	When asked about the 1965 lawrence application and appeal the Gladman representatives "didn't know" about it and didn't know if their clients had further plans for the rest of the land they own.	7/24/2017 4:27 PM
14	They appear to have decided they're going to build anyway so why did they bother going through the motions	7/24/2017 4:16 PM
15	Apparent distortion of local plans by Gladman	7/24/2017 4:06 PM
16	Lots of mis-information from Gladman	7/24/2017 3:50 PM
17	Misleading information presented by Gladman with regard to what had been already accepted in principle for the site.	7/24/2017 3:45 PM
18	I felt that the reps in this case were quite indifferent to our case	7/24/2017 3:06 PM
19	promotional/marketing bias	7/24/2017 2:32 PM
20	surely if it had been conducted properly we would not need to address the issue again	7/24/2017 2:23 PM
21	gladman simply took advantage of the Community niavety in their initial attempted presentations and subsequently misrepresented those who were prepared to give them the benefit of the doubt.	7/23/2017 7:20 PM
22	Facts were misrepresented	7/23/2017 3:28 PM
23	by Gladman-no but the community council kept us informed	7/23/2017 2:57 PM
24	The presentation had errors of fact in it and the meeting was convened at short notice and at halloween when many residents had other plans	7/23/2017 1:35 PM
25	Gladman gave, what I believed, a view of the planning situation that had no basis in the true situation - implying that they were responding to a need expressed by both the community and Stirling Council. The approach was, at best, stretching the truth, more likely as the preamble of a confidence trick.	7/23/2017 12:21 PM
26	Promise of green belt ending at theNew Cala houses ignored	7/23/2017 11:19 AM
27	Born & brought up in the village & owned property here for 11 years & was unaware of pre-application consultation.	7/22/2017 4:18 PM
28	I think every local household was made aware of the pre-application consultation & had a chance to find out more & to make their views known	7/22/2017 1:30 PM
29	I only heard about it via the community council newsletter and the timeframe was short. The information session held by Gladman at the village hall was at a time and date which was not suitable for a significant proportion of the community Had it not been for the extensive work done by the community council to to raise awareness I would have been unformed of the proposal	7/22/2017 12:00 PM
30	There was not much notice given	7/21/2017 6:22 PM
31	Gladman seem to have disregarded the concerns voiced at the consultation	7/17/2017 7:04 PM
32	Too much presumption by Gladman	7/17/2017 5:36 PM
33	Much of the information presented was false and/or misleading	7/14/2017 8:02 AM
34	Performed in an underhand and surprise fashion.	7/14/2017 12:35 AM
35	in my opinion, the information provided by Gladman at that time was heavily weighted to give the reader the impression that this was almost a "done deal" with only the details to be "sorted".	7/13/2017 9:51 PM
36	The pre application was miss worded and miss leading. The consultancy reps were like robots and did not really know the village.	7/13/2017 8:05 PM
37	The answer is 'yes' because the community council provided villagers with multiple opportunities to make their views known about the Gladman approach - and those views were robust and consistent.	7/13/2017 7:36 PM
38	I recall the information being presented in a very skewed fashion using language that seemed to be trying to trick people into giving their implicit consent to the proposal.	7/10/2017 5:17 PM
39	Biased	7/4/2017 10:04 AM
40	Misleading info in their presentation	7/4/2017 9:26 AM


41	I really don't know since I was not at the meeting when the consultation details were discussed.	7/2/2017 7:32 PM
42	Gladman took absolutely no notice of the genuine concerns raised by locals. Token gesture consultation.	7/2/2017 9:13 AM
43	It was misleading.	7/1/2017 5:32 PM
44	I attended the "drop in" hosted by Gladman at the village hall. I noted that the Gladman employees made little effort to explain who Gladman was and the nature of their involvement. It would question whether the feedback questionnaire questions were entirely fair, they appeared somewhat skewed in the way they were couched in order to obtain the type of data that would be "favourable" to Gladman's objectives. I would question that this was a "consultation", when I was there several Gladman employees lurked in the background whilst one woman engaged in conversation - from what I saw, observed and experienced she was not really there to listen to any one's concerns.	6/30/2017 2:17 PM
45	Conducted reasonably fairly but timed to be as disruptive as possible to those consulting and wishing to repond on the issue	6/27/2017 9:05 PM
46	There was a lot of misleading info from Gladman.	6/27/2017 8:07 PM
47	Their views were slanted and they misrepresented numerous facts.	6/27/2017 5:11 PM
48	I think Gladman tricked people into responding that they were in favour of more housing, when in fact people are in favour of new housing only of a very specific type. This may have led Gladman to have a false positive view that their application would be supported.	6/26/2017 10:11 AM
49	They led us to believe That Stirling were keen on the idea .	6/25/2017 9:44 PM
50	Sneaky approach, hugely leading questions in their 'consultation' questionnaire, not upfront about their role and their motives.	6/25/2017 9:10 AM
51	Seemed very rushed and poor information	6/25/2017 12:01 AM
52	The meeting at the Village Club was poorly publicised, timed inconveniently for many people and ran out of questionnaires for completion which were supposed to be used as part of the consultation process.	6/24/2017 7:59 PM
53	residents' questions were not answered and concerns largely ignored.	6/24/2017 7:51 PM
54	They were in control of the situation and any questionnaires left. It should have been run by a third party.	6/24/2017 4:52 PM
55	They didn't take any notice	6/24/2017 4:03 PM
56	It was slanted to 'condition' and give biased reporting data. They were just following the process with no intention ever of listening to the community.	6/24/2017 3:58 PM
57	I photographed my response as I believed the responses would be filleted by Gladman who clearly had the facility for this.	6/24/2017 3:56 PM
58	False and misleading informartion was presented by Gladman, who bent and manipulated the truth of the matter. They are trying to solve a huge proportion of all of Stirling Council's housing needs with this development and are presenting incorrect information to further their cause.	6/24/2017 2:13 PM
59	It was done sneakily, pretending that they had the best interest of the village at heart and that they were actually concerned with our opinion!	6/24/2017 2:09 PM
60	I feel that the community council had to do all of the consultation work. I felt I heard very little from Gladman, not a good sign for any potential future work they would like to propose in the comminuted.	6/24/2017 1:21 PM
61	The questions were designed to trap people into answering in favour of the proposal	6/24/2017 12:47 PM

Q3 Did you respond to the pre-application consultation?



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	58.88%	126
No	31.78%	68
Don't remember	9.35%	20
Total		214

Q4 Reviewing the planning application 17/00434/PPP, do you think that Gladman have addressed your particular concerns?



Answer Choices	Responses	Count
Yes	2.86%	6
No	85.71%	180
Don't know	11.43%	24
Total		210

#	Please explain:	Date
1	Green Belt and therefore should not be built on. Countryside being eroded. Problems with local school, roads and waste water sewage not addressed	7/28/2017 5:59 PM
2	I have many concerns about the current application (that I will send separately and to the council) so therefore they have not been addressed.	7/26/2017 11:45 PM
3	Ignored community's views	7/26/2017 11:20 PM
4	They are violating the green belt. Council promised that if they put in the Gala homes the cemetery would be a hard boundary. Hundreds of community members signed a petition opposing the proposed development	7/26/2017 10:55 PM
5	Not at all - they have gone ahead with almost no change at all regardless of the feedback from the local residents, community council & Stirling Council. What they have produced is just like a sales brochure	7/26/2017 10:44 PM
6	They have not taken any concerns re building on greenbelt and removing the cemetery too far from the Church into consideration. In particular, they have not reduced the proposed number of units being applied for, which is absolutely ridiculous!	7/26/2017 10:34 PM
7	Despite strong objections at the pre-application stage, nothing was amended to take into account the communities views!	7/26/2017 10:06 PM
8	None of the concerns raised were addressed. The arrogance of Gladman was clearly demonstrated by this and their responses to questions at the public meeting in December.	7/26/2017 9:10 PM
9	There are too many houses on a green belt site. The village had already agreed a local development plan with Stirling council but this has been disregarded by Gladnan.	7/26/2017 8:16 PM
10	We do not have the infrastructure to support a substantial development like this in the village.	7/26/2017 7:27 PM
11	N/A	7/26/2017 4:57 PM
12	I did not make any concerns known at that time.	7/26/2017 4:55 PM
13	Gladman appears not to have taken any notice of the consistent rejection of their plans	7/26/2017 3:23 PM


14	I am not against housing development, but this one does not address the needs of the village.	7/26/2017 12:27 PM
15	They have not taken on any particular concerns from the community.	7/25/2017 10:20 PM
16	Too many new houses are being built.	7/25/2017 8:46 PM
17	Cemetery extension should be as near the church as possible as many old people visit on foot before church services.	7/25/2017 8:40 PM
18	The development proposed is at odds with the previously agreed ldp	7/25/2017 7:50 PM
19	Not taken into consideration that services, school, roads, sewerage, parking, environment etc (especially in green belt) have not been addressed	7/25/2017 5:51 PM
20	As per some other comments that have been made, their is only self-interest displayed here and no or little concern has been given to the knock-on effects of such a large development.	7/25/2017 5:26 PM
21	Nothing seems to have changed in their plan	7/25/2017 5:13 PM
22	I believe Gladman's planning application is not necessarily going to be the one that potentially might be built. Therefore Gladman's proposal may not mean much! There are also too many houses for the area. I would have been happier if the proposed new houses were more eco-friendly, and interesting.	7/25/2017 4:49 PM
23	Despite some cosmetic changes, Gladman have not convincingly allayed concerns about increased traffic on A891; pressure on local amenities; possible encouragement of further incursions on Green Belt; and impact on the character of the village.	7/25/2017 1:21 PM
24	Gladden don't appear to have addressed ANY local concerns	7/24/2017 4:27 PM
25	Gladman seem to have taken no notice of our community's wishes.	7/24/2017 4:17 PM
26	They've ignored the concerns totally, otherwise why go ahead with the application	7/24/2017 4:16 PM
27	Because Gladman are trying to overturn a decision already made	7/24/2017 4:07 PM
28	Total disregard for the wishes of the community - our voice was ignored	7/24/2017 4:06 PM
29	Too many houses on site and too close together. Cemetery should have priority	7/24/2017 3:58 PM
30	Haven't addressed any concerns re. school/sewers/more building	7/24/2017 3:50 PM
31	They appear to have taken no notice at all of the well argued and strong opposition of the community, with which i am in full agreement	7/24/2017 3:46 PM
32	Gladman hope to go ahead with up to 70 homes!!	7/24/2017 3:45 PM
33	Insufficient infrastructure to support increase population; building beyond village envelope.	7/24/2017 3:44 PM
34	Ignores previously agreed local development plan.	7/24/2017 3:28 PM
35	They had no intention of changing any plans despite the feelings of those present	7/24/2017 3:06 PM
36	Gladden are not concerned about the local community	7/24/2017 3:06 PM
37	complete disregard for the identity of the village. Will the next stop be the "space" between here and Milngavie?	7/24/2017 2:44 PM
38	Do not think a need in green belt for more houses.	7/24/2017 2:43 PM
39	too many houses, wrong mix,greenbelt	7/24/2017 2:32 PM
40	there has been no change in their planning application	7/24/2017 2:23 PM
41	Large scale housing development not appropriate for Strathblane/Blanefield. Allocated green belt should be protected.	7/23/2017 9:56 PM
42	did not explain why there is a local need for any of the development	7/23/2017 7:20 PM
43	a loss of greenbelt will allow for uncontrolled expansion in the future	7/23/2017 4:46 PM
44	nothing has changed my original objections stand	7/23/2017 3:28 PM
45	We don't need more bought houses in Strathblane	7/23/2017 3:14 PM
46	it is the same plan as far as I can see	7/23/2017 2:57 PM
47	The application is being bulldozed	7/23/2017 2:41 PM
48	wrong scale, wrong place, contravenes LDP	7/23/2017 2:29 PM
49	The scale of the development is too big for us to absorb easily and it is on Green belt land which we asked to be protected in our local development plan.	7/23/2017 1:35 PM

50	Gladman sought local opinion on types of housing, but they cannot give any promises on the type of properties that might be built as they admit they will not be the developers who will submit a planning application for the site.	7/23/2017 12:21 PM
51	The infrastructure of the village is not sufficient to accommodate another 70 houses & 140+ associated vehicles. I would doubt the sewer system could cope either.	7/22/2017 4:18 PM
52	Too large a development for current infrastructure - uncertainty regarding what final development will actually look like	7/22/2017 1:54 PM
53	My main concern was & is, that the proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan & is on land designated as 'Green Belt'	7/22/2017 1:30 PM
54	I have more concerns now that the extent of the proposed development has become clearer. This is a disproportionate development riding roughshod over the previously agreed Local Development Plan	7/22/2017 12:35 PM
55	Despite a significant response and valid comments with regard to the proposal not addressing local housing needs and concerns regarding the use of green belt and an inadequate infrastructure to support such a development the application proposal submitted is not in any way modified from the vital one it is also of great concern the the application as submitted is in no way binding to any developer	7/22/2017 12:00 PM
56	The cemetery has been agreed upon in the field next to the Cale site and is now proposed further away from the church. There is no need for further private housing in Strathblane on this site. Stirlingshire council's LDC has been agreed.	7/21/2017 6:22 PM
57	Gladman have not addressed any of my concerns about the proposed development, which were a) changing the character of a rural village b) overwhelming the capacity of local facilities and utilities c) threatening the biodiversity of the area and d) damaging an area of archeological and historical importance.	7/19/2017 8:59 PM
58	if they had addressed the concerns they would not be continuing with the application	7/17/2017 7:04 PM
59	They don't seem to realise the concerns about preserving the green belt	7/17/2017 5:36 PM
60	This is not a small scale development - it is a large scale development of high density housing in a green belt area which does not "fit" with a village like Strathblane	7/14/2017 5:02 PM
61	The community does not want or require a housing development of this magnitude or nature	7/14/2017 5:00 PM
62	This area was always designated for a new cemetery this company have just completely ignored this	7/14/2017 4:04 PM
63	Shouldn't build on greenbelt. Negative effect on local services. Not type of housing needed.	7/14/2017 9:35 AM
64	Developers are not interested in any community concerns other than to okay lip service to them to get planning!	7/14/2017 8:19 AM
65	I think it's a terrible proposal to build on green belt	7/13/2017 11:58 PM
66	It is still projected as "All Good". The papers totally gloss over that should "PPP" be granted, the community could have very little influence over what is actually proposed by whatever ACTUAL developer PURCHASES the ground and lodges a DETAILED PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ACTUAL HOUSING UNITS, as opposed to a theoretical concept.	7/13/2017 9:51 PM
67	My concerns were that the initial proposed scheme was in the established Green Belt, would obstruct the planned cemetery extension and was completely disproportionate to the scale of available village resources. In short, it was unacceptable.	7/13/2017 7:36 PM
68	I don't think we need any further major housing developments in the village so soon after the recent Cala development (or probably at all)	7/13/2017 4:49 PM
69	My concerns were over the nature of the proposed development and its large scale relative to the size and character of the village. This has not changed.	7/11/2017 9:41 PM
70	None of my concerns have been addressed.	7/11/2017 2:13 PM
71	Nothing much has changed compared to earlier application. Still means destruction of green belt, overloading of local services, cavalier disregard for local development plan and requirement for cemetery extension. Very cynical.	7/10/2017 5:17 PM
72	Though I did not personally bring up concerns, it is clear that the concerns i had in regards to size and effect of the development which people brought up were totally ignored.	7/6/2017 10:53 PM
73	The necessary infrastructure required to accommodate this development would have a negative impact on the village	7/4/2017 9:27 PM
74	Still wanting to build on greenbelt	7/4/2017 9:26 AM

75	My concerns are that the village needs housing to suit elderly and single people which are affordable together with younger people who have been born and brought up in the village. It seems sad that people are forced to move out of this lovely village because of lack of affordable housing. Elderly people would benefit from having accommodation suitable for the needs of those with mobility and other related issues.	7/2/2017 7:32 PM
76	The recently completed CALA development (H106) has already extended the green belt and I thought that Stirling Council had agreed that a new cemetery next to H106 would complete this process and finalise the village eastern boundary.	7/1/2017 5:32 PM
77	This is clearly overdevelopment, the scale of the development is totally out of keeping with the existing village environment. I think it is ironic that the proposals criticize the existing CALA boundary "unsympathetic and weakly designed" when you look at what is proposed. I feel that this kind of outsized development on the greenbelt perimeter of villages is becoming more and more prevalent, I am disappointed that companies such as Gladman are being permitted to dictate what the rural landscape looks like these days with their aggressive and systemic strategy to unpick existing consulted and agreed local plans.	6/30/2017 2:17 PM
78	No comments from gladman regarding infrastructure - school capacity, doctor's surgery, sewerage systems, traffic volume, local amenities, green belt violation.....	6/28/2017 7:58 PM
79	Building on green belt. Cemetery displaced and too far from church In contravention of Local Development plan Far too big a development for this small village - 10% increase. Strain on existing infrastructure.	6/27/2017 9:05 PM
80	There is not enough information. For example, exactly how many houses and of what type and the extra population to the village this would mean. The effect on the environment and feel of the village.	6/27/2017 8:07 PM
81	The development is too large. It pushes the cemetery out of the village. It is against the current local plan. It sets up the likelihood of further development on the north side of Campsie Road.	6/27/2017 5:11 PM
82	We need more affordable houses and less large luxury homes.	6/26/2017 9:57 PM
83	Gladman have basically not addresses community/my concerns at all. I do not think they should build on this site at all (other than for the proposed cemetery) - a village of our size does not need nor can it support a huge development of large family homes. If new homes are needed, they are smaller affordable homes for local people, and there are plenty other places they could be built other than this prime green field.	6/26/2017 10:11 AM
84	A development of this size is oversized and unsuitable for this type/location of village	6/25/2017 11:42 PM
85	Because they want to build on greenbelt land.	6/25/2017 9:44 PM
86	The village is losing its character becoming too big few shops just a commuter town	6/25/2017 2:41 PM
87	Still Too many houses up setting the dynamics of the village	6/25/2017 12:01 AM
88	Building on the greenbelt should. Be outlawed when there are plenty of brown field sites available .	6/24/2017 8:08 PM
89	The application is contrary to the local plan, is on a designated green belt site, doesn't adequately address the concerns in respect of the local infrastructure.	6/24/2017 7:59 PM
90	The planning application is not measurably different from the pre-planning. Community concerns have largely been ignored.	6/24/2017 7:51 PM
91	Do not address the need for cemetery extension on designated site; the several adverse impacts of the size of the development on essential services and the character of the community; does not provide the kind of houses the community needs.	6/24/2017 4:38 PM
92	Green belt erosion. Schools, shops and sewerage are all inadequate for a development of this size	6/24/2017 4:03 PM
93	They do not care at all about what we mere mortals say. They are entirely focused on getting what they want.	6/24/2017 3:58 PM
94	They reference "local" schools have sufficient capacity, yet one primary school they reference is in central Stirling, which does not make any sense for school children living in the village. They do not discuss clearly and openly that the border of the Cala development was to provide a robust boundary to the green belt. Moving this boundary is unnecessary. They do not discuss other available sites within the Stirling Council area which would be far better suited, such as sites already within the curtilage of the village and not on green belt land, nor the Killlearn Hospital brownfield site.	6/24/2017 2:13 PM

95	I am still concerned about the stretch on local ammenirties, I appreciate that there is an appetite for affordable housing in the area in general but I do not believe that these houses will be affordable for the young people in these communities. I am also against the loss of green belt land when there are other alternatives.	6/24/2017 1:21 PM
96	The whole premise of the application is that the Green Belt and LDP process should be overridden for profit. No concern is shown for the loss of land and burden on services, or sustainability. This landowner and others would come forward with more and more applications that would be harder to resist. Also a PPP application cannot bind the developer. All the present applicant wants is to open the door to development and profit from the increased value of the land. A next detailed applicant would then press hard to maximise profit from the actual development.	6/24/2017 12:47 PM

Q5 Should the Local Development Plan (which was produced by Stirling Council and the local communities) be disregarded to allow this housing development?



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	3.24%	7
No	94.44%	204
No opinion	2.31%	5
Total		216

Q6 The site of the proposed housing development is farm land in Strathblane's Green Belt. On a scale of 1 to 10, how strongly do you believe the Green Belt should remain protected?

Answered: 214 Skipped: 2

AVERAGE



COUNT



Answer Choices	Average Number	Total Number	Responses
	9	1,995	214
Total Respondents: 214			

#		Date
1	10	7/28/2017 6:01 PM
2	10	7/27/2017 9:23 PM
3	10	7/27/2017 9:18 PM
4	10	7/27/2017 9:12 PM
5	8	7/27/2017 9:06 PM
6	10	7/27/2017 9:01 PM
7	9	7/26/2017 11:49 PM
8	10	7/26/2017 11:23 PM
9	10	7/26/2017 11:20 PM
10	10	7/26/2017 11:14 PM
11	10	7/26/2017 10:59 PM
12	10	7/26/2017 10:47 PM
13	10	7/26/2017 10:37 PM
14	10	7/26/2017 10:08 PM
15	10	7/26/2017 9:11 PM
16	10	7/26/2017 8:48 PM
17	10	7/26/2017 8:22 PM
18	9	7/26/2017 7:31 PM
19	10	7/26/2017 4:58 PM
20	6	7/26/2017 4:57 PM
21	2	7/26/2017 4:43 PM
22	6	7/26/2017 4:24 PM
23	10	7/26/2017 3:40 PM
24	10	7/26/2017 3:33 PM






TABLE ABRIDGED

Q7 Do you consider that the proposal for up to 70 houses constitutes “small scale expansion” of the village?



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	6.05%	13
No	91.63%	197
No opinion	2.33%	5
Total		215

Q8 Would the proposed development threaten the identity and setting of the village?



Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	92.06% 197
No	6.54% 14
No opinion	1.40% 3
Total	214

#	Please explain:	Date
1	Lose village atmosphere. Rural villages must be retained. We are already larger than other villages around us. See also EDC submissions against expansion of our rural villages	7/28/2017 6:01 PM
2	Start of a slippery road.	7/27/2017 9:23 PM
3	Put pressure on local facilities; impede cemetery development and encroach on green belt.	7/27/2017 9:12 PM
4	Yes, although to some extent the approach to the village from the east has already been appallingly degraded by Cala's design of a wall of identical houses that make it look like an approach to an industrial estate. My biggest objection re "identity" would be the damage this will do to the facilities in the village which are already close to bursting - this proposal make zero provision for solving that problem and will make matter worse with increased numbers and "designed for drivers" layout.	7/26/2017 11:49 PM
5	Likely to increase dormitory nature of the village with less local interaction	7/26/2017 11:23 PM
6	Ribbon type modern development along a main route which is unsympathetic to the size and nature of the village.	7/26/2017 11:20 PM
7	70 new homes has the potential to instantly increase the local population by 12 - 15% this will place place strain local services in particular the primary school. Infrastructure such as drainage and sewage will be impacted....does our local water treatment works have sufficient capacity to deal with such a large development? We live in a high rainfall area, the implications of building on what is essentially a flood plain will increase the risk of flooding with the likely victims being the residents of Southview Road who live in closest proximity to the burn that forms the southern boundary of this proposed development. Let's also assume 70 new houses have at least two vehicles....more traffic, deterioration of air quality, chaos at the Co-op...those with children are unlikely to walk to school, there's insufficient parking available here at present. Street lighting on the new development - increased light pollution. It really bugs me that the central belt has a wealth of brownfield land sites prime for redevelopment that would have much stronger socio-economical and environmentally positive factors but developers see profit based upon location, location, location mentality and they do not give a toss for the impacts to the character of small local communities.	7/26/2017 11:14 PM

8	This is a beautiful and historic area .There are many examples of pre history that cannot be violated.	7/26/2017 10:59 PM
9	The size and type of the development would equate to at least a 10% increase in population of the village in a very short time frame. This is a great threat to the identity of the village. It no longer would have the character it has today , with a large chunk of characterless housing on the approach from the East.	7/26/2017 10:47 PM
10	70 houses represents around 10% of the entire village! In a spot which is most picturesque and on greenbelt. The floodgates would open following the grant of such an application for developing similar fields and areas, and before long the village will become a commuter town akin to Bishopston and eventually could be the next Bearsden. Local services already stretched would be unable to cope, and new services and infrastructure would further ruin the identity and setting of the village.	7/26/2017 10:37 PM
11	Grossly out of proportion compared to the existing size of the village. This would greatly impact on the services and amenities the village has to offer diluting the local feel of the place.	7/26/2017 10:08 PM
12	70 houses is a large scale development for a village of this size. We had already agreed a local development plan which Gladman are trying to over ride. The LDP was made with consultation and agreement from the village	7/26/2017 8:22 PM
13	The village has had a number of developments over recent years. While none of these seem large on their own, the cumulative effect is substantial. The village is spreading out in multiple directions, with little or no consideration of traffic impact, capacity of local resources such as schools and nurseries, and the loss of greenbelt land.	7/26/2017 7:31 PM
14	This proposed development will impact upon the volume of traffic using the A81, resulting in congestion. Further the services of the village would be impacted to a detrimental level. That is to say, the school and the GP practice would become overburdened.	7/26/2017 4:58 PM
15	Small scale development is more appropriate to retain a village setting.	7/26/2017 4:57 PM
16	The village is a collection of houses all of differing style, all built in bulk over the last century, this is no different. While 70 houses is too many, there is still extensive green belt between this field and the Stirling boundary.	7/26/2017 4:24 PM
17	The plan ignores the type of housing required by the current residents of the village.	7/26/2017 3:33 PM
18	It is the start of a linear development along Campsie Road. Once the green belt has been moved, who knows where it will end.	7/26/2017 12:31 PM
19	Too many new houses in the same area would lose the character and identify of the village. Eroding village demeanour by expanding onto the greenbelt.	7/25/2017 10:28 PM
20	This is a significant development that will have an adverse impact on local services and the visual aspect of the east entrance to the village as a community blending with the local environment.	7/25/2017 10:19 PM
21	It would open up the floodgates to further development on green belt land. It would completely redefine the village boundary and destroy the rural setting. I believe the development would be in prominent view on both the campsite road and Glasgow road approaches to the village.	7/25/2017 9:34 PM
22	The setting of the village is very attractive and should be preserved.	7/25/2017 8:47 PM
23	The village would look like a town suburband more like a new town in the making.	7/25/2017 8:41 PM
24	The development would significantly alter the village boundary	7/25/2017 7:51 PM
25	Too many houses in a small village where it is in an area of beautiful surroundings. Affects the habitat of birds etc. Commuter traffic is already too high etc. Exhaust fumes for walking is becomic toxic when walking in the village.	7/25/2017 5:54 PM
26	It appears to be an "add on" and outwith the village interior. Stress on schools, doctors and infrastrucure.	7/25/2017 5:41 PM
27	The village has already become a dwelling place with its inhabitants having become faceless neighbours of unknown names as opposed to the place that I grew up and knew someone from almost every house in the village	7/25/2017 5:28 PM
28	I am not against new houses being built, per se. But 68 or 70 new houses is a large addition to the village. In addition, these houses look from Gladman's visuals to be more of the same bland houses, similar to the new Cala homes next door. A few of these are okay, but with the considerably larger amount in the new proposals, it will look like an estate - not something that suits a rural village like Strathblane. There is no guarantee that whoever buys the site won't put even more houses on it than Gladman propose either.	7/25/2017 4:50 PM

29	Yes. It is very important to all of the population that we maintain the mix of local residents and newcomers. That way our local facilities can serve the population as a whole - i.e. school, library, shops, community groups, and village halls. It is important that we deal with the pressures that already exist for our population(lack of affordable housing,lack of social housing, poor fabric of our primary school, lack of sheltered accommodation, without coping with a bigger number of residents.Our community council already struggles at the moment to engage village residents in village issues. This would become even harder with an increase in our population. We do not wish to become a commuter village with no community spirit.	7/25/2017 3:00 PM
30	Two solid 'blocks' of housing development (Cala and the proposed new one) at the eastern end of the village would be quite out of scale with the rest of the village and I'm not convinced that Gladman's tinkering with the landscaping will preserve the approach from the east - apart from the other strains caused by the large population increase.	7/25/2017 1:21 PM
31	The village shouldn't just keep expanding. It will lose it's character eventually.	7/25/2017 9:32 AM
32	With this number of houses added it would no longer be a village and the sense of community would be lost.	7/24/2017 9:58 PM
33	1. Toe in the door for future development 2. good green fields covered in concrete	7/24/2017 4:30 PM
34	- Overload of buildings in the countryside setting. - Extra traffic on already busy and narrow roads for new residents who will likely travel elsewhere for work, schooling and entertainment. - it is outwith the agreed 'green belt'.	7/24/2017 4:24 PM
35	It would no longer be a village. Where do the developers stop - Lennoxton!?	7/24/2017 4:17 PM
36	The proposed development has already been rejected by Stirling and Scottish Government reporters because it would adversely affect the services and environment of the village	7/24/2017 4:15 PM
37	Significant increase in size and population	7/24/2017 4:07 PM
38	It is the beginning of an expansion towards Campsie. Everything is now leaning to the Strathblane end of the village.	7/24/2017 4:04 PM
39	Disregards village identity and becomes suburbia - housing density	7/24/2017 3:59 PM
40	It's a small close-knit community where the amenities can cope	7/24/2017 3:51 PM
41	1.the village would become too large in size of population to maintain its current cohesiveness 2.the infrastructure of the village in all respects does not have capacity for the increased population 3.the highly valued balance between countryside and built development would be lost	7/24/2017 3:50 PM
42	Completely out of proportion to needs and sustainability of our village.	7/24/2017 3:48 PM
43	See 4 below and more traffic congestion	7/24/2017 3:48 PM
44	We will no longer be a village if expansion continues!	7/24/2017 3:36 PM
45	Too busy for traffic, sewage, schools etc.	7/24/2017 3:17 PM
46	1. Village amenities such as primary school would not be able to cope. 2. Considerable increase in unnecessary traffic movement.	7/24/2017 3:06 PM
47	Strathblane/ Blanefield does not have a real "village centre" except for the area near the church. This development (with Cala) would completely submerge any identity there is	7/24/2017 2:46 PM
48	Village getting bigger by number and acreage.	7/24/2017 2:44 PM
49	only small scale mixed housing developments (24-30 units) should be considered within the village envelope	7/24/2017 2:34 PM
50	incomers often change the character of the village. Some tend to take over somewhat forcefully	7/24/2017 2:25 PM
51	Local facilities including Primary school, surgery, Scottish water amenities do not have capacity for such a large scale development. Loss of greenbelt could cause potential flooding issues further west into village along Blane watercourse. Balfron High School already at capacity.	7/23/2017 9:59 PM
52	would turn it into a commuter village entirely	7/23/2017 7:22 PM
53	since arrival here in 1966, a small village has become a large village and in danger of becoming a town	7/23/2017 4:47 PM
54	Ribbon development outside LDP	7/23/2017 4:36 PM
55	This is urban sprawl into the greenbelt and will destroy the visual amenity of the area	7/23/2017 3:29 PM


56	The greenbelt must be protected	7/23/2017 3:22 PM
57	traffic increase/danger increase local school and doctor surgery under pressure	7/23/2017 2:42 PM
58	it would render the whole concept of a greenbelt worthless. We need this site for our cemetery extension	7/23/2017 2:31 PM
59	It is too big and in the wrong place. This land was earmarked for the cemetery extension in our local plan	7/23/2017 1:38 PM
60	Local services are already stretched and such a large development would exacerbate this problem. The siting of the cemetery on the far side of the proposed housing places it a long way from the church and it shows unmitigated cheek to hijack the aims of the local development plan by aiming to curtail further development BEYOND the new proposed houses and not next to the church to prevent the building in that area.	7/23/2017 12:30 PM
61	It would undermine the sense of being in a village knowing that most of the residents and living in a small community-part of village life	7/23/2017 12:18 PM
62	Yet more expensive housing which will be bought not by local people, what about young people who have to move from the area due to housing costs.	7/23/2017 12:14 PM
63	Maybe	7/22/2017 8:08 PM
64	As I stated previously, the infrastructure & amenities cannot cope. For example, the local Coop & Post Office has insufficient parking as is.	7/22/2017 4:21 PM
65	I don't think the village has the infrastructure to accommodate any more houses .	7/22/2017 3:46 PM
66	Once 'green belt' protection is over ridden a precedent will have been set. It is likely that adjacent & other fields will then also become vulnreable to development pressures.	7/22/2017 2:11 PM
67	increased pressure on school and shops - but concerned that an increase in either would negatively impact the community and village identity	7/22/2017 1:57 PM
68	Most definitely. The village does not need any more large detached houses, bought by people who do not participate in village life, and who bring little in the way of contribution to the local community. In the main, they will be commuting to Glasgow for work, their children will likely attend fee-paying schools in Glasgow, and their many cars will cause more congestion on our already overstretched roads. This housing does not address the need for housing in Stirling District, for people who wish to work in Stirlingshire.	7/22/2017 12:40 PM
69	Once green belt land is used there will no stopping other applications and the village will not be the village anymore.	7/22/2017 12:32 PM
70	Would become just another large housing scheme and not be part of the village hub - especially if they choose not to include social housing options	7/22/2017 12:14 PM
71	it would extend the boundary of the village significantly and change the demographics completely . 70 houses is in no way a small scale development. As far as I am aware the housing needs as identified in the LDP include the provision of small bungalow style houses as these are needed for older residents and would be best placed within the village centre. The village needs its new cemetery and this site is currently the designated one for the cemetery which would form the border of the village there is already planning permission in place for the devils elbow site and this is close to the shop/post office and GP surgery	7/22/2017 12:08 PM
72	It would expand the boundaries of the village into the surrounding green belt	7/21/2017 6:29 PM
73	Seventy additional houses in a development is more akin to the size of developments seen in the suburbs of cities and not in rural villages. Strathblane and Blanefield do not have the infrastructure and facilities to accommodate such a large development.	7/19/2017 9:04 PM
74	the green belt must be protected or the door will open for applications to be made for the next field and the next and so on.	7/17/2017 7:09 PM
75	The green belt of a village should be preserved	7/17/2017 5:38 PM
76	It's disproportionate, and doesn't meet the needs for genuinely low cost social housing, or sheltered housing for elderly people.	7/15/2017 6:39 PM
77	See answer to nr 4	7/14/2017 5:03 PM
78	Strathblane and Blanefield have grown immensely over the past 60 years with a lot of green belt land being targeted enough is enough	7/14/2017 4:05 PM
79	The type of development does not meet local needs.	7/14/2017 8:20 AM

80	It's a village, not a town. Balfron has seen massive expansion over the years and many longstanding residents feel the village has lost its 'village' identity along the way. Significant investment would be needed in local amenities to prevent it becoming nothing more than a commuter town for Glasgow. The roads are busy enough already.	7/14/2017 12:37 AM
81	The village would no longer be a small village and would lose its charm With a big estate thrown onto the back. It has a small school and a small co op and the infrastructure doesn't support the application	7/13/2017 11:59 PM
82	The scale of the proposal: The impact of the infrastructure and elongating the village envelope would have a detrimental affect on community	7/13/2017 9:54 PM
83	It's a village!!!!	7/13/2017 8:08 PM
84	It would dominate the Eastern approach to Strathblane, already substantially impacted by the CALA development on Campsie Road; it would overwhelm existing village resources such as the primary school and sewage works; and it would prevent location of a vital extension to the cemetery close to the existing cemetery, which is important.	7/13/2017 7:40 PM
85	The essence of our village is in the name 'village' If I wanted to live in a town, I would move to one.	7/13/2017 4:51 PM
86	Strathblane/Blanefield is a relatively small village that is separated from the Glasgow conurbation by a narrow strip of greenbelt land that over the nearly 40 years of my residence here, has been eroded by incremental development of individual sites. The large scale of this proposal and its location would greatly compromise the rural nature of the village and would represent a major step in turning it into another suburb of greater Glasgow.	7/11/2017 9:48 PM
87	The identity and setting of the village has already been compromised to a degree by the Cala development. Any more development and the village will be radically changed, losing its character and despoiling beautiful areas of countryside.	7/10/2017 5:19 PM
88	We do not have the facilities to accommodate that amount of houses and this proposed development encroaches on the Green Belt.	7/10/2017 5:12 PM
89	The size and nature of a proposed development increases the size of the village massively, and takes away the more subtle movement from countryside to village appearance dramatically. It will take away from the church location and the moving of the new cemetery location will hurt those that require it dramatically given how far away any new graveyard will then be located.	7/6/2017 10:55 PM
90	Contravenes LDP	7/4/2017 9:28 PM
91	There has been too much development already. The village has too many people who are not interested in the village. It's just a place to too commute from.	7/4/2017 10:06 AM
92	The village becomes a suburb very quickly	7/3/2017 11:23 PM
93	I would not like to make a decision on this point at this stage. I feel it would depend on the number and type of housing as well as the site.	7/2/2017 7:36 PM
94	The village school, shop, GP and roads will not cope with the additional 70 families.	7/2/2017 9:15 AM
95	My wife and I live opposite the CALA development (H106). She has dementia but still enjoys walking around the village. We obtain great views of open countryside to the west within 100 metres of our house - this will be changed completely by the new development. Similarly when driving into the village from the east the village appearance will be very different, much less rural.	7/1/2017 5:40 PM
96	This is a general comment, and whilst I recognize that there is a requirement for a certain amount of "suitable" housing to be built my observation from a visual perspective is as follows: I have noticed an increasing trend of building very "vanilla" looking developments on the outskirts of small towns and villages. When you drive in you are presented with the same kind (and colour) of relatively densely spaced housing. For Blanefield this is a particular shame since on the other side of the road there is an interesting mix of architecture, and green space between the houses. I think it is similar to the issue that arises where town and city high streets all end looing the same with the same kind of national / multinational chain shops. It sets a precedent which I think is unfortunate. Whilst this is only an indication of what a developer might build, I think it is clear that it will be very similar to other developments of this type.	6/30/2017 2:34 PM
97	A village consists of a community and this development would jeopardise the sense of close community spirit where people know each other. It is simply a step in the wrong direction.	6/29/2017 3:03 PM

98	Green belt land should remain as so. The new cemetery extension is needed and cannot be disregarded but it should not be pushed further away from the church in favour of this huge development having the land nearest the village. We do not need housing as such is proposed. This would simply allow more families into the village from other areas, straining the entire local area and disregarding the actual needs of the village which are mainly starter homes and perhaps sheltered accomadation. This means long time villagers are having to move away in order to find appropriate housing.	6/28/2017 8:03 PM
99	This would change our village dramatically. We do not have the infrastructure to support such a development.	6/28/2017 4:04 PM
100	The village would loose it side ty as a village. Once one group of housing is approved then another will follow and another!	6/28/2017 10:42 AM
101	Desecration of the country landscape on the easter approach to the village. The Cala development was bad enough, but it is of a more modest size.	6/27/2017 9:07 PM
102	See no reason why a modest number of new homes should have an adverse effect. On the contrary, an increase may well assist in supporting/increasing local facilities.	6/27/2017 8:42 PM
103	The size of the development would increase the village by 10%. This would effect the general sustainability of the vilage.	6/27/2017 8:11 PM
104	The village infrastructure is appropriate for the village as it is currently. Things such as the school and sewerage infrastructure is at capacity. Parking around the Cooperative is already problematic.	6/27/2017 5:13 PM
105	Over the years with more people coming in and less villagers remaining we are losing our village feel and starting to become more townish. We need to keep the younger generations of villagers rather than lose them as they can't afford these large homes.	6/26/2017 10:00 PM
106	70 large family homes would have a huge impact on the kind of village we have.	6/26/2017 10:12 AM
107	A development of this size is overblown and unsuitable for this village and is certainly not the kind of development to warrant the sacrifice of Green Belt land.	6/25/2017 11:46 PM
108	It is spreading away from the village and will make the village into a small town.	6/25/2017 9:45 PM
109	Too large an expansion to a very small village	6/25/2017 5:04 PM
110	As stated earlier the village would turn into a soleless town	6/25/2017 2:42 PM
111	This village desperately needs to expand to keep local businesses alive. The proposed site although farmland is not exactly over used and would not affect the local farming community.	6/24/2017 10:04 PM
112	70 houses is a large development. Where will they stop! If this is approved over a green belt this gives them president for further plans. Our local amenities would be stretched and would developers be prepared to support this need.	6/24/2017 8:43 PM
113	It is a village for goodness sake not a town. Fix or extend the housing already here!!!!!!	6/24/2017 8:09 PM
114	The development is "large" as defined by planning regulations. It is out of proportion for the size of the village and will significantly impact the visual identity of the village and the approach to it from the Lennoxtown direction. The development is unlikely to meet needs for local housing for the local community or the Stirling area and is more likely to serve commuters to Glasgow. It will put strain on the already stretched infrastructure in particular primary school and the virtually non existent public transport.	6/24/2017 8:06 PM
115	There is currently an issue with having no real centre to the village and this will be exacerbated by a ribbon development like this.	6/24/2017 7:56 PM
116	The development proposed is enormous and totally out of keeping with the village	6/24/2017 4:53 PM
117	The threat is real with this development and very serious once the principles of the LDP and Green Belt are breached and land-owners and developers see opportunities for capital accumulation.	6/24/2017 4:39 PM
118	I think the identity of the village is being eroded by building a mixture of large expensive houses and housing association houses whereas many children of the village can not find mid range houses for sale thus breaking the continuity of families that makes the soul of a community	6/24/2017 4:10 PM
119	Obviously	6/24/2017 3:57 PM
120	The possibility of stretching the primary school and doctors surgery to cercqcapacity must be considered!	6/24/2017 3:33 PM

121	The village could double in size if the rest of the ground owned by Connel is also given planning permission.	6/24/2017 3:33 PM
122	It would make the village bigger, and open the door for further sprawling expansion. These homes will not address the need for local homes for local people, and are marketed at wealthy incomers who will use the village as a commuter town and not a community.	6/24/2017 2:15 PM
123	Encroaches on farm land and impacts on road accessing village	6/24/2017 1:44 PM
124	Again this is a development proposal which does not feel responsive to local needs - more to Gladman's priorities in terms of business. I am not clear on the changes from the previous proposal - they are not apparent and the community view has not changed from then. The location is extending out of the village which will make it harder for potential new residents to feel part of the village and I foresee an increase in traffic in already stretched areas such as the Coop and school as people will be less likely to walk leading to far more hazardous roads and an increase in pollution. Villagers are justifiably proud of their associations and heritage linked to the village - it is a disservice by Gladman to disregard local views and through their actions imply that they know what is better for a community. Communities need to be empowered through shared dialogue and being listened to - not identified as an area ripe for profit.	6/24/2017 1:29 PM
125	The effect of one site is always limited, although this site is already large. Worse is that the effect of allowing this site would be uncontrollable, as this landowner and others would come forward with more and more applications that would be harder to resist.	6/24/2017 12:47 PM

Q9 Are you in favour of moving the proposed cemetery further from the village, to make way for Gladman’s proposed housing?



Answer Choices	Responses	Count
Yes	4.63%	10
No	91.20%	197
No opinion	4.17%	9
Total		216

#	Please explain	Date
1	I have already been so near to major accident on road since Cala homes were built. People will walk from church to cemetery. If cemetery is further away, accidents more likely. I would not want that on my conscience.	7/28/2017 6:03 PM
2	Should remain within village.	7/27/2017 9:23 PM
3	This is an integral part of a rural community.	7/27/2017 9:13 PM
4	Absolutely not. Hard constraint: Build the promised cemetery now, in the promised location, to prove you care about the village, then we'll think about your planning application for houses.	7/26/2017 11:51 PM
5	Increased distance from the church likely to hinder less mobile elderly mourners as well as seeming more peripheral	7/26/2017 11:28 PM
6	The cemetery should be within easy walking distance of the church and not too far removed for obvious logistical reasons. ie funerals, members of the public (usually elderly) wishing to pay respects etc	7/26/2017 11:21 PM
7	Let's assume those who have suffered bereavements are elderly and may not drive....highly unfair Let's assume residents are emotionally attached to the village and want to be laid to rest in the area they loved, not half way to Lennoxton....highly unfair Simply more evidence of the disrespect of the developers for our local community	7/26/2017 11:18 PM
8	It needs to be near the Church	7/26/2017 11:00 PM
9	Definitely not. The Cemetery needs to be as near the church and existing cemetery as possible. It should not be moved further along the road away from the village.	7/26/2017 10:49 PM
10	1. LDP already negotiated and decided on the location of the cemetery. 2. The residents of Braidgate purchased the houses on the understanding that their properties would border the cemetery, not another MASSIVE housing scheme! 3. Too far from the Church 4. Too far for visitors to walk 5. Where would the cars park??!	7/26/2017 10:39 PM

11	This proposed development would make the cemetery too far for many of the local community to access by anything other than car. Any older or infirm residents and visitors would struggle to walk that far. It will also create a disconnect between the church and the new cemetery and increase traffic along Campsie road.	7/26/2017 10:12 PM
12	I understand the need to expand the cemetery, but do not understand why such a blatant money-making venture should be given priority over the needs of villagers to bury their loved ones in an accessible area.	7/26/2017 7:34 PM
13	We have no strong views on the position of the cemetery.	7/26/2017 4:57 PM
14	The village is small with no real center point, it is not a large move.	7/26/2017 4:25 PM
15	By its nature, it should be as close to the Kirk and the present cemetery as possible, allowing for walking to it	7/26/2017 3:35 PM
16	This would be further away from the church. As a large percentage of mourners are elderly this would involve getting back into cars, travel along Campsie Road and find parking places.	7/26/2017 12:36 PM
17	I believe that it should be made at the original site, as it will create an aspect more sympathetic with the local environment	7/25/2017 10:48 PM
18	Access issue for elderly and/or disabled people especially if they don't have transport. Keeping the agreed site for the cemetery would provide capacity for years to come.	7/25/2017 10:44 PM
19	The cemetery should be closer to the church and the heart of the village not shoved further out.	7/25/2017 9:38 PM
20	The extension needs to be nearer the church.	7/25/2017 8:48 PM
21	Too far for old people to walk. Many visit before or after Sunday services.	7/25/2017 8:42 PM
22	The cemetery extension should be adjacent to the existing, and form part of the natural greenbelt	7/25/2017 7:53 PM
23	Cemetery is needed now, urgently to complete envelope of village to establish green belt boundary.	7/25/2017 5:55 PM
24	The cemetery needs to be within walking distance for residents. The cemetery would have to be enlarged again with that amount of housing	7/25/2017 5:42 PM
25	A cemetery should as far as is reasonably practical, be located as near to the church as possible. As someone who might be looking for a berth there in the not too distant future, I don't think it is advisable to keep moving the proposed extension further and further away from the church itself.	7/25/2017 5:31 PM
26	I believe it was previously agreed that the cemetery would take the ground on which Gladman now propose new houses. I think this agreement should be stuck to.	7/25/2017 4:50 PM
27	I think that the Local Development Plan has spelt out very clearly that we need to defend our Green Belt boundaries.	7/25/2017 3:01 PM
28	For pedestrian access, the closer to the church, the better.	7/25/2017 1:21 PM
29	It's already not going to be adjacent to the church. Moving it further along will make little difference.	7/25/2017 9:32 AM
30	Under no circumstances should this be allowed. Why should the community be penalised for the sake of a builder whose only motive is financial.	7/24/2017 10:00 PM
31	would be beyond walking distance for many mourners	7/24/2017 4:31 PM
32	It is vital the cemetery be reached on foot and remains close to the village and church. It should be an important amenity of peace for many people.	7/24/2017 4:26 PM
33	Mourners are distressed enough without having to walk miles to bury a loved one. Stick to the deal Stirling Council	7/24/2017 4:18 PM
34	Totally undermine community wishes	7/24/2017 4:08 PM
35	I think cemetery should be as close to church as possible. People visit on a regular basis and it is making it further to walk from centre of village.	7/24/2017 4:05 PM
36	The land identified for cemetery already taken over by Cala. This is another plot even further from the church and present burial ground	7/24/2017 4:00 PM
37	It's within walking distance of the church, car parking etc	7/24/2017 3:52 PM
38	much too far for pedestrian access, especially for elderly infirm people	7/24/2017 3:51 PM
39	Cemetery should be as near as possible to church and present cemetery	7/24/2017 3:50 PM

40	Must be as close as possible to the church.	7/24/2017 3:48 PM
41	Unless new parking facilities provided. People with mobility issues or the elderly would be unable to walk the distance to visit graves of loved ones	7/24/2017 3:38 PM
42	Ignores previously agreed LDP.	7/24/2017 3:29 PM
43	It explains itself really!	7/24/2017 3:17 PM
44	The new cemetery site beside the Cala homes is within walking distance from the church. This is very important	7/24/2017 3:09 PM
45	The original proposal defined the requirements of the villagers who were likely to be using this facility	7/24/2017 3:08 PM
46	Cemetery extension should be as near to the church grounds as possible.	7/24/2017 3:06 PM
47	Lack of respect to mourners who would have to "leg it" across the equivalent of two large fields to bury their dead after a service.	7/24/2017 2:50 PM
48	Making it further for family members to visit graves. We observe this happens often and also more dangerous on roads.	7/24/2017 2:46 PM
49	it has to be placed close to the church	7/24/2017 2:34 PM
50	A cemetery needs to be close to the church. Walking distance too far for elderly and disabled	7/24/2017 2:26 PM
51	If the cemetery were to be moved further along Campsie Road it would very difficult for mourners to walk from the church in safety . There would then be a necessity to form a new car park at the new site which I am sure - would not happen.	7/24/2017 1:13 PM
52	as agreed in the local plan	7/23/2017 7:23 PM
53	The cemetery must be close to church and facilities	7/23/2017 4:57 PM
54	nearer to the church is better for the community	7/23/2017 4:48 PM
55	Too far out for the elderly to walk. This cemetery was proposed next to the Cala Development so why should it be moved to suit further Cala developments and before you know it could end up even futher out of Strathblane!!	7/23/2017 3:51 PM
56	this was the agreed site for the cemetery agreed by the community	7/23/2017 3:30 PM
57	The site for the cemetery has already been decided	7/23/2017 3:22 PM
58	the extension should have been opposite the church-Singh's field. Are we a village or a town?	7/23/2017 3:15 PM
59	The plan in the LDP has been agreed by the community and Stirling Council already. Please leave it at that	7/23/2017 2:59 PM
60	There was a clear understanding that our cemetery extension would be next to our new housing development. That is where it should be.	7/23/2017 2:33 PM
61	Ridiculous-cemetery must be close to church	7/23/2017 2:17 PM
62	If the cemetery is put here the current plan is people can walk from the church o it. Moving it further away would require extensive parking for a large funeral as there is no footpath along what can be a busy road that is subject to speeding offences	7/23/2017 1:40 PM
63	See previous comment, but their proposed new site for the cemetery would mean that older residents would be unable to walk from church to cemetery - a real loss of amenity.	7/23/2017 12:32 PM
64	Totally unacceptable and also impractical to have such a distance between the two cemeteries	7/23/2017 12:19 PM
65	There is no public transport in the village that covers Campsie Rd and also no footpath meaning visiting the cemetery is going to be difficult particularly for older people. The cemetery should not be sited on the outskirts but nearer the centre of the community.	7/23/2017 12:14 PM
66	Not convenient in any shape or form.	7/22/2017 4:21 PM
67	Definatly not necessary !	7/22/2017 3:47 PM
68	Stirling's existing planned site for the cemetery extension is sensible & also closes the boundary around this part of the village & provides protection for the Green Belt.	7/22/2017 2:17 PM
69	Again, instead of encouraging and enabling people to walk to the cemetery, more are likely to drive there, thus exacerbating road congestion and environmental damage	7/22/2017 12:41 PM
70	This should be close to the church- within easy walking distance	7/22/2017 12:15 PM


71	those attending funerals by default tend to be older and more infirm - access and parking are essential as part of the cemetery - the ideal situation is that attendees can walk to the cemetery from the church in order to address inequalities and discrimination issues regarding the disabled the current proposed site for the cemetery is best -and was agreed as part of the approval for the previous planing permission granted for the CALA development	7/22/2017 12:11 PM
72	It is already some distance for frail elderly people and people with mobility issues to get from the church to the proposed site.	7/21/2017 6:30 PM
73	Moving the cemetery so far from the village reduces the accessibility of the cemetery and isolates it from facilities within the village, such as the parish church.	7/19/2017 9:06 PM
74	this means that the elderly will be forced to travel much further to visit the cemetery. it has already been moved further out of the village by the Cala development which in my opinion was a travesty.	7/17/2017 7:12 PM
75	Many people who visit a cemetery would find the distance excessive and it would be too far from the church	7/17/2017 5:39 PM
76	The cemetery should be within easy walking distance from the existing cemetery and church - not 2 housing estates away!	7/14/2017 5:04 PM
77	The location was agreed and confirmed. The location of the graveyard is a distinct stop to further development and a clear boundary	7/14/2017 8:21 AM
78	It would be too far from the Kirk and would need its own parking	7/14/2017 8:03 AM
79	Why? How selfish. Just because someone wants to make money doesn't justify everyone else bending over to make way.	7/14/2017 12:38 AM
80	Having a burial ground outwith walking distance is in itself not an issue. However, the proposal, as presented, does not include the provision of footpaths. That aside, the distances make for extreme difficulties and quandaries for people not fully fit. Walk or Taxi or Car.	7/13/2017 9:59 PM
81	Why move it further from the church. When a local funeral takes place most attendees walk. Now they will have to drive to the cemetery. Also when local people want to visit the cemetery to place flowers on the graves they will need transport.	7/13/2017 8:13 PM
82	This would seriously inconvenience villagers, not only by having to walk some distance to visit relatives' graves but by separating the resting places of generations of local people. A cemetery is a vital community facility and if circumstances dictate that an extension has to be provided, it should be as physically close as possible to the established cemetery.	7/13/2017 7:43 PM
83	Dont really want a cemetery extension either.	7/13/2017 4:51 PM
84	Moving the graveyard further from the village would weaken its relationship to the village in general and to the church and existing graveyard in particular.	7/11/2017 9:49 PM
85	Designated Greenbelt should be protected.	7/11/2017 2:15 PM
86	The cemetery extension had already been agreed prior to this proposal. Gladman are cynically trying to undermine local planning democracy. The extension should be built where originally proposed.	7/10/2017 5:20 PM
87	It would mean that old people going to the cemetery would have to walk a lot further and are possibly not able to do that and that also means walking on the main road would be a lot more dangerous for them and it would also be outwith the village.	7/10/2017 5:16 PM
88	See previous answer. Too many additions would need to be made which would not only make the size of graveyard needing increased dramatically (Parking facilities will be required if it is moved further away from the church for instance) which would further ruin the style of the village and its graveyard facilities.	7/6/2017 10:57 PM
89	Proposal in LDP is correct ref proximity to church/village	7/4/2017 9:29 PM
90	Cemetery should be near the Kirk	7/4/2017 10:07 AM
91	It would be too far out	7/4/2017 9:27 AM
92	I realise the proposed cemetery would make it difficult for anyone to walk to it. However I would imagine it more than likely people would drive to the cemetery if the original plan was carried out anyway.	7/2/2017 7:38 PM
93	Most people could walk east from the Church just past the CALA houses to the site of the proposed cemetery but would be more likely to need to drive to a more distant cemetery (especially in the rain!!) Parking may then be an issue.	7/1/2017 5:45 PM

94	I think given that the cemetery was already identified as a requirement, and already part of the local plan, it should take priority over opportunistic development. It is probably another argument showing impact on the character of the village.	6/30/2017 2:38 PM
95	People should be able to visit the cemetery easily, by foot and on a public footpath. It should be within walking distance of the church, for funeral processions, for disabled and elderly folk to visit and tend to graves.	6/28/2017 8:05 PM
96	The cemetery extension should not be moved further away, it should be part of the village.	6/28/2017 4:05 PM
97	It is very convenient where it is.	6/28/2017 10:43 AM
98	Too far from the church and too far for elderly folks to walk needing a short car journey. More car parking needed to accommodate. The existing plot adjacent to Cala was promised by Stirling Council and should be compulsorily purchased if needs be.	6/27/2017 9:09 PM
99	It's only a few yards from the earlier proposal	6/27/2017 8:43 PM
100	I has already been agreed to have the cemetry as close to the church as possible.	6/27/2017 8:12 PM
101	The proximity of the cemetery close to the local church is very important. It must not be moved. If any development is allowed (and I do not believe it should be) it must be built beyond the cemetery.	6/27/2017 5:15 PM
102	In this current climate of ECO and carbon footprints why would we want to create a new cemetery where the use of vehicles is needed and lose cemetery space by having to provide an additional car park.	6/26/2017 10:02 PM
103	The cemetery would be too far away from the church and existing cemetery, and would presumably be further delayed.	6/26/2017 10:13 AM
104	The proposed, oversized, development would be detrimental to the village. Moving of the proposed cemetery further out just to make room for an already unsuitable development is simply another undesirable element.	6/25/2017 11:53 PM
105	It is so far away from the church older people will find it hard to walk the long distance.	6/25/2017 9:46 PM
106	It is really important that the cemetery is as close as possible to the existing cemetery and the church.	6/25/2017 9:11 AM
107	This is a basic need for our village it needs to be near the church if there was some form of development going ahead it should be moved further away from current site not the cemetery.	6/24/2017 8:45 PM
108	The local plan allowed for the placement of a new cemetery in the location of the proposed houses. This was intended to give a hard boundary to the greenbelt. The original,proposed area for the cemetery is much more appropriate being closer to the church, parking, pavements and public transport.	6/24/2017 8:11 PM
109	Older people cxant walk to visit their relatives	6/24/2017 8:10 PM
110	It will be difficult for residents, particularly the elderly,to visit the cemetery if it is further out of the village and further from the church.	6/24/2017 7:58 PM
111	The cemetery should be adjacent to the existing cala development and form a boundary for the village.	6/24/2017 4:54 PM
112	1. It would cause problems for those attending funerals and burials, and for those visiting graves. For many vehicular transport - and attendant car parking - would become necessary. 2. Extending the village envelope in this way opens up the opportunity for further housing application on the north side of Campsie Road.	6/24/2017 4:40 PM
113	Its already at a distance	6/24/2017 4:11 PM
114	It should be within easy walking distance of the church	6/24/2017 3:33 PM
115	I'm in favour of moving the cemetery further from the village. Not necessarily to allow Gladman to build houses.	6/24/2017 2:31 PM
116	It is a ludicrous suggestion. It is far too far a distance for pall bearers to have to carry a coffin and is so far away it would not appear to be connected to the church at all.	6/24/2017 2:16 PM
117	The Connel Estate own a large amount of land around the village, if we are forced to say yes to this application, they will start the same process with other greensite areas	6/24/2017 2:12 PM
118	Many older people cannot drive to distances further afield	6/24/2017 1:45 PM

119	Cemeteries and the remembrance of the dead should be within communities. It should not be made harder for people to visit their loved ones and why should people be laid to rest beyond the borders that they have known. There is also the impact of moving the cemetery further from the church which will impact on the ability of residents to seek solace from the church during their visits to their loved ones.	6/24/2017 1:33 PM
120	the currently proposed site is perfect for the cemetery: walking distance from church and home/village facilities. Moving it introduces the need for greater infrastructure and landscape impact.	6/24/2017 12:47 PM

Q10 What do you think would be the impact of this development on the following services:

Answered: 210 Skipped: 6



Positive Negative No concern

	Positive	Negative	No concern	Total	Weighted Average
--	----------	----------	------------	-------	------------------

Primary School Provision?	5.83% 12	87.38% 180	6.80% 14	206	-0.82
Secondary School provision?	3.63% 7	70.47% 136	25.91% 50	193	-0.67
Pre-school provision?	2.13% 4	79.79% 150	18.09% 34	188	-0.78
Sewerage?	1.51% 3	83.42% 166	15.08% 30	199	-0.82
What else?	5.41% 6	85.59% 95	9.01% 10	111	-0.80
What else?	0.00% 0	81.13% 43	18.87% 10	53	-0.81

#	Comments for "Primary School Provision?"	Date
1	Already inadequate. Close to full capacity. Need a new school.	7/28/2017 6:06 PM
2	School already struggles with numbers.	7/27/2017 9:25 PM
3	School already nearly at capacity	7/27/2017 9:20 PM
4	Pressure on facilities	7/27/2017 9:14 PM
5	Because it is close to full capacity	7/27/2017 9:03 PM
6	More children would probably come to the village with a development of this scale. More children probably creates an (even) better school (assuming the developer funds the required expansion).	7/26/2017 11:55 PM
7	School buildings as well as staff parking already close to maximum	7/26/2017 11:32 PM
8	The village has seen a natural increase in the demographic of young families as the baby boom generation have begun to downsize freeing up housing stock. The net result has seen the primary school become full to the brim so much so classes have had to be composited which is highly unfair on the children and teachers. More houses = more children = larger classes = diminished quality of education.	7/26/2017 11:30 PM
9	Over capacity would be a concern	7/26/2017 11:23 PM
10	Over crowding	7/26/2017 11:07 PM
11	This would put a strain on the resources at the primary school. We do not want to head for composite classes. The current size of the village means we can keep within one class per year age group	7/26/2017 10:59 PM
12	No capacity left	7/26/2017 10:43 PM
13	I understand the nursery and primary are already close to capacity.	7/26/2017 10:18 PM
14	Strathblane Primary School is an excellent school with excellent staff who are already struggling to keep class sizes manageable.	7/26/2017 9:18 PM
15	The school will. It have capacity for the potential number of extra children	7/26/2017 8:25 PM
16	The school has limited capacity, and the location of the school means that some roads are dangerous enough for the children getting to school.	7/26/2017 7:38 PM
17	Increased rolls.	7/26/2017 5:08 PM
18	The school may need to expand, however this is in line with many other schools in Scotland.	7/26/2017 4:29 PM
19	Already operating at near capacity, and with an elderly building	7/26/2017 3:43 PM
20	Strathblane Primary does not have a great deal of availaility.	7/26/2017 12:51 PM
21	This would likely completely fill, if not exceed the schools capacity	7/25/2017 11:06 PM
22	I have heard concerns that the primary school is close to capacity already	7/25/2017 10:50 PM
23	Not sufficient capacity to support such a large development	7/25/2017 10:44 PM
24	Primary school now near capacity	7/25/2017 8:52 PM
25	The school is already in need of investment. It would really struggle to accommodate a potential 70 additional families.	7/25/2017 8:20 PM

26	School is already virtually at full capacity	7/25/2017 7:58 PM
27	All following items dealt with within previous questions	7/25/2017 5:57 PM
28	School is at pupil limit already.	7/25/2017 5:45 PM
29	The School is already an outdated facility in need of major work if not bulldozing and starting again. I say this as one of the first class in P1 when the school first opened having started P1 in Blane Primary School and finishing it off in Strathblane Primary School.	7/25/2017 5:40 PM
30	Almost full to capacity	7/25/2017 5:16 PM
31	It could possibly overcrowd the primary school.	7/25/2017 4:50 PM
32	Our Primary School would be challenged by increased numbers of children. Not to mention the overdue need for a new school.	7/25/2017 3:04 PM
33	The present primary school would require a new building to cope with increased numbers	7/25/2017 1:21 PM
34	more pupils and children in the village is good	7/25/2017 9:33 AM
35	The primary school is already lacking in space.	7/24/2017 10:53 PM
36	More classes, larger class sizes, lack of suitable accommodation	7/24/2017 10:07 PM
37	all schools need children	7/24/2017 4:34 PM
38	Already at capacity.	7/24/2017 4:33 PM
39	School at limits now	7/24/2017 4:21 PM
40	it is already at full capacity	7/24/2017 4:18 PM
41	Depends on the type of houses. Will they be houses for families.	7/24/2017 4:12 PM
42	adverse impact on rural upbringing	7/24/2017 4:11 PM
43	The schools student population is already at the upper end of the range for a good primary education service	7/24/2017 3:58 PM
44	Expected 10% increase in population. School almost full already.	7/24/2017 3:57 PM
45	nearly at capacity	7/24/2017 3:54 PM
46	Overcrowding	7/24/2017 3:54 PM
47	Existing school in an ideal site. School already on the small size for the number of pupils. Gym is small for classes of 30+	7/24/2017 3:44 PM
48	Capacity already limited.	7/24/2017 3:23 PM
49	school would be overrun	7/24/2017 3:20 PM
50	Strathblane Primary is a wonderful school but is at full capacity. It could not accommodate Gladmans proposal	7/24/2017 3:15 PM
51	Our primary school is already not fit for pupils and there would definitely be an increase of pupils	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
52	School would be unable to cope with roughly 100-150 extra children.	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
53	Already almost at capacity I believe. Buildings also aging	7/24/2017 2:57 PM
54	Is building able to cope with increases numbers?	7/24/2017 2:56 PM
55	capacity	7/24/2017 2:39 PM
56	school would need to be enlarged	7/24/2017 2:29 PM
57	Existing school is now on it's last legs and should be renewed.	7/24/2017 1:18 PM
58	Not enough capacity.	7/23/2017 10:05 PM
59	already creaking	7/23/2017 7:25 PM
60	school too small	7/23/2017 4:59 PM
61	school already at maximum	7/23/2017 4:51 PM
62	strain class sizes	7/23/2017 4:40 PM
63	School is at full capacity at the moment	7/23/2017 3:52 PM
64	We would need a new one	7/23/2017 3:18 PM

65	school almost at capacity. Older building as it is not suitable	7/23/2017 3:06 PM
66	already near capacity	7/23/2017 2:36 PM
67	lack of spaces	7/23/2017 2:21 PM
68	It would safeguard our local primary school in the future but additional classrooms and other improvements would be required to cope.	7/23/2017 1:51 PM
69	current building needs to be replaced urgently-more pupils would make matters worse	7/23/2017 12:23 PM
70	School too small and class sizes would have to increase - more pressure on teachers	7/23/2017 11:43 AM
71	I don't know if there is room in the school for more children. i have heard there isn't. But i don't know.	7/22/2017 8:14 PM
72	The junior school is almost full to capacity !	7/22/2017 3:52 PM
73	The existing outdated school buildings are already at capacity. A new school or buildings would be required	7/22/2017 2:34 PM
74	school not big enough but increased numbers will affect the dynamic	7/22/2017 2:00 PM
75	Primary School may need to expand initially, but then the majority of children in the proposed housing are likely to attend private schools in Glasgow area, thus making education planning (particularly at the secondary stage)more problematic.	7/22/2017 12:51 PM
76	The school is already full	7/22/2017 12:36 PM
77	the primary schools is currently almost at capacity and the impact of the previous CALA development not fully assessed as yet In this current climate of austerity and council cuts extension to the school is extremely unlikely	7/22/2017 12:27 PM
78	I understand that the school is already struggling for space	7/22/2017 12:16 PM
79	Almost full already	7/21/2017 6:34 PM
80	The primary school is already at capacity and could not accommodate the number of additional children that this development would attract. The Strathblane Out of School Care could not cope with the additional demand for places.	7/19/2017 9:10 PM
81	could mean 100+children needing to be schooled which the school could not accommodate.	7/17/2017 7:16 PM
82	Could mean more than 100 children having to be accommodated at the school which would not be possible	7/17/2017 5:44 PM
83	The primary school has reached maximum capacity	7/14/2017 5:14 PM
84	School too small to cope with extra numbers moving in on this scale.	7/14/2017 3:14 PM
85	A new school is urgently needed.	7/14/2017 10:40 AM
86	Increase class size	7/14/2017 9:38 AM
87	It may increase the school roll but there us likely to be a portion of families who will attend private school. I don't know the answer to this.	7/14/2017 8:33 AM
88	The school does not have enough capacity for an extra development of this scale	7/14/2017 8:19 AM
89	Not aware of current situation enough to comment on PS.	7/14/2017 12:42 AM
90	My understanding is that the current role, while not totally full would be overwhelmed by the extra families of such a large development	7/13/2017 10:05 PM
91	We are told that the school is presently at full capacity. Stirling Council have been unable to find the funding to provide a new, larger school. So the existing one will have to meet community needs and the proposed new development risks adding an overwhelming number of new pupils.	7/13/2017 7:50 PM
92	It is my understanding that the local primary school is already near capacity.	7/11/2017 9:55 PM
93	Local Primary School does not have capacity to include large scale development of 70 houses.	7/11/2017 2:22 PM
94	The school is struggling to cope at the moment	7/10/2017 5:26 PM
95	School is close to capacity and not in especially good condition. New development would seriously strain resources.	7/10/2017 5:24 PM
96	Possibly bigger classes	7/4/2017 10:12 AM

97	I wouldn't say I have no concern but if new housing meant the school couldn't cope with any additional children then surely Stirling Council would have a responsibility to take this into consideration when considering the application. Or am I being nieve	7/2/2017 7:47 PM
98	The school doesn't have the capacity for more pupils and it's an old building.	7/2/2017 12:19 PM
99	I cannot comment as I have no involvement with primary school	6/30/2017 2:43 PM
100	The primary school is seriously in need of replacement and adding to pupil numbers will just exacerbate the current problems	6/29/2017 3:09 PM
101	The school is already very full, it couldn't cope with all the extra pupils from this development.	6/28/2017 4:09 PM
102	It would put too high a demand on the school numbers and perhaps mean some children whose family have been here a long time would not get in.	6/28/2017 10:47 AM
103	The primary school is in desperate need for expansion and further families in the local community will further increase the need for this to happen	6/28/2017 9:39 AM
104	I understand the school is near capacity now and certainly inadequate as is.	6/27/2017 9:18 PM
105	Might add weight to pressure on local/central government to address the appalling state of the local primary school	6/27/2017 8:45 PM
106	School would have to be extended or anew one built and would effect the small village school feel which people move to a village for.	6/27/2017 8:17 PM
107	It is already struggling to cope with existing numbers.	6/27/2017 5:32 PM
108	The school is almost at full capacity. Redevelopment of the school has been promised for more than 20 years and has still not taken place	6/27/2017 3:51 PM
109	Already full	6/26/2017 10:06 PM
110	The primary school currently has some space but I do not believe has anywhere near enough space to accommodate the potential number of new children in a large development of that size.	6/26/2017 10:18 AM
111	The Primary School is I believe near capacity and is an older building.	6/26/2017 12:28 AM
112	Primary school is nearly at capacity.	6/25/2017 9:49 PM
113	I believe it's oversubscribed already.	6/25/2017 3:48 PM
114	Full already	6/25/2017 2:44 PM
115	School is almost at breaking point now having to provide for a second nursery class.	6/25/2017 1:19 PM
116	Class sizes are just right as stands and the community aspect to the school is its charm.	6/25/2017 12:06 AM
117	School is under capacity by 50(ish) pupils so could easily take the estimated 10% increase. This would give them 7 teachers and extra funding.	6/24/2017 11:09 PM
118	Split classes increased work load for teachers. It's a small school a large scale development would put too much pressure on the school.	6/24/2017 9:01 PM
119	The primary school is already full.	6/24/2017 8:18 PM
120	Need more classrooms. More building, smaller playing field	6/24/2017 8:16 PM
121	The school does not have the capacity to cope with a large number of extra children.	6/24/2017 8:08 PM
122	More children will require more school places and teachers and possibly result in larger classroom sizes	6/24/2017 4:57 PM
123	Short run pressure. Significant capital investment would be needed.	6/24/2017 4:41 PM
124	Overload primary and there is limited early years coverage	6/24/2017 4:16 PM
125	I do not know the current capacity of the primary school so is just a guess	6/24/2017 4:04 PM
126	Already nearing capacity	6/24/2017 4:00 PM
127	They would probably need composite classes, and generally class sizes would increase.	6/24/2017 3:38 PM
128	Need the facts and figures investigated and the developer responsible for mitigating against any negative impact!	6/24/2017 3:35 PM
129	The school would need redeveloped and expanded.	6/24/2017 2:39 PM
130	Not enough spaces in Strathblane Primary School or the local Out of School Care to accommodate children from a further 70 households	6/24/2017 2:20 PM

131	E school desperately needs refurbishment, additional pupil numbers are unlikely to push this forward and the redevelopment of many other schools has led to smaller physical classrooms. This would be more likely to happen. Also, with the added distance families will be more likely to Drive which will impact on safety and pollution around the school.	6/24/2017 1:38 PM
132	Would have to build new school which has now been promised for 16 years!	6/24/2017 1:19 PM
#	Comments for "Secondary School provision?"	Date
1	Danger of being picked up on already dangerous road.	7/28/2017 6:06 PM
2	School already struggles with numbers.	7/27/2017 9:25 PM
3	School already nearly at capacity	7/27/2017 9:20 PM
4	Pressure on facilities	7/27/2017 9:14 PM
5	As above. Proposed layout needs amendment for much better "walk to bus stop" provision.	7/26/2017 11:55 PM
6	Balfron has seen significant residential developments in recent years = more children = bigger class sizes = more strain on services	7/26/2017 11:30 PM
7	Over capacity?	7/26/2017 11:23 PM
8	Further busing would cause traffic problems	7/26/2017 11:07 PM
9	Already 3 buses are needed every day to the High school, and they are full. Does this mean another bus required. Not good for the environment	7/26/2017 10:59 PM
10	Capacity issues and also additional buses needed to take children to and from the campus	7/26/2017 10:43 PM
11	As above.	7/26/2017 10:18 PM
12	Class sizes at Balfron High School are at or above the recommended limits set by the Scottish Government.	7/26/2017 9:18 PM
13	As with the primary school, there would be an impact upon the school roll, together with the environmental impact of having more buses on the school route.	7/26/2017 5:08 PM
14	Also operating at close to capacity	7/26/2017 3:43 PM
15	Balfron High is already at full capacity.	7/26/2017 12:51 PM
16	Presently children have to travel by bus to Balfron	7/25/2017 8:52 PM
17	Significant increase in numbers attending	7/25/2017 7:58 PM
18	Whilst a modern an improved facility since I attended, the building must have a capacity limit and although not as critical as the local primary, I would imagine that it itself may struggle to cope with the increased footfall.	7/25/2017 5:40 PM
19	Secondary school provision in Balfron is already stretched.	7/25/2017 3:04 PM
20	more pupils and children in the village is good	7/25/2017 9:33 AM
21	As above	7/24/2017 10:07 PM
22	Balfron	7/24/2017 4:21 PM
23	an increase in numbers heading to Balfron	7/24/2017 4:18 PM
24	Again depends what type of housing is built.	7/24/2017 4:12 PM
25	increased traffic	7/24/2017 4:11 PM
26	As above. Numbers would impact from P7.	7/24/2017 3:57 PM
27	Don't know	7/24/2017 3:54 PM
28	Overcrowding	7/24/2017 3:54 PM
29	Class sizes	7/24/2017 3:44 PM
30	Capacity already limited	7/24/2017 3:23 PM
31	not enough of	7/24/2017 3:20 PM
32	Again the likelihood of more pupils and the transporting of these pupils to Balfron	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
33	Secondary school would be unable to cope with extra children.	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
34	Excellent local school - could be damaged by extra demands	7/24/2017 2:57 PM
35	More bussing of pupils. How green is that?	7/24/2017 2:56 PM

36	capacity	7/24/2017 2:39 PM
37	more buses required	7/24/2017 2:29 PM
38	Not enough capacity	7/23/2017 10:05 PM
39	more need for transport	7/23/2017 7:25 PM
40	school maybe new but already near maximum	7/23/2017 4:51 PM
41	extra bus seats to Balfron	7/23/2017 4:40 PM
42	lad of spaces, distance to walk to school bus stops	7/23/2017 2:21 PM
43	My own children attended Balfron when the portacabins overwhelmed the school land thought the education provided was excellent. After much local effort a new school was built and this will now require additional classrooms as all the local villages grow.	7/23/2017 1:51 PM
44	As above	7/22/2017 8:14 PM
45	Even more pupils would have to be driven to school or take a bus .	7/22/2017 3:52 PM
46	I don't have sufficient information on Secondary School arrangements	7/22/2017 2:34 PM
47	see above	7/22/2017 12:51 PM
48	Balfron High is also highly populated and the bus service to it and cost to pupils for attending extra curricular activities is challenging -again this may lead to inequalities	7/22/2017 12:27 PM
49	Not sure about capacity of this	7/21/2017 6:34 PM
50	There are already issues with capacity at Balfron Secondary which would be made worse by this development.	7/19/2017 9:10 PM
51	as above	7/17/2017 7:16 PM
52	As above	7/17/2017 5:44 PM
53	Not in possession of enough facts to comment	7/14/2017 5:14 PM
54	Same as above.	7/14/2017 3:14 PM
55	Increase class size	7/14/2017 9:38 AM
56	The school is already bursting at the seams!	7/14/2017 8:33 AM
57	Balfron High school is already at/near capacity and with planned expansion in other villages there's no way it's coping with additional unplanned pressure.	7/14/2017 12:42 AM
58	My understanding is that Balfron High is already very pressured for places	7/13/2017 10:05 PM
59	While Balfron High School is also pretty full, it should be able to cope with a small-ish number of additional pupils. Given the likely cost of houses in the proposed development, it's likely that some children will go to school in Glasgow.	7/13/2017 7:50 PM
60	No guarantee of places at Balfron High as seems to be pushed to capacity already.	7/13/2017 4:55 PM
61	I do not know the situation at Balfron school.	7/11/2017 9:55 PM
62	Balfron High does not have capacity to include large scale development of 70 houses.	7/11/2017 2:22 PM
63	The Balfron High School is overloaded as it is and it would also put an added strain on the buses	7/10/2017 5:26 PM
64	I am not in a position to comment on whether the development would raise any issues for Balfron High.	7/10/2017 5:24 PM
65	More school buses	7/4/2017 10:12 AM
66	Can't really comment on this aspect	7/2/2017 7:47 PM
67	Not sure of the current numbers/capacity of the relevant secondary schools	7/2/2017 12:04 PM
68	Local facilities already stretched and would need to be considerably expanded to cope with up to 70 additional families.v	7/1/2017 12:55 PM
69	I cannot comment as I have no involvement with secondary school	6/30/2017 2:43 PM
70	Again it would be stretching an already stretched school.	6/28/2017 4:09 PM
71	As above	6/28/2017 10:47 AM
72	I understand this is also at capacity.	6/27/2017 9:18 PM

73	Might have an impact on Balfron High	6/27/2017 8:17 PM
74	Its current size is appropriate and it offers a very good outcome based upon its current size and nature	6/27/2017 5:32 PM
75	Also almost at full capacity. In addition, many more new houses have been built in Balfron by Cala and more are planned. Where are all these pupils going to go?	6/27/2017 3:51 PM
76	Almost full	6/26/2017 10:06 PM
77	Same as above - Balfron High is not at capacity currently but to my knowledge there may not be enough capacity for a huge development like this, on top of all the existing developments going on (mainly in Balfron itself).	6/26/2017 10:18 AM
78	Secondary school is nearly at capacity	6/25/2017 9:49 PM
79	Don't know enough to comment	6/25/2017 3:48 PM
80	Over crowding.	6/25/2017 1:19 PM
81	Balfron is also having to allow for small developments through the catchment one as large as 70 houses is unexpected.	6/25/2017 12:06 AM
82	We live on the outskirts of the catchment area for Balfron if there is a large influx of children this may mean locals might not get their own kids into their high school.	6/24/2017 9:01 PM
83	Further public transport would be required to provide transport to Balfron or additional traffic would be generated in transporting pupils into school in Glasgow.	6/24/2017 8:18 PM
84	More bussing busier roads, congestion	6/24/2017 8:16 PM
85	BHS is almost at capacity and will be unable to accommodate many more children.	6/24/2017 8:08 PM
86	More children will require more school places and teachers and possibly result in larger classroom sizes	6/24/2017 4:57 PM
87	School currently overstretched.	6/24/2017 4:41 PM
88	Seriously overload when taken in concert with other proposals	6/24/2017 4:16 PM
89	Probably mean more buses and cars leaving the village each morning and returning in the afternoon	6/24/2017 4:04 PM
90	No Sec School in village so little impact	6/24/2017 4:00 PM
91	Balfron high will not be able to cope with all the new houses being built in it's catchment area.	6/24/2017 3:38 PM
92	Need the facts and figures investigated and the developer responsible for mitigating against any negative impact!	6/24/2017 3:35 PM
93	Balfron high is at capacity, it would need expanding or another built due to this development and others in the area.	6/24/2017 2:39 PM
94	Increased numbers putting strain on the provision.	6/24/2017 1:38 PM
#	Comments for "Pre-school provision?"	Date
1	School already struggles with numbers.	7/27/2017 9:25 PM
2	Do not know enough about pre school provision	7/27/2017 9:20 PM
3	Pressure on facilities	7/27/2017 9:14 PM
4	Don't know	7/26/2017 11:55 PM
5	As above	7/26/2017 11:32 PM
6	As above	7/26/2017 11:30 PM
7	Again, over capacity	7/26/2017 11:23 PM
8	I have no knowledge on Pre-school	7/26/2017 10:59 PM
9	No capacity left	7/26/2017 10:43 PM
10	as above.	7/26/2017 10:18 PM
11	Insufficient infrastructure.	7/26/2017 9:18 PM
12	The service will suffer as the above education facilities.	7/26/2017 5:08 PM
13	You do not have an option to say I am not informed enough to make a comment.	7/26/2017 4:29 PM

14	A/a	7/26/2017 3:43 PM
15	Limited pre-school facilities exist as it is	7/25/2017 11:06 PM
16	Potential for significant pressure on local suppliers	7/25/2017 10:50 PM
17	Again capacity	7/25/2017 10:44 PM
18	Children have to make their way through existing every morning.	7/25/2017 8:52 PM
19	Both schools are needing to expand at the moment.	7/25/2017 8:43 PM
20	The school is already in need of investment. It would really struggle to accommodate a potential 70 additional families.	7/25/2017 8:20 PM
21	Village nursery near full capacity, and their is a lack of alternatives already in the village	7/25/2017 7:58 PM
22	As above	7/25/2017 5:45 PM
23	Similar comments to that apportioned to the Primary School. I am aware that SOSC have limited capacity for their activities due to building constraints.	7/25/2017 5:40 PM
24	There are already only a few childminders, and local nurseries - it may well increase competition for places.	7/25/2017 4:50 PM
25	more pupils and children in the village is good	7/25/2017 9:33 AM
26	As above	7/24/2017 10:07 PM
27	Already at capacity.	7/24/2017 4:33 PM
28	Outwith our age bracket	7/24/2017 4:27 PM
29	Are there enough places now let alone with a potential to more families	7/24/2017 4:21 PM
30	The type of housing which has been built recently is so expensive there are few young families .	7/24/2017 4:12 PM
31	adverse impact on rural upbringing	7/24/2017 4:11 PM
32	already stretched	7/24/2017 3:58 PM
33	Too many children for available places.	7/24/2017 3:57 PM
34	At full capacity	7/24/2017 3:54 PM
35	Problems giving all entitled children a place	7/24/2017 3:44 PM
36	The nursery again is at full capacity-surely a 10% increase is not possible	7/24/2017 3:15 PM
37	would put extra pressure on this facility	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
38	Don't know current available services other than fun hut.	7/24/2017 2:56 PM
39	capacity	7/24/2017 2:39 PM
40	more staff more accommodation	7/24/2017 2:29 PM
41	Not enough capacity	7/23/2017 10:05 PM
42	already at capacity	7/23/2017 7:25 PM
43	strain on already oversubscribed places	7/23/2017 4:40 PM
44	Strathblane nursery has operating at maximum or very close to it in recent years. anymore children could not be accommodated meaning kids would either miss out on pre-school education or have to travel to another nursery as far afield as Stirling or Fintry	7/23/2017 3:06 PM
45	full to capacity	7/23/2017 2:21 PM
46	We need better and larger premises for nursery provision and afterschool care too. There is already increased demand due to changes in the amount of preschool provision required by government.	7/23/2017 1:51 PM
47	again facilities could not cope at the moment	7/23/2017 12:23 PM
48	Already full	7/23/2017 11:43 AM
49	Same	7/22/2017 8:14 PM
50	I believe the pre school provision is already struggling for space	7/22/2017 2:34 PM
51	as above	7/22/2017 2:00 PM
52	Would likely put pressure on the provision of pre-school places	7/22/2017 12:51 PM

53	who would provide the resources for an increase in numbers ?	7/22/2017 12:27 PM
54	Facilities already stretched	7/21/2017 6:34 PM
55	as above	7/17/2017 7:16 PM
56	As above	7/17/2017 5:44 PM
57	Not in possession of enough facts to comment	7/14/2017 5:14 PM
58	Ditto	7/14/2017 3:14 PM
59	Don't know	7/14/2017 8:33 AM
60	There's little that I'm aware of. Maybe more candidates would allow a business to start up.	7/14/2017 12:42 AM
61	no comment	7/13/2017 10:05 PM
62	This is a stretched resource at present, and funding is always difficult to find. Adding a substantial number of new children would require extra funding - and the council is unlikely to be able to provide this given the general local government funding climate.	7/13/2017 7:50 PM
63	I do not know what the situation is regarding current pre-school provision.	7/11/2017 9:55 PM
64	Local primary school nursery does not have capacity to include large scale development of 70 houses.	7/11/2017 2:22 PM
65	There is a waiting list already without an added strain	7/10/2017 5:26 PM
66	I suspect facilities in this area are already under strain.	7/10/2017 5:24 PM
67	No capacity.	7/2/2017 12:19 PM
68	Similar to above	7/1/2017 12:55 PM
69	I cannot comment as I have no involvement with pre-school provision	6/30/2017 2:43 PM
70	The same problem as above exists for this sector as well	6/29/2017 3:09 PM
71	This would reduce the amount of places available in the nursery school, they don't have the space or staff to cope with an influx of this many children.	6/28/2017 4:09 PM
72	As above	6/28/2017 10:47 AM
73	Inadequate now and would only get worse.	6/27/2017 9:18 PM
74	Same comments as primary school provision.	6/27/2017 8:17 PM
75	Local groups currently operate adequately and neither need, nor would benefit from significantly greater numbers.	6/27/2017 5:32 PM
76	Pre school provision is at Strathblane Primary. See previous comments	6/27/2017 3:51 PM
77	Longer waiting lists	6/26/2017 10:06 PM
78	The nursery is already bursting at the seams - certainly a couple of years ago there were insufficient spaces to take all the 3-4 years.	6/26/2017 10:18 AM
79	As above.	6/25/2017 9:49 PM
80	Don't know enough to comment	6/25/2017 3:48 PM
81	Few places available	6/25/2017 2:44 PM
82	Primary school not adequate.	6/25/2017 1:19 PM
83	Also current provision is perfect for number of children in the village as stands.	6/25/2017 12:06 AM
84	a large development may include a large influx of children so locals may find they are unable to their own children in	6/24/2017 9:01 PM
85	Insufficient local provision afor present.	6/24/2017 8:18 PM
86	Too many kids who can't have a chance to form relationship s	6/24/2017 8:16 PM
87	The accommodation available will make it difficult to expand current nursery provision.	6/24/2017 8:08 PM
88	I think there is already a shortage of pre-school places	6/24/2017 4:57 PM
89	Very limited capacity already and no facilities to expand	6/24/2017 4:16 PM
90	As above - people make their own arrangements	6/24/2017 4:00 PM
91	Need the facts and figures investigated and the developer responsible for mitigating against any negative impact!	6/24/2017 3:35 PM

92	Currently the nursery at the school is at capacity so another nursery will be needed.	6/24/2017 2:39 PM
93	Not enough spaces in Strathblane Primary School or the local Out of School Care to accommodate children from a further 70 households	6/24/2017 2:20 PM
94	With the Government move to extended hours and flexibility of provisions there is already a strain on provisions. Additional numbers will naturally make this more challenging.	6/24/2017 1:38 PM
#	Comments for "Sewerage?"	Date
1	Close to capacity	7/28/2017 6:06 PM
2	Already nearing capacity	7/27/2017 9:25 PM
3	Already at capacity.	7/27/2017 9:20 PM
4	Pressure on facilities	7/27/2017 9:14 PM
5	Because it is close to full capacity	7/27/2017 9:03 PM
6	Don't know although the SEPA objection (online) shows related concerns	7/26/2017 11:55 PM
7	As per previous comments. Current housing stock in the village was largely built in the mid 70's....what age is the present sewerage infrastructure? Can in cope with additional volumes?	7/26/2017 11:30 PM
8	Same, over capacity	7/26/2017 11:23 PM
9	Current use is already at capacity	7/26/2017 11:07 PM
10	This would be a massive increase in the strain on the Sewerage system, considering the proposed development site is as far from the sewerage works. Sounds like they are proposing adding pumping station - but this large volume of additional sewerage still has to be fed through existing infrastructure which is not designed for the larger volume	7/26/2017 10:59 PM
11	Existing system would struggle to cope with potentially 70 more houses	7/26/2017 10:43 PM
12	Again I understand that the addition of so many new houses would put exceptional strain on the system in place.	7/26/2017 10:18 PM
13	Insufficient capacity.	7/26/2017 9:18 PM
14	It is improbable that the presently installed system will adequately accomodate such an increase in population that 70 new homes will introduce.	7/26/2017 5:08 PM
15	I am not sure what the mechanics of the current provision are therefore I am unable to comment	7/26/2017 4:29 PM
16	Where would the extra capacity be sited? Would Gladman or successors be responsible for costs?	7/26/2017 3:43 PM
17	There are already issues in the village about sewage. I feel this development could overload the system	7/26/2017 12:51 PM
18	At capacity	7/25/2017 10:44 PM
19	Services believed to be near capacity.	7/25/2017 8:52 PM
20	Frequent localised road flooding attests to this already being clise to capacity	7/25/2017 7:58 PM
21	Did Cala not have to site pumps for sewerage and drainage?	7/25/2017 5:45 PM
22	The sewerage works were built to accommodate the needs of a much smaller number of residents. I am no expert, but I am led to believe that it may struggle to cope with the increase in requirements needed for this size of development.	7/25/2017 5:40 PM
23	At moment, close to capacity	7/25/2017 5:16 PM
24	Not entirely sure of the answer to this - but we have had a few problems with raw sewage leaking into our garden over the last few years, due to old systems not being updated. If the new houses are going to be adding to this problem, without anything being improved, I would be concerned of a negative impact.	7/25/2017 4:50 PM
25	An increase in the population would increase the use of our sewerage scheme which is already at full capacity	7/25/2017 3:04 PM
26	Don't know but it is a big development.	7/25/2017 9:33 AM
27	Current system only suitable for current needs	7/24/2017 10:07 PM
28	River Blane overloaded	7/24/2017 4:34 PM
29	At capacity. Might endanger water quality of the Blane.	7/24/2017 4:33 PM

30	Our. Properties already had problems when Cala houses built	7/24/2017 4:27 PM
31	Sewage system at its limits too	7/24/2017 4:21 PM
32	Sewage provision is at its maximum at the moment.	7/24/2017 4:12 PM
33	significant increase in waste	7/24/2017 4:11 PM
34	i am told the village sewerage system is nearing capacity	7/24/2017 3:58 PM
35	Need I explain!! More waste etc.	7/24/2017 3:57 PM
36	Already at capacity	7/24/2017 3:54 PM
37	Already a very old sewerage system. Unsure if existing could cope. Disruptive to householders if new system/upgrade required	7/24/2017 3:44 PM
38	System already at capacity	7/24/2017 3:31 PM
39	waste water is at full capacity	7/24/2017 3:15 PM
40	extra pressure on old sewers which can barely cope just now	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
41	Considerable impact on sewerage facilities.	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
42	I do not have utter faith in Scottish water or the drainage system	7/24/2017 2:57 PM
43	It looks as though they have plant on site- SUDS basin. Sewerage in Campsie Rd blocked constantly.	7/24/2017 2:56 PM
44	local sewerage and water services would require significant enlargement	7/24/2017 2:39 PM
45	new sewers would need to be built or old sewers increased in size	7/24/2017 2:29 PM
46	The village was told some years ago that the present sewage system was working at capacity , since then there have been numerous new houses built including the Cala development.	7/24/2017 1:18 PM
47	Not enough capacity to cope with large scale development	7/23/2017 10:05 PM
48	see above	7/23/2017 7:25 PM
49	extra houses=extra facilities=extra finance	7/23/2017 4:51 PM
50	extra demand on strained facility	7/23/2017 4:40 PM
51	Village expanded already. Infrastructure not in place	7/23/2017 3:06 PM
52	We already have had substantial work to cope with the Cala development	7/23/2017 2:46 PM
53	already near capacity	7/23/2017 2:36 PM
54	could present system cope	7/23/2017 2:21 PM
55	The local sewerage works does not have sufficient capacity to cope with such a large development and we are very early in the drainage into rivers and streams.	7/23/2017 1:51 PM
56	Sewerage has suffered from blockages and the local treatment centre has had overflows into the Blane, causing contamination. Scottish Water says that capacity is close to maximum.	7/23/2017 12:37 PM
57	great disruption during previous development for nearby residents	7/23/2017 12:23 PM
58	I believe there is no capacity for more houses.	7/22/2017 8:14 PM
59	Again I'm sure that everything in the village is running at max capacity , and probably needs updating .	7/22/2017 3:52 PM
60	I should imagine the local sewerage works would require extension & upgrading to cope with the substantial increased loadings	7/22/2017 2:34 PM
61	current system at its limit	7/22/2017 2:00 PM
62	There are already problems with sewerage in the village additional housing would exacerbate the problems	7/22/2017 12:36 PM
63	I am aware that there were issues with the connection of the sewage for the CALA estate. I live in Dunglass view and our road was dug up on three separate occasions for a vastly extended period to that of which had been advised in order for the sewage to be connected - I am not clear as to what the survey of the capacity for increased sewage is or if this has been carried out ?	7/22/2017 12:27 PM
64	Already had Cala development. Our toby was blocked by this twice and had to get plumber and Scottish Water out to clear it.	7/21/2017 6:34 PM

65	When I consider the work involved to provide this for the Cala development I would imagine that this would cause huge problems	7/17/2017 5:44 PM
66	The current system is already struggling	7/15/2017 10:44 AM
67	Not in possession of enough facts to comment	7/14/2017 5:14 PM
68	Ditto	7/14/2017 3:14 PM
69	Already have problems with sewerage	7/14/2017 9:38 AM
70	Don't know enough about it.	7/14/2017 8:33 AM
71	not enough capacity for a development of this scale	7/14/2017 8:19 AM
72	70 additional houses is going to need some upgrades.	7/14/2017 12:42 AM
73	The SW web site indicated there is insufficient capacity for the proposal	7/13/2017 10:05 PM
74	We are told that the present facility is at full capacity. Where would be funding come from to expand it?	7/13/2017 7:50 PM
75	It is my understanding that the local sewerage system is already near capacity.	7/11/2017 9:55 PM
76	Scottish Water do not have capacity to include surface/sewage drainage/treatment from large scale development of 70 houses.	7/11/2017 2:22 PM
77	The Sewerage system wouldn't cope without adding anymore on	7/10/2017 5:26 PM
78	System is already close to capacity.	7/10/2017 5:24 PM
79	The sewage works are under strain at the moment and will need to be expanded	7/4/2017 10:12 AM
80	Again I don't know the extent of sewage drainage in the village.	7/2/2017 7:47 PM
81	Couldn't cope with more houses.	7/2/2017 12:19 PM
82	Already near full capacity.	7/1/2017 5:55 PM
83	The scale of the development is clearly going to have an impact	6/30/2017 2:43 PM
84	Nearby residents including ourselves suffered lengthy disruption during the recent housing development and this would be even worse.	6/29/2017 3:09 PM
85	Would put more strain on existing sewerage and who would pay for upgrade?	6/28/2017 10:47 AM
86	Near capacity already	6/27/2017 9:18 PM
87	Already at capacity and would need upgrading.	6/27/2017 8:17 PM
88	This is already at capacity and like to struggle with any further significant development.	6/27/2017 5:32 PM
89	Again, so many more families without regard to infrastructure	6/27/2017 3:51 PM
90	Close to capacity	6/26/2017 10:06 PM
91	I understand the existing sewerage may not be able to cope with a huge addition of houses.	6/26/2017 10:18 AM
92	I believe there is only a small spare capacity which this proposed expansion would exceed.	6/26/2017 12:28 AM
93	The sewer system might not take the extra waste.	6/25/2017 9:49 PM
94	Already problems in very wet weather	6/25/2017 3:48 PM
95	At capacity at present	6/25/2017 2:44 PM
96	Almost at full capacity	6/25/2017 1:19 PM
97	There has been enough disruption to toads etc without more	6/25/2017 12:06 AM
98	There are already areas in the village that have blockage issues would the developers be prepared to invest in this	6/24/2017 9:01 PM
99	Believed to be insufficient capacity at present.	6/24/2017 8:18 PM
100	Can't cope! More disruption while they consider what to do	6/24/2017 8:16 PM
101	Scottish Water has indicated that there might not be sufficient capacity to accommodate this development.	6/24/2017 8:08 PM
102	The system is old and was designed fir a much smaller rural settlement	6/24/2017 4:57 PM
103	Not enough spare capacity at the moment	6/24/2017 4:41 PM
104	It will overload system and give rise to excessive costs for all residents through rates	6/24/2017 4:16 PM

105	The sewerage works (past Blanefield House) were NEVER designed for this loading	6/24/2017 4:00 PM
106	The sewage would need to be pumped up to the Dunglass View sewer which would not cope, and Dunglass View has already had to cope with months of sewage works.	6/24/2017 3:38 PM
107	Need the facts and figures investigated and the developer responsible for mitigating against any negative impact!	6/24/2017 3:35 PM
108	Unknown	6/24/2017 2:39 PM
109	Without a significant upgrade to the system there will naturally be an increased pressure on an aging system leading to more flooding and system failures.	6/24/2017 1:38 PM
110	Scottish Water's database does not show capacity for this. Anecdotally there are already problems with overflow from the sewage works.	6/24/2017 12:47 PM
#	Comments for "What else?"	Date
1	Road access. Lennoxton road is too narrow for more traffic.	7/27/2017 9:07 PM
2	Traffic issues. This area is far too busy for a village without more traffic	7/27/2017 9:03 PM
3	See separate document	7/26/2017 11:55 PM
4	Road network	7/26/2017 11:23 PM
5	Existing traffic problems would be further exacerbated	7/26/2017 11:07 PM
6	Doctor's surgery. Addition of 70 families on the books would put strain on the surgery, reducing the service for existing population, increasing waiting times, availability of appts, etc	7/26/2017 10:59 PM
7	Shops and pubs and public parking facilities could not cope with such an increase in population	7/26/2017 10:43 PM
8	General amenities such as shops, doctors surgery and other services would be stretched and become inadequate.	7/26/2017 10:18 PM
9	The Local development Plan, put together in consultation with Stirling Council and the Scottish Government and already includes a commitment for increased housing. The Gladman proposal is in addition to the LDP and exceeds what can be supported by the community and the existing infrastructure.	7/26/2017 9:18 PM
10	Additional pressure on Primary Care services.	7/26/2017 7:38 PM
11	The amenity of the area of proposed development has already been diminished by the most recent development. Further development in that area risks the ruination of that area by reduced enjoyment of the immediate surroundings of the Campsies and Dunglass.	7/26/2017 5:08 PM
12	SCC indicate that Gladmans proposal would put pressure on all of the above services therefore there could be a negative impact on the services. However hopefully services would be adapted to meet the requirements of any future beneficial developments in the village.	7/26/2017 4:57 PM
13	Local economy, there is a lot of concern regarding the Kirkhouse and the Blane Valley and their sustainability, additional people in the village will add footfall to these businesses. There is the scope for further retail within the village which can only be positive.	7/26/2017 4:29 PM
14	Taxing on overstretched local amenities. Loss of local character.	7/26/2017 3:43 PM
15	Site traffic. Roads in general.	7/26/2017 3:43 PM
16	Campsie Road is already a very busy road with commuter traffic. This size of development would put a bigger strain on it.	7/26/2017 12:51 PM
17	Green Belt Should 100% be protected, otherwise the green belt principle / policy is a sham	7/25/2017 11:06 PM
18	Increased traffic flow through the Lennoxton road	7/25/2017 10:50 PM
19	Local services for example doctors surgery	7/25/2017 10:44 PM
20	Council is struggling to provide services as it is to the village. Bins never seem to be collected when they should. Roads and paths not maintained to a high standard. This development will just add to the problems	7/25/2017 9:45 PM
21	Significant increase in local traffic	7/25/2017 7:58 PM
22	Increased traffic. Increased traffic on Campsie Road	7/25/2017 6:15 PM
23	This development must not be allowed to happen as previously discussed	7/25/2017 5:57 PM
24	Increase in population - are we a village or a small town without town facilities?	7/25/2017 5:45 PM

25	Medical facilities	7/25/2017 5:35 PM
26	Commuter traffic -roads already heavily used	7/25/2017 5:16 PM
27	roads commuter routes already overloaded	7/24/2017 4:34 PM
28	Roads, shop (Co-op) parking, medical services. All busy and parking is limited.	7/24/2017 4:33 PM
29	it would increase road traffic density and add to parking problems in the village	7/24/2017 4:18 PM
30	Our roads are already too busy and this will just increase the volume of traffic.	7/24/2017 4:12 PM
31	Traffic, safety, Broadband , noise. Significant increase in houses will adversely affect all	7/24/2017 4:11 PM
32	roads too busy parking an issue Coop shop vital and at full stretch	7/24/2017 3:58 PM
33	Traffic increase. Safety conflict with tourist traffic.	7/24/2017 3:57 PM
34	Developing Green Belt. Agreed boundaries should remain fixed	7/24/2017 3:54 PM
35	Makes a mockery of the LDP and green belt laws.	7/24/2017 3:23 PM
36	Basically against a development like this	7/24/2017 3:20 PM
37	roads are at full capacity any increase in population would be more dangerous	7/24/2017 3:15 PM
38	Vehicle traffic in region of 100-150 cars.	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
39	How many more "carrots" will this developer offer to persuade Stirling to give permission to build this big development?	7/24/2017 2:57 PM
40	Insufficient water pressure to supply all these houses.	7/24/2017 2:56 PM
41	vehicles	7/24/2017 2:39 PM
42	Health providers need more personnel or give less time to patients	7/24/2017 2:29 PM
43	Local surgery would be put under strain.	7/23/2017 10:05 PM
44	change village dynamic	7/23/2017 7:25 PM
45	the infrastructure to support all the above is not suitable	7/23/2017 4:59 PM
46	Edenkiln surgery would need extra personnel and GPs who provides the money for this?	7/23/2017 4:51 PM
47	increased footfall for local shops	7/23/2017 4:40 PM
48	these issues have no direct bearing on my situation, but I would support in principle any resident who might have real objections on the grounds above	7/23/2017 3:32 PM
49	we need council houses for rent	7/23/2017 3:18 PM
50	Roads and transport. Roads not designed for that many extra cars	7/23/2017 3:06 PM
51	road system already overloaded	7/23/2017 2:36 PM
52	extra traffic created-narrow winding road-unsafe access onto it. traffic speed	7/23/2017 2:21 PM
53	It could have a positive effect on local shops but not if most of the houses are for Glasgow commuters who tend to shop elsewhere.	7/23/2017 1:51 PM
54	More pressure on healthcare & transport	7/23/2017 12:03 PM
55	I do think an increase in traffic will make commuting times much greater. Especially with the huge development which is ongoing at Hillfoot	7/22/2017 8:14 PM
56	Even more traffic on roads that are in dire need of resurfacing .	7/22/2017 3:52 PM
57	There may be positive elements for local businesses & clubs to increase customers or memberships	7/22/2017 2:34 PM
58	Aesthetic concerns: The new Cala development has been generally well-accepted. The landscaping is reasonably attractive. However, they are still new houses of a stock design, which do not necessarily fit in with other buildings in the village. At least, however, the development is of a relatively modest scale. The proposed development on the other hand, looks far too big in comparison.	7/22/2017 12:51 PM
59	We live in a village because we like it more housing would gradually alter the ambience of the village	7/22/2017 12:36 PM


60	access to GP practice - all rural areas are under extreme pressure with regard to providing GP services.there are no GPs available for locums or posts -indeed a number of vllages have lost their practices with GPs unable to cope and retiring - this village is no different - there will not be capacity within the current practice provision to accommodate that number of new houses and people -again we have not had time for any audit of the impact the CALA development has had on GP appointment times or practice nurse and health visitor demands	7/22/2017 12:27 PM
61	GP surgery would be stretched with the increase in population. No one has consulted with them to see if they have capacity	7/21/2017 6:34 PM
62	Would turn the village into a housing estate fill of commuters, rather than the community it is.	7/15/2017 6:42 PM
63	Traffic will be an issue, green belt should be cherished and protected. It's good for mental and physical health.	7/15/2017 10:44 AM
64	Further to the answer in Nr4 the proposed site would be an eyesore from both the A81 & A891 destroying the appearance of our low density housing village	7/14/2017 5:14 PM
65	Volume of traffic	7/14/2017 5:05 PM
66	Traffic issues as village main roads can't cope.	7/14/2017 3:14 PM
67	No meeting housing need in the village. We need more social housing, more small units for older people to downsize into, supported "Mc Carthy and stone type. We don't need more big family homes	7/14/2017 1:55 PM
68	This development is the wrong type in the wrong place that does not meet the needs of the community. Any future development needs to be at the bottom end of the village!	7/14/2017 8:33 AM
69	Unplanned and out of proportion for a village. Strain will be placed on all transport and services. Roads are increasingly busy and will no doubt attract commuters.	7/14/2017 12:42 AM
70	Traffic. Existing and already approved developments in East Dunbartonshire do and will increasingly impact on traffic on the A891 joining and exiting the A81in Strathblane	7/13/2017 10:05 PM
71	Roads. The village roads are presently busy enough, particularly at commuting and school times, and would struggle to accommodate a large number of new vehicle users.	7/13/2017 7:50 PM
72	Simply don't need any more houses in the village. Threatens to destroy the close knit community that we have built here.	7/13/2017 4:55 PM
73	Once they have been built, roads and houses are never removed leading to an inexorable and cumulative loss of green spaces.	7/11/2017 9:55 PM
74	Local surgery does not have capacity to include large scale development of 70 houses.	7/11/2017 2:22 PM
75	The local shops are struggling without adding anymore houses or people onto them	7/10/2017 5:26 PM
76	Volume of road traffic - already high, will become higher	7/10/2017 5:24 PM
77	Internet services etc are not the best as is, increasing the demand on these will only make matters worse.	7/6/2017 11:00 PM
78	Greenbelt	7/4/2017 9:27 AM
79	environment	7/3/2017 11:27 PM
80	Parking in the village, especially near the CO-OP is already a major concern	7/1/2017 5:55 PM
81	Public transport would require to be improved considerably. Parking at the local Co-op is about to be restricted by the introduction of double yellow lines on part of Old Mugdock Road which will make shopping for those unable to walk far extremely difficult without the potential addition of another 70 families likely to use cars to access the main local shop.	7/1/2017 12:55 PM
82	Doctor surgery would not have enough doctors and nurses to cope with the added people.	6/28/2017 4:09 PM
83	The plans do not seem to include some sort of recreational area which will be greatly needed as a large volume of houses will be taken up by families	6/28/2017 9:39 AM
84	Increased traffic to Glasgow on a poor road. Up to an extra 150 car journeys daily?	6/27/2017 9:18 PM
85	Parking around the Cooperative shop already struggles. Nay further housing will only make matters worse for local residents.	6/27/2017 5:32 PM
86	heavier traffic on country village roads	6/27/2017 12:04 PM
87	Doctors and shops - our doctors and shops are mainly tucked into residential streets and are already under pressure from existing traffic.	6/26/2017 10:18 AM

88	Water provision - recent difficulties would Not be helped by an oversized proposed development.	6/26/2017 12:28 AM
89	The traffic around the area will increase and the access to the Co Op. The village will lose its character.	6/25/2017 9:49 PM
90	Respect for green belt in general	6/25/2017 5:20 PM
91	Transport and condition of roads is already quite problematic	6/25/2017 5:06 PM
92	GP already overstretched. Insufficient parking around Co-op and school	6/25/2017 3:48 PM
93	More traffic	6/25/2017 2:44 PM
94	Impact on traffic.	6/25/2017 1:19 PM
95	No negatives at all apart from the so called do gooders who are lucky enough to have already bought a house in the village.	6/24/2017 10:07 PM
96	A large development will include a huge influx of ppl/children putting mass pressure on our local facilities school/GP/infrastructure	6/24/2017 9:01 PM
97	Further pressure on stretched local medical and other health services.	6/24/2017 8:18 PM
98	We loose our village identity and become a town	6/24/2017 8:16 PM
99	The local roads are already very busy and additional vehicles will be an issue.	6/24/2017 8:08 PM
100	The Village must remain a Village. If this goes ahead - what next ? They will keep going for more and more	6/24/2017 4:00 PM
101	Doctor surgery! Need the facts and figures investigated and the developer responsible for mitigating against any negative impact!	6/24/2017 3:35 PM
102	We only have two doctors and no dentist so this provision will need to be expanded.	6/24/2017 2:39 PM
103	Adding a settlement on the outskirts of the village is unnecessary. It would not be integrated into village life, and is not targeted at locals for local needs.	6/24/2017 2:20 PM
104	It will completely change the whole environment of the village, small sporadic developments do not impact in the same way. The last time we saw this number of houses developed at the one time was in the 70's with the Lawrence Estate. Our primary school is now at max capacity with an order do to emergency work that was stated in over 15 years ago! When my children were there..... my youngest is 21 this year! Our roads will not handle another 130 plus cars. If you think we have chaos just now parking at the Co op, doctors surgery, library, chemist, primary school and deli just now.....just wait!	6/24/2017 2:17 PM
105	Greenbelt	6/24/2017 1:59 PM
106	Greenbelt	6/24/2017 1:46 PM
107	Density of housing	6/24/2017 1:46 PM
108	The parking at the Coop is already a big issue for the village - the addition of so many new people will contribute more pressure to this situation.	6/24/2017 1:38 PM
#	Comments for "What else?"	Date
1	Violation of the green belt is a cause for extreme concern	7/26/2017 11:07 PM
2	Co-op parking and road infrastructure. Already a major issue with parking around the local shops. Imagine another 140 cars (average of 2 cars per house) would be chaos. Also the traffic around the school at start & pickup time is a major issue - it would only get worse	7/26/2017 10:59 PM
3	Roads through the village would suffer from increased use and congestion on the main road into Glasgow would be commonplace. Dangerous for everyone involved and especially horse riders, bikers and cyclists.	7/26/2017 10:43 PM
4	lack of public parking around services like the coop which would be too far for many to walk to from the proposed development.	7/26/2017 10:18 PM
5	Go and health services will also be impacted on	7/26/2017 8:25 PM
6	Increase in road traffic, hence pollution and noise.	7/26/2017 3:43 PM
7	The LDP had Cala as the last large scale development approved	7/25/2017 11:06 PM
8	Proposed SUDs basin and pumping station - sited to close to existing houses. Contamination and source of ongoing problems, i.e. keeping clear/odour free.	7/25/2017 10:44 PM
9	Demand on doctors surgery	7/25/2017 7:58 PM

10	We want to sustain a village identity and do not want to become suburb of Milngavie.	7/24/2017 4:12 PM
11	GP practice too small	7/24/2017 3:58 PM
12	10% increase in population will put undue pressure on public services.	7/24/2017 3:57 PM
13	Sending a message to all that sc doesn't care about the law or feelings.	7/24/2017 3:23 PM
14	Edenkiln surgery. the first class surgery is almost at full capacity and could not cope with a new influx	7/24/2017 3:15 PM
15	Strathblane will change from a village to an extension of the city	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
16	Further impingement on an already busy A81 route into Glasgow.	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
17	some 150 car/vans would be entering this poorly calmed main road	7/24/2017 2:39 PM
18	Potential environmental issues with loss of green belt fields, habitats, higher risk of flooding along Blane Water west in village due to loss of greenbelt.	7/23/2017 10:05 PM
19	already unwanted	7/23/2017 7:25 PM
20	our village is becoming a town with no amenities	7/23/2017 3:18 PM
21	lack of local facilities to cope e.g. GP surgery, pharmacy/playpark	7/23/2017 3:06 PM
22	if we give into this pressure from developers they will never let up and our village will be destroyed	7/23/2017 2:36 PM
23	Environment & wildlife Plus it's greenbelt for a reason, so shouldn't be even considered for building on.	7/23/2017 12:03 PM
24	The green belt is there for a purpose not to be ridden roughshod over with an estate of this size.	7/14/2017 5:14 PM
25	Local health resources	7/14/2017 5:05 PM
26	Doctors surgery may not cope with extra numbers without affecting the level of service.	7/14/2017 3:14 PM
27	I feel very against this proposed plan	7/14/2017 12:00 AM
28	Large scale loss of greenbelt will result in increase in surface water runoff into local Blane watercourse, putting further pressure on water course upstream towards village, possibly casuing flooding of houses along watercourse within village.	7/11/2017 2:22 PM
29	Tourism will suffer as village character is eroded.	7/10/2017 5:24 PM
30	A massive influx in youth could have a detrimental affect on the feel of the village. Increasing of the population will also put more strain on law enforcement and require an increase in presence most likely.	7/6/2017 11:00 PM
31	Village services already stretched	7/4/2017 9:30 PM
32	Village boundary	7/4/2017 9:27 AM
33	traffic	7/3/2017 11:27 PM
34	It is green belt protected land it shouldn't be built on! This development would be detrimental to the environment.	6/28/2017 4:09 PM
35	A small rural village will have its character spoiled with so many additional houses in a large estate such as this.	6/27/2017 9:18 PM
36	small village surgery for small village needs	6/27/2017 12:04 PM
37	Electricity: Previous issues with supply - small village - oversized proposed development - will not improve the situation.	6/26/2017 12:28 AM
38	Also the sheep and cows will lose a place to graze.	6/25/2017 9:49 PM
39	Impact on green belt.	6/25/2017 1:19 PM
40	The coop is an accident waiting to happen more ppl more cars something has to be done before someone is killed are developers prepared to invest here	6/24/2017 9:01 PM
41	Doctors surgery overwhelmed, more traffic on the road, no villagers can afford the houses	6/24/2017 8:16 PM
42	Transportation and bus service provision would need to be upscaled	6/24/2017 2:39 PM
43	Parking at the doctor, the Co Op, the Blane Valley Inn, the Premier Store and Deli is all extremely limited and difficult already. There is not sufficient infrastructure to support all these new homes	6/24/2017 2:20 PM

44	Landscape setting	6/24/2017 1:59 PM
45	Landscape setting	6/24/2017 1:46 PM

Q11 Would you be concerned about an increase in traffic if the development goes ahead?



Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	91.20% 197
No	6.94% 15
Don't know	1.85% 4
Total	216

#	Please explain	Date
1	Having been frightened at 2 near major accidents on road already, this is of utmost concern to me. The parts of road that stick out at junction are a disaster. I have no confidence that similar stupid road configuration will not happen.	7/28/2017 6:06 PM
2	We are already trying to calm and slow traffic.	7/27/2017 9:25 PM
3	Traffic already dangerous at times.	7/27/2017 9:20 PM
4	The design simply omits really obvious thinking on how to encourage non-car travel	7/26/2017 11:55 PM
5	Problems with volume and speed likely to increase	7/26/2017 11:32 PM
6	See previous answer. With additional comment that during construction there'll be a significant period of HGV vehicular moments through village during earthworks, delivery of materials, plant. Then influx of trades people's vehicles.	7/26/2017 11:30 PM
7	Already a dangerous road which cannot withstand further increase in traffic	7/26/2017 11:07 PM
8	As mentioned above there is likely to be over 100 additional vehicles if the development was to go ahead putting a large strain on existing roads and traffic pollution	7/26/2017 10:59 PM
9	See reason above. Speeding is already rife on the roads and a huge percentage of residents from this and surrounding villages commute towards Glasgow and Stirling.	7/26/2017 10:43 PM
10	In general around the village the addition of so many houses and the associated vehicles would have a considerable impact on the traffic. As many people would no doubt work in Glasgow or in that direction the strain at peak times could have significant impacts on the greater road network.	7/26/2017 10:18 PM
11	Very few cars follow the rules for the mini roundabouts as it is - this development will increase the number of cars ignoring the rules. We have cyclists, horses, children cycling and motorbikes - the roads feel treacherous enough as it is. More houses can only make the traffic situation worse.	7/26/2017 7:38 PM
12	The road (A81) is, in my view, at capacity. Introducing more traffic to this road would make its use more dangerous for all road users and particularly cyclists.	7/26/2017 5:08 PM


13	No concerns per se as volume of traffic is increasing everywhere - a national issue not unique to rural areas. The site access onto Campsie Road looks safe.	7/26/2017 4:57 PM
14	Much of it already goes too fast	7/26/2017 3:43 PM
15	A/A	7/26/2017 12:51 PM
16	Campsie Road is already a very busy road and this would only impact further with an increase in traffic.	7/25/2017 10:44 PM
17	it would certainly add to the volume of traffic given that most houses would be likely to have at least 2 cars. It would also add to the parking problems around the school and the coop	7/25/2017 9:45 PM
18	Existing roads are near capacity. Parking is a problem at the Coop and outside church.	7/25/2017 8:52 PM
19	Dangerous road for pedestrians to cross at peak periods.	7/25/2017 8:43 PM
20	Big increase in commuter traffic	7/25/2017 7:58 PM
21	Campsie Road already very busy. Parking outside shops inadequate.	7/25/2017 6:15 PM
22	Already had many accidents	7/25/2017 5:57 PM
23	Apart from A81 all roads are narrow village roads.	7/25/2017 5:45 PM
24	There will be a resulting increase in traffic within the village surrounds and parking, particularly in relation to the local businesses ie Co-Op, The Blane Valley Inn, The Deli / Café and the Premier Store on Glasgow Road will all suffer further in relation to the significant increase in traffic.	7/25/2017 5:40 PM
25	Heavy traffic damaging roads. Cars getting damaged. No concern for pedestrian safety.	7/25/2017 5:28 PM
26	Roads already heavily used as stated on previous page.	7/25/2017 5:16 PM
27	I think the roads could probably handle it.	7/25/2017 4:50 PM
28	Traffic through the village is already a problem. A village by-pass is not at all likely, so increased population with cars would increase the safety aspect of transport in the village. There is really inadequate parking around our main Co-op store, this would become extremely problematical.	7/25/2017 3:04 PM
29	More vehicles would exacerbate the shortage of available space for short term parking in the centre of the village, and exiting on to the A891 east of the development would become more difficult.	7/25/2017 1:21 PM
30	Traffic is already a concern. The roads are too busy and parking at Milngavie station is already awful.	7/25/2017 9:33 AM
31	There is already more traffic in the area as households increase the number of family cars. It doesn't bear thinking what a further 70 households would bring.	7/24/2017 10:07 PM
32	Roads in and around Strathblane already very busy.	7/24/2017 4:33 PM
33	It's bad enough as it is. Another housing complex will add to the burden	7/24/2017 4:21 PM
34	more cars - less safety, more pollution,more noise	7/24/2017 4:11 PM
35	Commuter traffic already taken by A81 through the village to neighbouring villages	7/24/2017 4:02 PM
36	this village has enough traffic problems with a trunk road passing through the middle of it	7/24/2017 3:58 PM
37	+ + noise + + cars ++ pollution. Less safety for drivers and pedestrians.	7/24/2017 3:57 PM
38	We have young children	7/24/2017 3:54 PM
39	Bad enough at cooperative and school/library at the moment	7/24/2017 3:54 PM
40	Parking already a problem at primary school and shops	7/24/2017 3:44 PM
41	Possible impact on parking at local shops, surgery etc.	7/24/2017 3:32 PM
42	local roads already suffer from "heavies" and through traffic	7/24/2017 3:31 PM
43	Too busy at present	7/24/2017 3:20 PM
44	very concerned re increased traffic	7/24/2017 3:15 PM
45	our road is narrow and full of bends and would not be able to cope with the extra traffic	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
46	As overleaf.	7/24/2017 3:13 PM
47	Some children have to walk quite a distance to school along/across the A81 which is a fast dangerous road especially at commuter times	7/24/2017 2:57 PM

48	Campsie Rd gets busier. Would be increased if grave yard goes further along road.	7/24/2017 2:56 PM
49	see Q10 vehicles	7/24/2017 2:39 PM
50	The rat race will just increase	7/24/2017 2:38 PM
51	There will be 70 plus extra cars in the village-with no change to roads or parking.	7/24/2017 2:29 PM
52	as above	7/23/2017 7:25 PM
53	Already the A81 to the Trossachs is extremely busy	7/23/2017 4:51 PM
54	the build outs on Campsie Rd are already an obstruction	7/23/2017 4:40 PM
55	an increase in traffic flow in this area would not be desirable	7/23/2017 3:32 PM
56	I do not agree that local roads and junctions will cope with increased traffic flow	7/23/2017 3:24 PM
57	Campsie Rd is dangerous at the moment so what does that say	7/23/2017 3:18 PM
58	Lennoxton Rd is already quite busy and increased traffic entering onto this road and subsequently onto the A81 too much	7/23/2017 2:46 PM
59	already overloaded, given we have no bypass	7/23/2017 2:36 PM
60	speed, volume of traffic, access from development to road-a narrow winding road	7/23/2017 2:21 PM
61	The road into Glasgow is already busy at peak times and it will add to congestion in Milngavie too. It already cannot cope with commuters who wish to transfer to trains for the onward journey.	7/23/2017 1:51 PM
62	already increased traffic and no appropriate calming measures in place. would be dangerous for locals	7/23/2017 12:23 PM
63	No pedestrian facilities on Campsie rd	7/23/2017 12:15 PM
64	the roads around here are already too busy: and too fast	7/23/2017 11:20 AM
65	This proposal would significantly exacerbate existing parking & congestion problems around the local primary school & the Coop.	7/22/2017 2:34 PM
66	As mentioned above, our roads are already overstretched . The Council clearly struggle to maintain an adequate road surface as it is. More traffic would mean a requirement for more not less maintenance, so the situation of the roads would only deteriorate. There is increasing volume of traffic from new developments in Lennoxton and Milton of Campsie, all ending up at the mini-roundabout at the Kirkhouse Inn, which is already the scene of several near-misses, witnessed on a daily basis	7/22/2017 12:51 PM
67	It's already difficult to cross the road even with the provision of traffic lights. 70 houses with at least 2 cars per household would make things worse	7/22/2017 12:36 PM
68	the exit route from the proposed site would be directly onto the Campsie Road - this road despite calming measures having been put in place is still one which cars speed along -the roundabout at the bottom onto Strathblane road is a mini roundabout which is already challenging at high volume times e.g. early am and evening - I would be extremely concerned with regard to this coping with the volume of traffic and a full size roundabout or lights would be completely inappropriate and again destroy the dynamics of the village	7/22/2017 12:27 PM
69	Especially on the A81 into Glasgow where it meets Milngavie and another HUGE housing development!	7/22/2017 12:16 PM
70	Speed of traffic on Campsie Road is excessive already and people coming out of the development may be at risk	7/21/2017 6:34 PM
71	70 houses could possibly mean as many as 140 extra cars on the roads around the village.	7/17/2017 7:16 PM
72	70 houses could possibly equate to 140 extra cars on the roads	7/17/2017 5:44 PM
73	For those like myself using public transport (train) from Milngavie there is inadequate parking. The bus service is badly scheduled.	7/15/2017 6:42 PM
74	At the moment traffic is increasing all the time through this village speeding cars	7/14/2017 4:07 PM
75	Don't know	7/14/2017 8:33 AM
76	1) The route into Glasgow is already too busy and it is increasingly hard to park to use the train from Milngavie. 2) I live on the same road as the proposed development and it is already very unsafe walking into the village - this scale of development would make this even worse.	7/14/2017 8:19 AM
77	Roads are already too busy. Too many cars.	7/14/2017 12:42 AM
78	See earlier	7/13/2017 10:05 PM

79	See above	7/13/2017 7:50 PM
80	Traffic on the A81 to Milngavie is already heavy at rush hours. This would make it worse.	7/11/2017 9:55 PM
81	Potentially over 140 extra cars moving within village boundaries. Miniroundabout on main road, inadequate for such an increase in traffic. In addition already several parking problems at local Co-op shop and primary school at peak times. A large scale development of this nature will have even further detrimental impact.	7/11/2017 2:22 PM
82	It is bad enough without adding on more traffic onto the village	7/10/2017 5:26 PM
83	Live on busy main road - already too much traffic going by.	7/10/2017 5:24 PM
84	Longer commuting due to increased volume of traffic	7/4/2017 10:12 AM
85	Campsie Road is already dangerous!	7/4/2017 9:27 AM
86	I can imagine it would cause gridlock in the areas around the school and the Co-op.	7/2/2017 7:47 PM
87	Roads are too busy already with a high number of cars, motorcycles etc going over the speed limit. No more are needed.	7/2/2017 12:19 PM
88	There seems to have been an increase in the traffic and more speeding vehicles in recent years. Children and the elderly will be more at risk of accidental injury if the population of drivers living nearby increases.	7/1/2017 5:55 PM
89	As above related to parking but also a further possibly 70 or more cars travelling from the village for employment purposes would detract from the nature of the community	7/1/2017 12:55 PM
90	70 houses probably with on average two cars each, and associated work related vehicles will inevitably have an impact especially at commuting times. Also potential impact on parking at Milngavie station.	6/30/2017 2:43 PM
91	Traffic is already considerable on Campsie Road and at present represents a danger to the village as there is no discernible speed limit. A further development would make matters so much worse for people living on the surrounding area.	6/29/2017 3:09 PM
92	Parking is already difficult at the school, the library, Co Op, doctors surgery.	6/28/2017 8:06 PM
93	We already have a massive volume of traffic passing through and it would add to it plus the parking in the village would be difficult.	6/28/2017 4:09 PM
94	More congestion and longer commuting time.	6/28/2017 10:47 AM
95	Increased traffic to Glasgow on a poor road. Up to an extra 150 car journeys daily?	6/27/2017 9:18 PM
96	Any increase would be minimal	6/27/2017 8:45 PM
97	As a commuter and father of small children this development will make the village roads busier and less safe.	6/27/2017 8:17 PM
98	Road traffic through and within the village is already very heavy. Also, parking is very difficult around the Co-op store and would only get worse.	6/27/2017 5:32 PM
99	I have 2 children who require to cross campsie road to get to school. The road is already fast and busy enough to be a worry.	6/26/2017 10:06 PM
100	Especially around the school, doctors and shops.	6/26/2017 10:18 AM
101	Traffic and especially parking is already an issue in the village due to the mainly linear layout. Parking at amenities is severely restricted already. More vehicular traffic especially of the volume which this proposed, oversized, development would generate is the very Last thing this village requires	6/26/2017 12:28 AM
102	The A891 is already a very busy commuter road, this will increase with the new development.	6/25/2017 9:49 PM
103	It is already too heavy	6/25/2017 5:20 PM
104	There is a main artery which runs through middle of village and this already causes great concern to villagers.	6/25/2017 1:19 PM
105	We have idiots on the roads already extra ones won't make much difference.	6/24/2017 11:09 PM
106	Small village small streets already many cars on the roads limited access to many areas. As before co op is an accident waiting to happen	6/24/2017 9:01 PM
107	There is currently poor public transport provision for the village. A development of this size will inevitably increase traffic particularly as it is likely that there will be a significant number of commuters into Glasgow adding to peak time traffic flows. The local roads are particularly popular with cyclists who will face increased hazards. Sight lines are not good for traffic currently joining Campsie Road.	6/24/2017 8:18 PM


108	Complete up grade,and rethink of road system required	6/24/2017 8:16 PM
109	As above	6/24/2017 8:08 PM
110	Current total failure by Council and Police to enforce speed limits and do serious traffic calming would only get worse.	6/24/2017 4:41 PM
111	It will increase commuter traffic as there seems to be no effort to generate local employment	6/24/2017 4:16 PM
112	See above and add the dormitory suburb factor.	6/24/2017 4:04 PM
113	Traffic through / to / from the Village is already saturated.	6/24/2017 4:00 PM
114	The 30 mile limit would have to be extended, at present traffic speeds along Campsie road	6/24/2017 3:38 PM
115	A little but traffic in the village would still be limited to 30. I would be more concerned that parking at the coop and shopsmart are current totally inadequate.	6/24/2017 2:39 PM
116	The roads through there village are fast and dangerous enough, we do not need more traffic	6/24/2017 2:20 PM
117	Road safety for old and young users, reduced safe parking and an increase in pollution.	6/24/2017 1:38 PM
118	Development on the scale proposed can only be intended for commuters travelling by private car. Expansion of neighbouring villages in Stirling and EDC areas (Lennoxton etc) already contributes to heavy traffic, and tourist traffic is huge on this route in the holidays.	6/24/2017 12:47 PM

Q12 Does the community currently have the correct mix of housing types and ownership/rental models for the needs of a sustainable community?



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	30.19%	64
No	58.96%	125
No opinion	10.85%	23
Total		212

Q13 If we do not have the correct mix for the needs of a sustainable community, what type(s) of new housing are most needed?



Answer Choices	Responses
Affordable housing	84.97% 130
Shared ownership housing	37.25% 57
Private housing	9.80% 15
Other (please specify)	39.22% 60
Total Respondents: 153	

#	Other (please specify)	Date
1	small retiral units; thus releasing family homes.	7/27/2017 9:25 PM
2	sheltered housing	7/27/2017 9:21 PM
3	elderly housing	7/27/2017 9:15 PM
4	In Gladmans plan only 20 out of 62 are affordable	7/26/2017 11:11 PM
5	supported housing for the elderly	7/26/2017 11:01 PM
6	Sheltered housing for an ageing population	7/26/2017 9:20 PM
7	Sheltered	7/26/2017 4:57 PM
8	accessible for elderly and/or disabled	7/26/2017 3:46 PM
9	Smaller accommodation for single people and childless couples.	7/26/2017 3:44 PM
10	More 3-4 bed homes needed for growing families	7/25/2017 8:00 PM
11	Sheltered Housing for older people	7/25/2017 7:34 PM
12	N/A enough required for reasons explained already	7/25/2017 5:58 PM
13	Retirement properties	7/25/2017 5:36 PM
14	Private affordable smaller properties for the young and for downsizing	7/25/2017 5:18 PM
15	Eco-friendly housing.	7/25/2017 4:52 PM
16	Sheltered Accommodation	7/25/2017 3:05 PM

17	sheltered housing	7/25/2017 1:22 PM
18	Accomadation for ederly that is not flats	7/24/2017 10:55 PM
19	Sheltered housing or small bungalows for ageing population.	7/24/2017 4:13 PM
20	small retirement private	7/24/2017 4:03 PM
21	N/A see Q12	7/24/2017 3:58 PM
22	Rented	7/24/2017 3:55 PM
23	Council houses for rent for families on below average income	7/24/2017 3:46 PM
24	Sheltered housing	7/24/2017 3:34 PM
25	pensioners type housing with care facilities	7/24/2017 3:14 PM
26	Local authority provision as long as it is not promptly sold!	7/24/2017 2:59 PM
27	Rental	7/24/2017 2:59 PM
28	rented	7/24/2017 2:31 PM
29	pensioner's housing	7/23/2017 3:19 PM
30	Housing Association homes affordable must be really affordable £150k is not	7/23/2017 3:08 PM
31	affordable for young and old,smaller to buy not rent	7/23/2017 2:24 PM
32	Bungalows for older residents who wish to downsize but remain in a community where they know folk and are known.	7/23/2017 1:53 PM
33	We need more houses for elderly residents who want smaller homes suitable for less physically able people.	7/23/2017 12:41 PM
34	no more needed	7/23/2017 11:21 AM
35	NONE !	7/22/2017 3:53 PM
36	Council housing	7/22/2017 12:52 PM
37	Sheltered housing.	7/15/2017 6:43 PM
38	Smaller starter homes smaller private homes to release larger homes within the village	7/14/2017 5:09 PM
39	Bungalows for older people to down size to.	7/14/2017 3:16 PM
40	Homes for the elderly	7/14/2017 12:10 PM
41	Sheltered and/or bungalows	7/14/2017 8:34 AM
42	Social rented housing	7/14/2017 8:19 AM
43	Maybe smaller units to facilitate those who MAY wish to "downsize" to do so without being crippled financially	7/13/2017 10:09 PM
44	Retirement/sheltered homes for those no longer able to look after themselves in their own property.	7/13/2017 7:51 PM
45	Council housing	7/4/2017 10:13 AM
46	Please see my previous comments	7/2/2017 7:49 PM
47	Sheltered	6/28/2017 8:07 PM
48	Private affordable smaller properties for the young and for downsizing	6/27/2017 9:19 PM
49	It's clear what most people want is more affordable rented council housing. It is an unfortunate historic fact that Strathblane and Blane field once had a good stock of such housing, but the vast majority has been sold off for private ownership. Whilst this means we have a relatively good supply of 2-3 bedroom houses for private sale, there is still a substantial body from the community who can not afford or who do not want to buy, but there are very few options for long term secure rented accommodation.	6/26/2017 10:21 AM
50	Sheltered Housing.	6/25/2017 9:51 PM
51	Smaller houses such as bungalows for downsizing.	6/25/2017 1:21 PM
52	New builds is fine but not unaffordable!!	6/24/2017 9:07 PM
53	Our children want to live in their Own community. They should havecec priorities	6/24/2017 8:18 PM
54	Smaller, low cost private housing	6/24/2017 8:11 PM

55	Housing suited to older people	6/24/2017 4:41 PM
56	Mid range houses for young families to buy	6/24/2017 4:18 PM
57	Residents do not need more residents	6/24/2017 4:06 PM
58	We need possible sheltered accommodation, houses available (with good sized rooms) for down sizing and starter homes	6/24/2017 2:18 PM
59	Sheltered	6/24/2017 1:47 PM
60	accessible/warden bungalows for elderly, especially to allow downsizing by owners of larger houses in the village	6/24/2017 12:47 PM

Q21 Do you have any final points you would like to make?

Answered: 112 Skipped: 104

#	Responses	Date
1	The scenic view of hills from railway path will be grossly impaired. Houses previously approved in area had planning restriction of only being a bungalow to retain view of hills	7/28/2017 6:10 PM
2	This proposal would tax local resources and effect the quality of life. This is especially true of the threat to the green belt.	7/27/2017 9:17 PM
3	If this development is allowed the village will lose its community feel which I don't want to happen.	7/27/2017 9:09 PM
4	I will send a copy of the objection letter I propose sending by their due date	7/26/2017 11:58 PM
5	This is an area of historic and scenic beauty that needs to be preserved for future generations	7/26/2017 11:16 PM
6	I am strongly against this development. It is the wrong size and type of development and does not meet the community's needs	7/26/2017 11:04 PM
7	This application is sheer commercial greed from a parasitic company who care not a jot for the local community or LDP and are all about exploiting the Government housing targets for the gain of one already wealthy landowner so they can take a cut. Disgusting and makes my blood boil. Shame on them.	7/26/2017 10:46 PM
8	The archaeological heritage of this area should be taken into more consideration. The local development plan should not be tampered with as it will set a dangerous precedent for other communities across the country. If this is altered then what was the point in the time and money spent on these plans! At the end of the day this comes down to the greed of a likely already wealthy land owner and a parasitic company! One last point what about the poor tenant farmer who is losing a couple of good fields!	7/26/2017 10:25 PM
9	Can see no reason why the green belt should be sacrificed	7/26/2017 8:51 PM
10	We have concerns that an 'In Principle' planning application can be made by a party who is not a developer. This introduces a degree of uncertainty. We understand that approval can be given with conditions but what happens when land is sold on? We would support small scale developments - even on this green field site -in the village if cognisance is given to the type and design of homes, site layout and landscaping to nestle them into their surroundings.	7/26/2017 4:58 PM
11	Strathblane needs more affordable houses and i think these should be considered for people wityrn the village not from outside, i think it is a good idea to build new homes.	7/26/2017 4:47 PM
12	This is a very poorly designed questionnaire, which seeks negative views and leads the respondents to comment as such. It is not gathering all the options which you are looking for and does not provide a balanced account for you to present to the council. The council will comment on this and it makes it difficult to defend your views. While 70 houses is too many, there is a housing crisis and there is the area for development, the village can support extra residents.	7/26/2017 4:33 PM
13	This housing development is clearly driven by a maximum-profit motive – without regard for the green belt, or local needs/desires, and concerns.	7/26/2017 3:47 PM
14	Time and effort has been spent in developing and agreeing the ldp with both council and community, the outcome should be respected	7/25/2017 8:02 PM
15	Gladman developmenst should respect the wishes of the community for reasons given by the residents	7/25/2017 5:59 PM
16	Being at the end of the line in Stirling Council region, grass cutting, weed killing and the general upkeep of the village is diabolical. Can they manage to keep a 70 home development tidy?	7/25/2017 5:48 PM
17	This application appears to me as being similar to the SNP chasing a "neverendum" in terms of voting for an Independent Scotland. If you don't get the answer that you want this time round, keep asking the question until you do get the answer that you do want!	7/25/2017 5:45 PM
18	Village unable to cope with new housing and volume of people. Roads and sewer problems as well as possible digging up roads for cables, elect etc. Dog fouling and litter on the increase. Unable to get doctor's appointment on the same day.	7/25/2017 5:32 PM
19	I am not against any new houses, but I feel that the new housing needs to be right, and add something to the community, rather than be a bland development opportunity with little concern for the environs.	7/25/2017 4:57 PM

20	The Local Development Plan was agreed. On that basis there should be no accommodation with Gladman or any other developments which seek to ride change the the Plan	7/25/2017 3:09 PM
21	a) Gladman still persist in a wilful misrepresentation, claiming that Stirling's plan for the cemetery extension 'clearly establishes the principle of developing the site' as if this could be compared in its impact - and necessity - to a substantial new private housing development. b) my greatest worry is that these plans are apparently not binding on the eventual developer and that the community will not have any sight of changes at a later stage.	7/25/2017 1:22 PM
22	The scale of this new development is too big. Granting permission for this will just lead to yet another request for more housing.	7/25/2017 9:35 AM
23	I do not understand how we can all agree a plan for the local community and stick to it. Proposal in this area where discussed and not taking forward and that should be the end of it until the local plan is reviewed in the future.	7/24/2017 10:58 PM
24	Gladman Developments have little or no interest in what might be good for the community. Their interest is purely profit. I hope Stirling Council will be able to support Strathblane Community to resist the project which is. Outside the green belt.	7/24/2017 4:40 PM
25	Keep the Blane Valley green and scenic please	7/24/2017 4:37 PM
26	Stop riding roughshod over our community. We've already said we don't want another housing project, our infrastructure can't take any more. Please note we're not not in my backyard advocates just sensible enough to know it will be mayhem	7/24/2017 4:27 PM
27	we feel strongly that any further expansion of the village envelope would be detrimental to the community here	7/24/2017 4:21 PM
28	Totally feel that Gladman have not listened or are completely ignoring the wishes of the community	7/24/2017 4:13 PM
29	I am anxious not to lose the warm village atmosphere with local activities and organisations swallowed up by large numbers and thanks to you all on the local Community Council	7/24/2017 4:05 PM
30	This is seriously unsustainable both socially and environmentally flying in the face of sustainable development endorsed by the local development plan. It is a disgrace that the strathblane community should have been dragged through all the work involved in opposing it.	7/24/2017 4:04 PM
31	We need to be listened to as a community and not have major building changes foisted on u. We have to live here.	7/24/2017 4:00 PM
32	Blanefield and Strathblane is already losing its small community friendliness with many incomers inflicting their lack of effort to integrate with the locals.	7/24/2017 3:48 PM
33	Developers must not be allowed to encroach on the Green Belt - given a foot they will take a mile! Viz. Cala	7/24/2017 3:34 PM
34	I have spoken to many of our residents and not one of them has a word of support regarding the Gladman proposal	7/24/2017 3:27 PM
35	This is green belt land and should remain so. This planning application should be rejected in totality with no re-submissions permitted.	7/24/2017 3:16 PM
36	No	7/24/2017 3:15 PM
37	The village has expanded fast over the last 10 years - a lot of infilling in areas once thought "sacrosanct". Once permission would not have been sought or given but , with the loss of identity, areas like Mugdock/Campsie Dene lose their attractiveness	7/24/2017 3:02 PM
38	I have responded at all stages re Cala, Campsie Road to no effect.	7/24/2017 3:01 PM
39	I find it difficult to fine words to express my anger at the strategy adopted by Gladmans. Their application flies in the face of all the evidence e and the views and feelings of the local community. It is contrary to the local development plan and green belt principle. it is clear that this organisation has only one aim in mind and that is financial/commercial gain. they must be stopped dead in their tracks. The council should kick this application into touch without further discussion. and one final point, have they considered what a habitat analysis might reveal?The recent earthworks carried out in the proposed area disturbed many ground nesting birds and stopped the lapwings from nesting. Lapwings are a "red list" (the highest level of conservation)protected species(http://www.rspb.org.uk/birds-and-wildlife/bird-and-wildlife-guides/bird-a-z/l/lapwing/) Lapwings used to nest in the Cala field. It seems to me that planning ignores significant matters like this. It is high time this changed.	7/24/2017 2:56 PM
40	stick to the simple dictum "too many of the wrong kind of houses in the wrong place	7/24/2017 2:42 PM
41	This development is not suitable for this area	7/24/2017 6:27 AM

42	Development of 50+ houses in village (Cala Home Development & proposed development east of Old Mugdock) is more than sufficient house allocation for the village. Anymore larger scale housing would have massively negative impact.	7/23/2017 10:16 PM
43	The LDP is in danger of being over-ridden by profiteering developers which does not reflect well on the Council	7/23/2017 4:54 PM
44	if the proposed graveyard site is moved further out from the village it may give the impression that the planning dept/Council is willing to trade with developers!	7/23/2017 4:43 PM
45	Do not let the democratic process and the greenbelt to be undermined please	7/23/2017 3:35 PM
46	LDP should be respected. We need more truly affordable 2-3 bedroom flats/houses. Not a huge development	7/23/2017 3:11 PM
47	with recent developments,village is at capacity. Greenbelt should mean that. An eyesore like Cala homes, not needed. Extension to cemetery should have been across from church in field next to the manse. There should be NO consideration of moving it to even further away.	7/23/2017 2:27 PM
48	there may well be a suitable site within Strathblane/Blanefield for a SMALL development of mixed housing but this particular site is most definitely not it and never will be.	7/23/2017 12:28 PM
49	Keep our green belt green	7/23/2017 12:17 PM
50	I would ask that you keep the promise of he green belt already agreed	7/23/2017 11:46 AM
51	i dont want the village to expand.	7/23/2017 11:24 AM
52	I	7/22/2017 8:17 PM
53	Gladman (like Cala) only intend to profit from this development. There is no benefit to the village from this development nor the previous Cala development.	7/22/2017 4:31 PM
54	I do not wish to see the village turned into a small town . I prefer it to remain the same .	7/22/2017 3:56 PM
55	In common with many of our friends and neighbours, I would like to oppose this development very strongly. I understand that there is a shortage of housing in the Stirling council area. But this is not the place to address this issue. There are plenty of other places to build, as opposed to this greenfield site which would obviously be preferred by developers for its ability to maximise profits. Benefits to those who actually live in the Stirling Council area, particularly those who do not wish/are not able to buy a home, but would prefer/need to find affordable rented properties, would be less obvious. I believe the so-called ' Devil's Elbow' site has already been earmarked for future development here in Strathblane. I feel strongly that in any case brownfield sites should be the first choice for future development. The Local Development Plan explicitly sets out where the new cemetery and village boundary should lie, and I see no reason to disregard this, and further encroach on the surrounding countryside. If there is indeed a shortfall in the Stirling Council allocation for new homes, this should be resolved in the central Stirling area around already built-up towns, and not here in a small village on the edge of the council boundary, miles from Stirling itself, where 70 new homes would have a huge impact on the identity and status of our village. What is the point of all the time and energy undertaken by so many people in agreeing a local development plan if developers can then put forward development which clearly contravene the plan? Such an outcome would seem to fly in the face of local democracy.	7/22/2017 1:06 PM
56	We as a community must do all we can to prevent this development	7/22/2017 12:38 PM
57	this application reflects the practice where financial gain for the individual is given precedence over the needs of the community. The village at the moment has a diverse housing provision I would be very concerned that 70 new houses with most being of a high cost and specification would undermine and change the village infrastructure and demographics as well as eroding the green belt	7/22/2017 12:34 PM
58	I feel the development would be ok as long as it is not yet another scheme of huge expensive detached houses. We need small affordable houses and sheltered housing for the elderly.	7/22/2017 12:19 PM
59	I am totally against this development when there has already been the Cala development and planning permission given to the Devil's Elbow site	7/21/2017 6:37 PM
60	This proposal is contrary to all the rules on building on the green belt	7/17/2017 5:48 PM
61	This is entirely in the interests of the developer, and not Str as thblane and Blanefield, nor indeed Stirling Council.	7/15/2017 6:45 PM
62	I object in the strongest terms to this development taking place.	7/15/2017 10:45 AM
63	The village needs a development plan to increase housing supply to meet needs Development if any should be in the centre of the village, sites that could be identified and developed	7/14/2017 1:57 PM

64	Object to this application	7/14/2017 12:14 PM
65	Development good for local businesses	7/14/2017 10:06 AM
66	Development is needed but it needs to be the right type and at the bottom end of the village - it had (and continues to be abandoned) and as good as the new railway path is and ant proposed improvements in the road at the bottom of Station Road, it's still a twenty minutes walk (minimum) to the main shops/services etc. If this is not addressed, we may move out of the village altogether!!	7/14/2017 8:38 AM
67	Existing sites for new housing have already been agreed. Any new housing should be at least 50% social rented, possibly including some shared ownership.	7/14/2017 8:20 AM
68	Some additional houses that are sympathetic to local requirements and design are welcome. Mega housing estates and development are not. We live in a rural village already poorly served and it's not just a commuter location for glasgow.	7/14/2017 12:46 AM
69	As the SCC comment said at the PreApp stage, this to "Too Many, Wrong Type, Wrong Size and Wrong Place.	7/13/2017 10:12 PM
70	Most of the residents in this village work towards Glasgow. This housing development would not benefit Stirlingshire.	7/13/2017 8:25 PM
71	We need to find a way of resolving Gladman/Connell Estate's determination to develop some of their extensive land holdings to the east of the village. That requires a more long-term approach, and some joined-up thinking involving the landowners.	7/13/2017 7:53 PM
72	The great majority, possibly all, of the proposed houses will almost certainly be occupied by people moving to the village rather than by relocating existing residents. Given the location close to Glasgow, the potential number of people in this category is extremely large, meaning that there is no foreseeable limit to the number of new houses that could be considered necessary to meet future need. Gladman have done nothing to explain why this development should be considered as meeting a unique local need rather than just allowing them to profit by contributing to urban sprawl.	7/11/2017 10:06 PM
73	Housing developments (completed Cala Homes) and proposed development of 20+ off Old Mugdock Road means that in last 2 years more than 50 new housing properties have been built in village. Large scale housing projects near Killearn and Balforn should be sufficient to address housing needs of local community. Large scale housing development (70 houses) not needed within Stathblane/Blanefield and would have a significantly detrimental impact on local services, school and environment.	7/11/2017 2:27 PM
74	This proposed development would take away the village status and also take away the Green Belt	7/10/2017 5:31 PM
75	I am totally opposed to any more development on the Green Belt, especially in the proposed area. The Cala development is blight enough - please, no more.	7/10/2017 5:27 PM
76	Gladman have clearly ignored all feedback during the pre-application and are more interested in lining their pockets as opposed to taking note of the current communities needs and feelings. Given the way that they have reacted to the pre-application responses, and that the current application does not bind them to stick to this proposal just leaves things open for them to continue acting in such a way	7/6/2017 11:03 PM
77	Suggest Gladman focus attention on communities within the Stirling area where there would be easier access to infrastructure	7/4/2017 9:32 PM
78	I have lived here for 28years and that time every spare bit of ground has been developed and I believe the village has lost it's soul. All future development should be banned!	7/4/2017 10:20 AM
79	No more houses on our greenbelt! We have built enough recently. CC needs to fight this for us.	7/4/2017 10:07 AM
80	The CC needs to launch a proper campaign to stop this development. Why are you doing a housing survey on this site? The Chairwoman is part of Stirling Housing Association - is that why? Get off the fence and oppose this like the community told you to do at the last survey!!!!	7/4/2017 9:32 AM
81	Green Belt land is called that for a reason. This land needs protected. Our village does not need to be expanded. The money should be spent upgrading/refurbishing properties that are derelict therefore not needing to build on Green Belt land. It's all about them making money and they don't care about what the local residents feel - they don't live here so it doesn't matter to them. I'm sure they'd feel differently if it was on their own doorstep. The application failed the first time, hopefully it'll fail again.	7/2/2017 12:29 PM

82	I'm concerned about the conflict of interest that Margaret Vass has between her roles with the community council and the housing association. The community showed that it is vehemently against this development so the community council leadership should oppose it, not look for ways to get more housing association homes built. The survey should be about this application - not housing needs so I have answered some questions N/A. I am completely against this application and want to protect the greenbelt.	7/1/2017 6:06 PM
83	It is essential that Stirling Council commit to creating the new cemetery next to H106 as soon as possible.	7/1/2017 6:00 PM
84	Preservation of agreed Green Belt essential for the nature and amenities of the village	7/1/2017 1:01 PM
85	A little research on Gladman shows the amount of disruption, distress and cost to the public purse associated with their aggressive business model of "land promotion". I feel that this should in some way be escalated nationally as a concern. It must be very difficult councils to deal with companies like this, who are staffed up with a legal department totally focused on defending their case. In the case of Blanefield, it seems to me that consideration and consultation has already been given to housing needs for this particular area, with smaller scale (in fill) development already identified. It is disturbing that a man who lives nowhere near the areas he is proposing should be developed has such power to influence the lives of others, and to ride rough shod over that which has been agreed. I feel sorry for the people living in the immediate vicinity of this of this proposed development - it must be terribly stressful for them.	6/30/2017 2:58 PM
86	This proposed development goes against the Local Development Plan which was put in place for a very good reason. Of course ther will always be a need for housing but this particular site is definitely not the answer.	6/29/2017 3:11 PM
87	I am really concerned about the building on green belt land. I am concerned about what this would mean for the infrastructure of our village but mostly what this means for the environment. I fear that building on this land will open up the possibilities for more building on green belt in the future. I believe it is our duty to fight for and protect our countryside and allowing a development company to destroy it for financial means is not acceptable in any way.	6/28/2017 4:13 PM
88	I am all for further expansion of the housing within Strathblane however the lack of School development and investment is a great concern as I have 2 children at the local school. I would also think it be an idea to have a recreational area for the new housing areas so that the children have a place to use rather than be playing in the street all the time.	6/28/2017 9:43 AM
89	Generally in favour, ideally a development not unlike the Cala one, with a smaller proportion of social housing	6/27/2017 8:49 PM
90	No development on green belt. If this deveolpment is gived the green light then no green belt anywhere in the village is safe.	6/27/2017 8:22 PM
91	This development is too large and in the wrong location.	6/27/2017 5:36 PM
92	Far too many of my generation and younger have to move out of the village as more and more luxury homes are built and no affordable homes until the recent 14 Cala homes for local authority. Demand for these was so high it shows how many want to remain in their village. It is clear the only homes this village wants to see are affordable ones.	6/26/2017 10:11 PM
93	If there is a shortage of housing in the Stirling council area, this is not the place to rectify it. There are plenty other places to build, as opposed to this beautiful greenfield site which would obviously be preferred by developers for its ability to maximise profits. We have the devil's elbow site here in Strathblane, and I strongly believe we should be developing brownfield sites such as Killearn Hospital before encroaching further on our countryside. If there is indeed a shortfall in the Stirling Council allocation for new homes, this should be resolved in the central Stirling area in the built up towns, and not here in a small village on the edge of the council boundary, miles from Stirling itself. Building 70 executive homes in Strathblane would in any event do nothing to help the residents of the Stirling Council area - most would be purchased by commuters working in the greater Glasgow area. And to the local people who insinuate that 'incomers' are preventing 'real' local villagers from getting what they want, I very strongly believe that this development would in no way be of any benefit to them - whilst there may be a small proportion of affordable housing factored in, the vast majority of this development is going to be hugely expensive private homes, bringing in more of exactly the sort of people they seem to resent being in the village in the first place.	6/26/2017 10:31 AM
94	Why all the questions on housing? The community council needs to stop this development on our greenbelt!	6/26/2017 5:58 AM

95	A proposed development of this size Is Not what our village needs. Expansion for it's own sake or for Profit is of no benefit to a community of this size in this location. Utilities and (particularly) traffic would be adversely affected. This and the sacrifice of green belt is simply not justified by an expansion of this type and size. It is the Wrong type and size of development in the Wrong place.	6/26/2017 12:41 AM
96	The beautiful greenbelt land should be protected. There are other areas of Strling that are more practical to develop.	6/25/2017 9:53 PM
97	Green belts should be respected at all costs.	6/25/2017 5:24 PM
98	the planning for 62 new houses will bring in 124 additional residents with 124 cars and is far too large an increase for a small village	6/25/2017 5:12 PM
99	Any development needs to be primarily affordable housing for families in the area needing to upsize. NOT incomers.	6/25/2017 3:50 PM
100	Should this application be successful it would set a very dangerous precedent. It is pointless having a LDP if it is not adhered to.	6/25/2017 1:23 PM
101	The village needs to grow. This is a relatively small development compared to some areas. New blood needs to be brought in. Most of the houses in village were a new development at some point. Can't live in past. This is a commuter village so new homes needed. Survey questions, especially at beginning, are very leading. Should be impartial and neutral to give fair result.	6/25/2017 4:36 AM
102	Just no	6/25/2017 12:08 AM
103	Get them built and stop putting up barriers!	6/24/2017 10:12 PM
104	I'm not against developments so long as they are not excessive and the house prices are affordable for villagers also not mega rich outsiders. Developers need support the village too can't expect to gain as our village collapses under the strain. Village is full of families who have been here for many years and can't afford to stay in the village as houses are so expensive and few and far between.	6/24/2017 9:14 PM
105	Please do not destroy our village.	6/24/2017 8:19 PM
106	To accept an application of this kind at this time would significantly undermine the democratically accountable LDP process.	6/24/2017 4:42 PM
107	If we do not put a halt to this they will just keep coming back again and again until they get what they want. All that drives them is money and the 'game' of winning. Truly selfish.	6/24/2017 4:02 PM
108	There is a shortage of mid range housing in the village. Currently they seem to be local authority or £500k plus.	6/24/2017 2:47 PM
109	This application is purely about greed on behalf of the landowner, who does not even live in the village and does not care about the people who live here. There are plenty of other sites within the curtilage of the village which would be more suitable.	6/24/2017 2:23 PM
110	Thin end of the wedge! Gladman have no say over what the end developer will do.....and can not promise us anything.	6/24/2017 2:21 PM
111	The community made us clear at the time of the PAN that it strongly rejects the building of houses on this greenbelt site. The community council must represent those views and lead the fight against this application. If the community feels that more affordable housing is needed then alternative sites should be found that don't destroy the greenbelt or push the village boundaries out further.	6/24/2017 2:02 PM
112	Traffic already worrying in a village which has no bypass	6/24/2017 1:48 PM