

<b>Issue 37</b>	<b>Strathblane &amp; Blanefield</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 10 - Strathblane & Blanefield Settlement Statement (page 226-231) H106 - Campsie Road H108 – South of 13 Old Mugdock Road	<b>Reporter:</b> Richard G Dent
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Strathblane Community Council (SLDP_102) Ian Swann (00497) Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330) SportScotland (SLDP_178) Charles Connell & Co Holdings Ltd (SLDP_1251) A Mary Marshall & Jane Early (00467)	D Le Marquhand (01030) Robert Burns (SLDP_402) Simon Graham (SLDP_720) Robert Insall (01329) CALA Homes (West) (SLDP_230) Rural Stirling Housing Association (SLDP_156) Sted Investments (00699)	
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	The Strathblane & Blanefield Settlement Statement is the section of the Plan that sets out the approach to development in the village. All of the sites and designations considered under this Issue are contained within the Strathblane & Blanefield Settlement Statement.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>General</u></p> <p>Strathblane Community Council (SLDP_102/002) - Surprised that there is still no mention of the Carbeth Conservation Area in the Settlement Statement for Strathblane. With regard to the Cemetery proposal, the changes described do not seem designed to enforce lower speeds by physical measures. Consideration should be given to a roundabout to access the cemetery extension and/or housing site. Pedestrian access to the village through the old railway route (maybe private property) should be investigated. The Plan needs to provide a complete map of the Green Belt as at present only partial views are visible.</p> <p>Ian Swann (00497/002) – Considers the location for the cemetery would place it at a low point where water can be seen lying following recent rainfall. This raises questions about the drainage in that area and health and safety issues which would need addressed.</p> <p>Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/001) - Disappointed that there is no map in the Plan showing the location of Mugdock Country Park with Strathblane and the roads and footpaths linking the two. Also no mention of the Nature Reserve at Loch Ardinning and the walks available. The Plan does not acknowledge the need to extend Mugdock Country Park to cope with the increasing number of visitors, particularly parking or the need to travel to Loch Ardinning by car because the A81 is so busy and there is no adequate footpath. Non mention of the need for investment in improvements.</p>		

Removal/Amendment to the Green Belt

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/002); SportScotland (SLDP\_178/007); Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/002) – All opposed to the removal of Green Belt at the north west corner (Dumgoyach Local Landscape Character Area) and request that the Green Belt be retained (i) north of the B821 and (ii) west of the A809. Note that the Carbeth Landscape Character Area is not to be deleted from the Green Belt on the basis that the West Highland Way runs through the area. The West Highland Way also runs through Dumgoyach so this is an anomaly.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/002) – The Battle of Mugdock is not yet on the Inventory of Battlefield sites but should be afforded protection by not removing its Green Belt designation.

The proposal to remove the steep north-facing site on the Glasgow Road, west of Glenarden from the Green Belt seems a strange adjustment when the trees that have already been cut down on the site.

Charles Connell & Co Ltd (SLDP\_1251/008) - Blane water should form the new southern and eastern boundary of the Green Belt east of Strathblane. Through the robust definition of the eastern boundary of Strathblane, considers it possible to conserve and enhance the Green Belt and its function in this location for the long term future benefit of the village.

Housing – General

Rural Stirling Housing Association (SLDP\_156/004) – Supports housing in the village and particularly affordable housing due to its Pressured Area status but the issues here are particular acute due the fact that affordable housing represents a particularly low proportion of the existing housing stock and the Right to Buy has severely reduced the original stock of Council homes and there has been no affordable housing built for several decades.

Ian Swann (00497/002) – Supports the creation of additional housing where needed, especially affordable for local families and the elderly.

Sted Investments (00699/001) – The area of land at Blanefield Care Home and its grounds be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development. Refers to recent appeal dismissed on the site and the need for low density development, set within a landscaped setting in keeping with surrounding area. Considers a suitable, defensible, Green Belt boundary can be drawn immediately to the north west of site which would not lead to coalescence of Strathblane with other towns/villages or undue impact upon historic setting of village.

A M Marshall & J Early (00467/003) – Considers the Green Belt boundary could be well defined if the field opposite East Ballewan were allocated for housing. This site would also have the advantage of being on a bus route and include a roundabout to assist traffic calming on the approach to the village.

A M Marshall & J Early (00467/002); Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/009); D Le Marquhand (01030/001) - All support the proposed Green Belt boundary following the A81 at Glenarden. Developing the site adjacent to Glenarden would be nearer to facilities and access would be via Old Mugdock Road - less busy than A891.

D Le Marquhand submits two plans showing a proposed layout for the site, including

affordable housing, which is supported by further information relating to road access and improvements to the junction of Old Mugdock Road and Milngavie Road, available services and drainage infrastructure improvements, suitable ground conditions, and references to the support of Strathblane Community Council. All the information is presented to demonstrate the suitability of the site for housing development.

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/009) – Considers Glenarden suitable for affordable housing. Development might be justified on that basis, with replacement of woodland elsewhere, providing the scheme meet the 50%+ affordable criterion.

D Le Marquhand (01030/001) – Considers support is given in the Plan under Policy 2(b) to residential development at Glenarden as the site is not protected open space and it will provide affordable housing. Wants the site specifically allocated for housing if the above understanding is not correct.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/005) – Considers a number of sites should be reconsidered for housing development, which are all preferable to the allocated site H106. Considers that given the sensitivities around the village the provision of affordable and special needs housing is going to take some time and will be reliant on other settlements i.e. Milngavie and the Greater Glasgow Conurbation.

Robert Burns (SLDP\_402/001) – Considers a site at Old Mugdock Road should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development. Sensitive development will have to take place on the Green Belt where it will not lead to coalescence or urban sprawl which this site offers. The Green Belt will be protected with a strong natural replacement boundary. The site is proposed for 6 - 8 self-build plots and would help support existing community facilities and provide stimulation for new community development with socio-economic benefits.

Simon Graham (SLDP\_720/001) - Objects to non-inclusion within the settlement boundary of site of 'the house and garden ground at Campsie Dene Road' which has now been built. The site is small, identifiable and well-defined, performs no useful Green Belt function and its inclusion within the settlement should not be constrained by the legal agreement. Refers to evidence of a different approach taken by the Council elsewhere in Killearn (Drumbeg Loan).

#### Allocated Housing Site - H106, Campsie Road

A M Marshall & J Early (00467/001) - The A891 is a busy road with a flooding problem at Dungallass entrance - suggests changes to the location of the development H106 to assist with this. Welcomes the extension of the 30 mph zone. Site not a bus route which may be disadvantageous to residents unable to drive. Pleased that footpaths are to be provided. The Green Belt boundary is currently well defined by the path at side of the Glebe this would not be so if it were merely defined by a line of trees as proposed.

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/006) – Wants flexibility within the development brief to obtain the best outcome for the community. For example, whether the housing and cemetery site should be switched around, to avoid accidents when funerals are taking place.

The Key Site Requirements are a good start but not easily visualised on the ground. They do not seem designed to enforce lower speeds by physical measures. Consideration should be given to a roundabout to access the cemetery extension and/or housing site. Pedestrian access through the old railway route should be investigated, to avoid the hills and the traffic.

The new hard boundary to the Green Belt is essential.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/004) – Considers Strathblane is effectively at its limit for significant development and further expansion, in the form of either large or small scale growth and therefore objects to H106. Does not believe that a robust boundary can be established between the proposed houses and the Green Belt within the span of the Plan. Refers also to the Battle of Loch Ardingning as not yet on the Inventory of Battlefield sites and the building of houses at H106. Refers to previous planning applications made in the 1990's refused at Appeal at H106.

Robert Insall (01329/001) - Supports the idea of building affordable housing in Strathblane but objects to the H106. It is current green fields with a widely used footpath and view to Kirkhouse. Affordable housing here is as far away from shops as possible, crossing a maximum number of roads to get anywhere, and at a site bounded by two main roads in which people drive too fast. The natural place is nearer the middle of the village where there are connections and where the Green Belt boundary is not extended outwards.

Ian Swann (00497/001) - The Green Belt boundary to the east of the village is well established at a high point in the road and follows an old waypath which is lined by mature trees. The views of the eastern border of the village are exceptional as are the view in the opposite direction from the church. The views of the village would be dramatically changed by development on H106 and would impact negatively on open space as it would place buildings next to existing walkways. The rural character of the village would be irrevocably changed.

Charles Connell & Co Ltd (SLDP\_1251/007) – Supports H106 but requests that the housing allocation is expanded to the east, with the cemetery extension taking the place of the proposed housing at H106 closer to the Church. Proposes a site specific design solution with the cemetery extension to be sited opposite the church with car parking provided behind a low stone wall and beech hedge. Also considers that the delivery of the required cemetery and the proposed landscape elements required to provide a 'robust Green Belt boundary' and site specific design solution, can only be achieved through delivery of 50 housing units rather than 30 units.

CALA Homes (West) (SLDP\_230/010) – Supports the inclusion of H106. The delivery of 30 homes on this site is appropriate for the site's location at the edge of the existing village as well as providing a 50:50 split between affordable and market homes. Welcomes the clarity now provided in the Table (page 230) under Key Site Requirements regarding the need to confirm that the site for the extended cemetery will be located outwith the allocated site (in the Green Belt). Confirms that the programming (Phase 1) can be delivered in accord with PAN 2/2010.

#### Allocated Housing Site H108 – South of 13 Old Mugdock Road

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/008) - Site H108 should be deleted. It is no longer available in view of the approval for the Co-operative development (CD127).

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

##### General

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/002) - Correct references to Strathblane being

'12 miles from the Glasgow conurbation'. The conurbation includes Milngavie which is perhaps only 4 miles away.

Provide a complete map of the Green Belt within the Plan.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/001) - The Plan needs to commit Stirling Council to improving paths in its ownership and to working extensively with private land owners to make all paths more attractive and safer for public access, possibly within Primary Policy 15: Tourism and Recreational Development.

#### Removal/Amendment to the Green Belt

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/002) - Reinstate the Green Belt at the north west corner - north of the B821 and west of the A809 (Dumgoyach).

SportScotland (SLDP\_178/007) - Amend Green Belt boundary to include area of West Highland Way that runs through the Dumgoyach Local Landscape Character Area.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/002) – Do not remove the areas of Green Belt at Carbeth.

The trees at Glenarden should be being replaced to improve the absorption of carbon emitted by traffic on the hill.

Charles Connell & Co Ltd (SLDP\_1251/008) - Amend the Green Belt boundary to the east of Strathblane to reflect the recommendations of the objector's submitted Ian White Landscape Appraisal. Amend Strathblane and Blanefield Settlement Plan to allocate the extended area submitted for H106 and the masterplan prepared by Jimmy Denholm Partnership.

#### Housing – General

Ian Swann (00497/002) – Supports the creation of additional housing where needed, especially affordable for local families and the elderly. Suggests Glenarden is used for this purpose as it is closer to the village shop and GP surgery than H106, and this is a site recently cleared of trees.

Sted Investments (00699/001) - Remove Blanefield Care Home and surrounding land from the Green Belt and allocate as a residential site. Suggests re-drawing the Green Belt boundary to release this site and land immediately to south east (Site Assessment ref. STRA07) as a minor expansion to village.

A M Marshall & J Early (00467/003) – Housing development at Ballewan (Site Assessment ref. STRA07) should be considered.

A M Marshall & J Early (00467/002) – Housing development at the site adjacent to Glenarden (Site Assessment Ref: NEW1) should be considered.

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/009) - The Plan should allow for Glenarden (Site Assessment Ref: NEW1) to be considered for provision of affordable housing.

Ian Swann (00497/001) - Suggests Glenarden is used for affordable housing as it is closer to the village shop and GP surgery than H106, and is recently cleared of trees.

D Le Marquhand (01030/001) - Wants the site at Glenarden (Site Assessment Ref: NEW1) specifically allocated in the Plan for housing if support is not forthcoming from the policies in the Proposed Plan.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/005) – The Council should reconsider the following areas for housing: The Council own small piece of land within the village on Glasgow Road, opposite the War Memorial and east of the Glasgow water mains (Site Assessment Ref: STRA05), open ground off Glasgow Road next to New City Row and west of the Glasgow water mains, and the Telephone Exchange.

Robert Burns (SLDP\_402/001) - The gap site at Old Mugdock Road (Site Assessment Ref: STRA02), should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.

Simon Graham (SLDP\_720/001) - Remove site of 'the house and garden ground at Campsie Dene Road' from the countryside and Green Belt.

#### Allocated Housing Site H106 – Campsie Road

Ian Swann (00497/001 and 002); A M Marshall & J Early (00467/001) – Suggests the cemetery needs could be met by the use of some or all the site H106 which is adjacent to the Manse and close to Strathblane Parish Church and existing cemetery. There could then be a roundabout at Dunglass making a safer exit and also aid traffic calming. Traffic lights would allow a safe crossing for pedestrians to access the village (and facilities) via Dunglass.

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/006) – The Plan should require that the community is fully involved in the production of the Development Brief for this site. The road and footpath improvements must also be subject to consultation with the community. The location and extent of 'additional tree planting' should be marked on the plan.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/004) – Remove H106 as being suitable for house building.

Charles Connell & Co Ltd (SLDP\_1251/007) – Amend the Green Belt boundary of H106 to the east of Strathblane to reflect the recommendations of the (objectors submitted) Ian White Landscape Appraisal. Amend the Settlement Plan to allocate the area to the east of the Campsie Road (H106 site) for 50 residential units of mixed tenure. Reduce the affordable housing contribution from 50% to 25%.

#### Allocated Housing Site H108 – South of 13 Old Mugdock Road

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/008) - Site H108 should be deleted.

#### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

##### General

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/002) – A plan of the Carbeth Conservation Area is shown at Page 229 of the Plan. There is no reference to Carbeth itself within the Settlement Statement as the Statement deals with the main settlement of Strathblane and Blanefield – Carbeth is not identified as a settlement in the Settlement Hierarchy. Details in terms of how the cemetery can help reduce lower vehicle speeds can be

considered at the planning application stage. A roundabout is not considered necessary given the scale of the proposed development and pedestrian access to the village outwith the site is not a consideration for the Key Site Requirements for the proposed housing development.

The references to Strathblane being '12 miles from the Glasgow conurbation' can be corrected in the final Plan. The Council considers this to be non-notifiable modification.

It is not possible to provide a complete map of the Green Belt within the Plan as it would comprise a number of separate pages if a consistent scale was to be used. When the Plan is adopted it will be published as an online Local Development Plan, and all full extent of the relevant designations in the Plan will be viewable through a GIS mapping facility.

The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Ian Swann (00497/002) – Further investigations will be undertaken in relation to the Cemetery and the ground water levels determined to allow the site to be managed appropriately. The site is considered appropriate for this use as several options are available including reducing capacity for interments in lairs, allocating low lying areas for ashes interments only, suds pond etc. It is anticipated that the higher ground will be used for burial purposes. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/001) – Proposals to improve local access routes and links to the West Highland Way, John Muir way and Mugdock Country Park are highlighted in the Open Space Strategy Opportunity Plan for Strathblane (CD59). Any Improvements to Mugdock Country Park are handled by the Country park Management Committee and any planning permissions secured under this use. This is not therefore a matter for the development plan. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

#### Removal/Amendment to the Green Belt

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/002); SportScotland (SLDP\_178/007); Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/002) - In relation to the proposed removal of Green Belt at Dumgoyach, Chapter 5 of the Green Belt Review Background Report (CD55) explains why the Green Belt to the west at Auchineden plays a lesser role in the setting and identity of settlements – this is one of the key objectives for Green Belts outlined within Scottish Planning Policy (CD1). This is different to Carbeth, where the Green Belt has a complementary role in providing a landscape setting to the Carbeth Huts. The Council considers therefore that the Green Belt west of Auchineden should continue to be deleted. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to these representations.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/002) – The Green Belt at Carbeth is not proposed for removal, but at Dumgoyach – this is shown on Page 229 of the Plan. The battle of Mugdock is not on Historic Scotland's Inventory of Battlefield sites and therefore not recognised as being of national interest for inclusion on the Inventory. It would not be appropriate therefore to retain the Green Belt designation on this basis.

In relation to the proposed removal of Green Belt at Glenarden, Chapter 5 of the Background Report (CD55) explains why a more robust Green Belt boundary is considered to be the A81, consistent with Scottish Planning Policy. A felling licence has been issued

(CD219) for the thinning of trees on the site, the licence gives no indication of the need for replacement planting and this would be a matter for the Forestry Commission Scotland. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Charles Connell & Co Ltd (SLDP\_1251/007) – If the Green Belt boundary were to follow the Blane Water as suggested by the objector, this would result in significant areas of land taken out of the Green Belt. This area falls within the Dunglass Local Landscape Character Area as referred to in the Strathblane Green Belt Study (CD54), and is considered highly visible from the A891. As the existing Green Belt boundary with the settlement is considered robust, only a modest removal of Green Belt to accommodate proposal H106 is proposed in the Plan, with the proposed extension to the cemetery forming the inner boundary of the Green Belt to reduce its overall impact. The justification for a Green Belt up to the Blane Water is considered strong given the potential adverse impact additional development could have on the settlement pattern, further extending Strathblane into the largely unsettled valley to the east. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

### Housing - General

Sted Investments (00699/001) – The removal of the Green Belt at Blanefield House and between the site and Blanefield, and its allocation for low density housing in conjunction with site STRA07, is not supported. The sites lie outwith the village and in the Local Landscape Character Area of Blanefield as referred to in the Strathblane Green Belt Study (CD54). The existing Green Belt is considered to play a central role in protecting the local setting and identity of Strathblane, through maintaining the association of Strathblane and Blanefield with the valley landform. There is therefore no justification for deleting large areas of the Green Belt in this location.

A planning application refusal (CD94) and planning appeal decision (CD95) at Blanefield House concludes that development here would increase sprawl into the countryside and would be an intrusion into an open landscape.

Although the study (CD54) suggests the area south of the A81 (East Ballewan) could accommodate development in landscape terms, the Council's Site Assessment (CD45) of STRA07 concludes that it is some distance from local amenities and does not encourage sustainable transport modes. Development here would need to address the road frontage and flood risk and the site is also significantly constrained by existing landscape features. For these reasons, the site is not considered appropriate for development.

A M Marshall & J Early (00467/003) - also supports development at STRA07. The Council considers that any development at STRA07 and Blanefield House would represent a major expansion into the countryside having an adverse impact on the setting and character of Blanefield. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to these representations.

A M Marshall & J Early (00467/002); Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/009), Ian Swann (00497/001 & 00497/002); D Le Marquhand (01030/001) – The Council does not support the specific allocation of Glenarden for housing purposes. H106 is identified as the preferred housing site for Strathblane and Blanefield. Although it is recognised that there is housing need pressure within the settlement, the identification of further affordable housing within the period of the Plan is constrained by funding and only one site therefore is considered deliverable. The Council's Site Assessment ref: NEW1 (CD45) highlights concerns with the site and its suitability for housing development. A felling licence has been



issued (CD219) for the thinning of trees on the site, the licence is not to clear fell the trees on the site and gives no indication of the need for replacement planting. The Council is concerned that the proposed development (either options put forward) are not achievable without significant tree loss on the site contrary to the national policy on woodland removal. No tree survey is submitted with the representation to demonstrate otherwise. The suggestion to improve Old Mugdock Road/Milngavie junction is welcomed but should not be used as an argument to support development that would not otherwise be supported. The gradients of the site also render affordable housing difficult to achieve and at a cost affordable relative to the limited government funding available. No information has been provided to counter this argument by either the promoter of the site or the local Registered Social Landlord. The allocated site H106 is therefore considered to present a more cost-effective option for the delivery of affordable housing in the village. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/005) – Most of the sites suggested by the objector have already been considered in the Council's Site Assessment process (CD45). Of all the sites considered, H106 is considered to be the best opportunity to secure affordable housing within the village. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Robert Burns (SLDP\_402/001) – The Council's Site Assessment (CD45) of Old Mugdock Road (STRA02) concludes that the site is remote from existing facilities, difficult to access safe routes to school, and would not therefore be appropriate as a site for affordable housing particularly. Further housing in this area would continue the existing undesirable pattern of development in this location. The retention of Green Belt in this location is considered important to the setting of Strathblane. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Simon Graham (SLDP\_720/001) – The site at Campsie Dene Road (STRA03) was considered in the Council's Site Assessment process (CD45). Outline Planning Permission (CD96) was granted in 2008 for a house on the site subject to a S75 Agreement to ensure the property is tied to the agricultural business and land. This was because of the site's location within the countryside and the Green Belt. It would not be appropriate therefore to remove the Green Belt and adjust the Countryside Policy Boundary area to accommodate the site simply because the house has now been built. The comparison made with amendments made to Countryside Policy Boundary with respect to Drumbeg Loan, Killearn (CD125a & CD125b) is not directly comparable as the housing permitted at these sites are not within the Green Belt, the sites fall within the definition of brownfield land, and were not been approved subject to S75 Agreements. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

#### Allocated Housing Site H106 – Campsie Road

A M Marshall & J Early (00467/001); Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/006); Charles Connell & Co Ltd (SLDP\_1251/007) – all request that the location of the proposed cemetery extension be switched with H106, for varying reasons. The location of the cemetery extension is considered important in order to round-off the eastern edge of the village and prevent future development encroaching into this sensitive area of Green Belt. It will also provide a clear boundary for the inner edge of the Green Belt. A roundabout is not considered necessary given the scale of the proposed development but the Key Site Requirements require a new crossing facility to be provided. Relocating the 30 mph signage may involve introducing a new gateway/traffic calming feature that will complement the crossing facility which may take the form of either road narrowing, a refuge island or a zebra

crossing. The Community Council will be consulted on any Development Brief for this site along with any proposed road and footpath improvements. It is not possible to identify the extent of tree planting for the site – this is a matter for the Development Brief and full planning application that is submitted. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt (01330/004) – The Council considers that a robust boundary can be established between the proposed houses and the Green Belt through the provision of the cemetery extension. The battle of Loch Ardinning is not on Historic Scotland's Inventory of Battlefield sites and therefore not recognised as being of national interest for inclusion on the Inventory. It would not be appropriate therefore to prevent development at H106 on this basis. Any previous planning applications relating to the site would have been considered under the previous development plan strategy. As this is a new Local Development Plan, the new strategy requires sites within the Green Belt to be considered where appropriate. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Robert Insall (01329/001) – Sites for housing development within the village were considered through the Council's Site Assessment process (CD45). H106 is considered to be the best opportunity to secure affordable housing within the village and is relatively close to existing village amenities e.g. primary school. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Ian Swann (00497/001) - This area falls within the Dunglass Local Landscape Character Area as referred to in the Strathblane Green Belt Study (CD54), and is considered highly visible from the A891. Only a modest removal of Green Belt to accommodate proposal H106 is therefore proposed in the Plan, with the proposed extension to the cemetery forming the inner boundary of the Green Belt to reduce its overall impact. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Charles Connell & Co Ltd (SLDP\_1251/007) – The delivery of the required cemetery extension and the proposed landscape elements required to provide a robust Green Belt boundary, is not dependent on 50 houses. The cemetery extension will be delivered and funded by the Council, and it is next in line to be delivered after Callender. The Council considers that housing on H106 site can be delivered in the timescales indicated – the site is supported by a house builder for 50% affordable housing and is considered effective. The Council does not agree that the site should be extended further into the Green Belt to the east to provide a low density housing development similar to that north of the A891. Built development here would be highly visible, the proposal to widen the road frontage and introduce a footpath, verge and avenue tree planting right up to Ballagan House, would introduce an urban form of development into open countryside, changing the character of this countryside location. This would impact on the wider landscape setting of the Green Belt in this location. The H106 site can be considered separately as it relates more to the existing village edge to the west, and at a proposed density of c.23 units / hectare is appropriate for this part of the village. The Council needs to prioritise the delivery of affordable housing within the village and the location and scale of H106 provides an opportunity to do this as opposed to that proposed by the objector. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

Allocated Housing Site H108 – South of 13 Old Mugdock Road (Housing Land Audit Ref: SC114).

Strathblane Community Council (SLDP\_102/008) – This site does not feature in the period to 2024 within the 2012 Housing Land Audit (CD64) because it is now being proposed for conversion to commercial uses. In 2011 however the site was considered effective and therefore the Plan is consistent with the 2011 Housing Land Audit (CD63). The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

### Reporter's conclusions:

#### General

##### Carbeth Conservation Area

1. The planning authority explains that the Carbeth Conservation Area is not within the Strathblane and Blanefield settlement area but that there is a map of the conservation area on page 229. This map is within the section of the local development plan dealing with Strathblane and Blanefield but, as pointed out by the community council, there is no reference to Carbeth in the text. It would be appropriate to provide a context for the conservation area in the Description section of the settlement statement in a similar manner to the reference to Mugdock Country Park, also not within the settlement area. This would allow a better understanding of the purpose of the Carbeth Conservation Area map. The local development plan should be modified accordingly.

##### Mugdock Country Park and Loch Ardinning Nature Reserve

2. The Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt is concerned about the lack of a map of the country park or mention of the nature reserve. The planning authority points out that improvements in Mugdock Country Park are the concern of the management committee. There is no response in respect of the nature reserve.

3. The Description section of the settlement statement makes a detailed reference to Mugdock Country Park. This is appropriate content for the local development plan particularly as the planning authority has explained the park management arrangements.

4. Although close to Strathblane, there does not appear to be a particular requirement to refer to the Loch Ardinning Nature Reserve.

5. No modification to the local development plan is required.

##### Proximity to Glasgow

6. The community council's concerns regarding the proximity to Glasgow appear to have been resolved as the planning authority has undertaken to change the Description section by means of a non-notifiable modification. No further action is therefore required although it would be preferable to ensure consistency through the use of either metric or imperial distances.

##### Green belt map

7. It would be useful to have a single, complete map of the green belt as requested by the community council. However, the planning authority has provided an explanation why this would not be practical because of the form in which the local development plan has been presented.

8. The Key Diagram for the Core Area and Rural Villages does show the extent of the green belt. However, the scale is such that the outer edge of the designated area is sometimes difficult to discern accurately, including to the north-east of Strathblane. The inner boundary, of course, is defined on the larger scale settlement plans including Strathblane/Blanefield along with the Carbeth map on page 229.

9. It does not appear that the presentation of the green belt in the local development plan has prejudiced the community council or any other party wishing to make representations in respect of the extent of the designated area. (note: the green belt is considered on a wider basis under Issue 8). As a consequence, no modification of the local development plan is required.

10. On the adoption of the local development plan, the planning authority will no doubt ensure that the status of all published documents, including any showing the designated green belt, is made clear.

### Green belt boundary changes

#### Land west of the A809

11. The Green Belt Review explains that in the vicinity of Auchindene, to the west of the A809, the green belt plays a lesser role at both strategic and local level. It is therefore proposed to “draw back” the boundary to the A809. The local development plan reflects this proposal.

12. To the west of the road, as indicated in the review, the green belt designation serves little practical purpose in strategic terms. However, a small part of the Carbeth Conservation Area lies to the west of the A809 and another part lies immediately to the east of the road.

13. The green belt at this location complements the conservation area and protects the landscape setting. Accordingly, the designation should not be deleted as proposed and the local development plan should be modified to show the green belt retained at this location.

#### Land north of the B821

14. The Green Belt Review states that to the west of Strathblane, the green belt contributes in terms of local settlement setting and identity. It overlaps part of the designed landscape of Duntreath Castle. Beyond this, at Carbeth, the review indicates that the green belt plays a strategic role in relation to the Glasgow conurbation and again complements the Carbeth Conservation Area in providing a landscape setting.

15. Although the planning authority argues that the green belt is not proposed for removal at Carbeth, but at Dumgoyach, the green belt to the north of the B821 plays an important role in respect of the conservation area. Part of the conservation area is included in the existing green belt and a further section lies adjacent to the green belt, immediately to the south of the A821. The green belt designation is therefore justified at this point.

16. Additionally, the green belt in this vicinity meets the objective of securing recreational access to the countryside, in this case, by means of the West Highland Way. Reference has also been made to the Battle of Mugdock but there is no compelling evidence to retain the green belt to protect this battle site. In any event, other considerations support the green belt designation in this vicinity.

17. The green belt should not be deleted to the north of the B821 and the local development plan should be modified to show the green belt retained at this location.

#### Land west of Glenarden, adjacent to A81

18. The Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt believes that the trees removed from the site should be replaced by new planting. The planning authority recognises that the woodland (now removed under licence) was important for the setting of Strathblane but argues that a green belt boundary following the A81 would be more robust.

19. As explained by the planning authority, the felling of the trees was undertaken under the terms of a licence. The A81 does provide a clear green belt boundary and the land proposed for removal from the green belt is closely associated with the built form of Strathblane. There is existing development on three sides. Despite the submission of informal housing layouts, any future development proposal would require assessment through the development management procedures. However, in terms of the local development plan preparation process, the document does not require modification in respect of the proposal to remove the green belt designation from this area of land.

#### Land at Campsie Dene Road

20. It is argued that as a house has been built on the land, the settlement pattern of the village has been reinforced and the site serves no green belt function. The occupancy agreement is not relevant to this land use consideration. On the other hand, the planning authority believes it would not be correct to adjust the boundary, simply because the house has been built.

21. The legal agreement restricting the occupancy of the house was clearly considered appropriate when planning permission was granted. At that time the site was in the green belt and subject to restrictive development policies. The future of the legal agreement is not a matter for this examination to consider.

22. Visually, the new house relates to the built form of the village which, at this point, is characterised by substantial residential properties built in generous grounds. It would be incongruous to retain the land within the designated green belt and logic suggests that both the green belt and countryside policy boundaries should be adjusted to include the house and garden ground. On this basis the local development plan should be modified.

Note: other representations with green belt implications are considered under matters relating to housing land

#### Housing – General

#### Land at Old Mugdock Road

23. The land has been portrayed as an ideal infill opportunity and a gap site but it is neither. Topographically and visually the land is separated from nearby development and is not a natural infill site. It is not a gap site as it simply constitutes part of the irregular development boundary at this part of Strathblane.

24. As pointed out by the planning authority, development of the site would continue the already undesirable pattern of development in this location. In effect, the development at Moor Road is an isolated low density residential development in the countryside. In

planning terms, it has no meaningful relationship with Strathblane, remote in terms of facilities and access to school.

25. Green belt designation is appropriate to protect the landscape setting of Strathblane and the local development plan should not be modified.

Land at Blanefield Care Home (including land between the care home and the village)

26. It has been suggested that an amended green belt boundary to include the care home site along with the intervening land between the care home and Blanefield would constitute a “minor expansion of the village”. Under no circumstances could such a level of release be regarded as minor. As argued by the planning authority, housing allocation would give rise to a scale of development which would threaten the identity and setting of the village. The edge of the village is quite clear at this point and there is no requirement to redefine “a suitable and defensible green belt boundary”.

26. The planning authority has also drawn attention to a number of constraints including access, flood risk, the provision of sustainable transport modes and topography. Even if these development challenges could be overcome, the principle of development would remain unacceptable.

27. On the foregoing basis, the land should be retained in the green belt and the local development plan should not be modified.

#### Allocated Housing Site H106, Campsie Road, and adjacent cemetery extension

28. Mr I Swann believes the development of the site would threaten the rural character of the village. It would be preferable to allocate at least part of the site for the cemetery extension being adjacent to the manse and close to the church. The allocated cemetery extension site poses drainage questions. Mr R Insall also considers the loss of a peripheral green belt site to be unacceptable. Ms J Early and Ms M Marshall are concerned about traffic generation and flooding but suggest that Site H106 and the proposed cemetery extension could be reversed. The Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt is of the opinion that the development of Site H106 would not permit the creation of a robust green belt boundary. Development may also impinge on the site of the Battle of Ardingning.

29. The community council considers it essential for the development to include affordable housing. The opportunity should be taken to explore the possibility of a roundabout to provide access to the housing site and/or the cemetery extension. At the end of the day a new, hard boundary to the green belt must be created.

30. Cala Homes supports the allocation and has prepared a “development concept” plan showing 30 houses of which half would be affordable houses. The Rural Stirling Housing Association supports the concept of providing affordable housing in Strathblane.

31. Charles Connell & Co Holdings Ltd has suggested an enlarged allocation with the proposed cemetery extension to the west and residential development extending to the east. A layout has been prepared showing 50 houses of which about 25% would be affordable houses. The local development plan requirement for a contribution of 50% is too high.

32. The planning authority considers Site H106 to be the best opportunity to secure limited housing development – including affordable housing – in the village. The location of the

proposed cemetery extension would allow the creation of a firm green belt boundary. The additional release required by Charles Connell & Co Holdings Ltd would be of a scale leading to an unacceptable impact on the wider green belt landscape. Development details, including traffic control measures, would be assessed as part of the ongoing planning process although it is not anticipated that a roundabout would be necessary.

33. The concern expressed about drainage and water levels in the proposed cemetery extension would be the subject of further investigations.

34. The settlement statement explains that Strathblane is regarded as Tier 4 within the settlement hierarchy with the potential for modest amounts of new development. The scale of development proposed under Site H106 meets this requirement. The provision of affordable housing is justified as Strathblane lies within an area identified as “highly pressured”. Although Charles Connell & Co Holdings Ltd objects to the required level of affordable housing, Cala Homes has provided a layout with a 50% contribution.

35. Affordable housing is considered in detail in Issue 9 but, insofar as Site H106 is concerned, the affordable housing contribution is justified.

36. The planning authority argues that the disposition of Site H106 and the cemetery extension would permit the formation of a strong green belt boundary. This is agreed and, in turn, the council’s view that a residential land release of the size required by Charles Connell & Co Holdings Ltd would have an unacceptable impact is also accepted. The Concept Plan lodged by Charles Connell & Co, whilst perhaps, indicative, includes an internal woodland belt. However, the housing layout to the east of the woodland belt appears to have taken little account of the proximity to the green belt boundary.

37. Undoubtedly, Site H106 would have a visual impact when approaching from the east and, to some extent, this would affect the landscape setting of the village. The settlement statement recognises the site as being “highly visible” and requiring a design solution to respect the sensitive nature of the location. Taking account of the proposed location for the cemetery extension and existing development on the north side of Campsie Road along with the need for an appropriate design solution, the allocation of the housing site is regarded as being acceptable.

38. The planning authority points out that details of the development, including related traffic matters would be brought forward through a development brief and planning application. This is standard development management procedure and there is no reason to believe that the design challenges posed by the site could not be met in an acceptable manner. Although it has been suggested that a roundabout would be appropriate to provide access, the planning authority, very fairly, has indicated that such a feature would be difficult to justify.

39. The planning authority has noted the references to drainage and water levels at the proposed cemetery extension site. Whilst recognising this potential constraint, the use of the land for burial purposes has not been ruled out. It is reasonable therefore to retain this local development plan allocation.

40. The reference by Strathblane Committee for the Preservation of the Green Belt to the Battle of Ardinging is noted. This battle is not included in the Inventory of Battlefield Sites and, in any event, appears to have taken place closer to Loch Ardinging. It therefore does not appear that there would be an impact on historic culture to the extent of precluding the allocation of Site H106 or the cemetery extension.

41. All-in-all there is not a requirement to modify the local development plan in respect of allocated housing site H106 and the proposed cemetery extension.

Allocated Housing Site H108, South of 13 Old Mugdock Road

42. Development for housing purposes has been precluded by the conversion of this property to commercial use. The site cannot therefore be regarded as effective and has been removed from the 2102 Housing Land Audit for the period to 2024. On this basis the site should be deleted from the local development plan.

**Reporter's recommendations:**

The local development plan should be modified by:

1. Adding an extra paragraph to the "Description" section of the Strathblane and Blanefield settlement statement to provide a context for the map entitled "Carbeth" on page 229.
2. Retaining not deleting the designated green belt at land west of the A809.
3. Retaining not deleting the designated green belt at land north of the B821.
4. Excluding the garden and house at land at Campsie Dene Road from the designated green belt and countryside policy area.
5. Deleting all reference to site H108 South of 13 Old Mugdock Road entirely.



<b>Issue 38</b>	<b>Mugdock</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Chapter 10: Strathblane & Blanefield Settlement Statement (pages 226 – 231 of the Plan)	<b>Reporter:</b> Richard G Dent
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>		
Strathblane Community Council (SLDP_102) Robert D Nixon (01065) Kenneth Harvie (01327)	Grant Gibson (01328) Rosemary M H Brown (01349) Scotia House (SLDP_1272)	
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mugdock lies outwith the settlement and therefore does not appear on the Settlement Proposals Map on page 231.	
<b>Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<p>Strathblane Community Council (SLDP_102/002) - Strongly supports the retention of the Green Belt designation around Strathblane generally and in particular throughout Mugdock and would not wish to see any change to this in the future.</p> <p>Robert D Nixon (01065/001); Kenneth Harvie (01327/001); Grant Gibson (01328/001) - Consider Mugdock should be given village status as it is recognised locally and by other Council departments as a village. A defined boundary should be created for the purposes of clarity.</p> <p>Rosemary Brown (01349/001) - Having been an employer at Easterton for the last 17 years, part of the attraction is the fact that Mugdock has always been referred to as our village. Surprised that the boundary is not legally defined, this presents problems for new clients occasionally.</p> <p>Scotia House (SLDP_1272/001) - The settlement status of Mugdock, and the need for a Green Belt should be reviewed as there is an opportunity to release land in this area for development that would help meet the overall spatial strategy. The Council's review of the Green Belt presupposes that the Green Belt should remain but this should be reviewed further and other policy means e.g. Countryside, Local Landscape Area, be considered. Submits a landscape and visual impact assessment in support of releasing land for housing at Mugdock. Scottish Planning Policy guidance outlines a far more permissive regime for development within Green Belts than was previously the case. Considers Mugdock to be a settlement because of its plan form, how it is described in the Stirling Local Plan, and how Scottish Ministers and reporters have referred to it as a settlement in appeal decisions. It was listed as a Proposed Small Settlement in Appendix A (Settlement and Site Assessment) of the Main Issues Report. Suggests a 'defensible' boundary for Mugdock and an area to be developed along with potential development infill.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
Robert D Nixon (01065/001); Rosemary Brown (01349/001); Kenneth Harvie (01327/001); Grant Gibson (01328/001) – All request that a village status be granted for Mugdock and a		

defined boundary set round the village.

Scotia House (SLDP\_1272/001) - Replace the Green Belt with an alternative landscape-based policy. Alternatively the removal of Mugdock from the Green Belt with a new defensible boundary (plans submitted for two boundary options - expanded or tightly drawn). Identify Mugdock as a separate small village/settlement suitable for development in Chapter 10. Release land for housing with the extent of release dependent on the eventual decision regarding an appropriate Green Belt and settlement boundary for Mugdock.

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:**

Robert D Nixon (01065/001); Rosemary Brown (01349/001); Kenneth Harvie (01327/001); Grant Gibson (01328/001); Scotia House (SLDP\_1272/001) - There is no legal definition of a 'village' or 'settlement' within Scottish Planning Policy. SPP Para.77 indicates that the Local Development Plan sets out the settlement strategy for its area under a number of key considerations. The deliverability of the strategy, accessibility by a range of transport options, and protection and enhancement of the landscape and the wider environment, are just three of these considerations. The Settlement Strategy Table 1 in the Plan refers to the strategic area of the Rural Villages Area and its more modest role in meeting future development needs. The Settlement Hierarchy map at Page 17 of the Plan clearly identifies all the settlements that constitute Rural Villages and therefore are identified within Chapter 10 with a Settlement Statement. Not all Rural Villages are defined with a Countryside Policy Boundary i.e. Ardeonaig, which is considered a dispersed rural crofting community, worthy of identification in the Plan.

Mugdock comprises of fragmented groups of smaller houses and very large single houses with large gardens, all within a countryside setting. The Appeal Reporter (CD90) describes Mugdock as comprising of an 'irregular scatter of buildings' (Para.28). The housing dates from the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries and includes one listed building at Dineiddwg. When compared with the Tier 4 Rural Villages identified for modest housing development in the Plan such as Killearn, Buchlyvie and Strathblane, Mugdock does not compare favourably. There is no recognisable 'centre' to the settlement and it lacks local facilities including shops, schools and other amenities. It has very poor walking and cycling links, which are considered suitable and safe, to access these facilities in other nearby settlements, and poor public transport provision. It also does not compare favourably with other Tier 5 settlements such Ardeonaig (a remote dispersed rural community), and Arnprior and Blairlogie, located outwith the Green Belt and positioned directly on main A class roads.

As well as not being suitable in principle, the identification of a Countryside Policy/Green Belt boundary at Mugdock is also problematic due to its dispersed characteristics. The Council does not therefore support the identification of Mugdock as a Rural Village in the Plan.

The Mains Issues Report Appendix A, Section 3 (CD42), put forward a proposed policy on small settlements for inclusion in the Plan which initially highlighted Mugdock, but questioned whether such a policy should apply within Green Belts. The Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Plan and Appendix B Addendum Components (CD83) highlights that as developments in the suggested small settlements are not likely to be able to connect to public sewer systems they have the potential to affect a number of Scottish Environment Protection Agency classified water bodies.

The lack of public waste water treatment systems and the need for further investigations in most cases, led the Council not to identify small settlements in the Plan. Housing development in the countryside permitted under Policy 2.10 and forming building groups that reach a certain size, places particular pressures on the provision of local services and amenities, as well as having a greater impact on the immediate and sometimes wider landscape setting. The Action Programme (CD48) and Supplementary Guidance SG10 on Housing in the Countryside (CD177a) indicates the intention to produce Supplementary Guidance on small settlements which will explore all these issues in greater detail.

The timescale for producing the Guidance on small settlements is indicated as October 2013, with final adoption alongside the Plan in 2014. The merits of identifying Mugdock as a small settlement, and whether this will apply within Green Belts, will be considered as part of this process. It is therefore considered too early to give clarity on whether the approach finally adopted by the Council will include Mugdock. This approach is considered appropriate given that the context for Green Belts and housing in the countryside is already set out in Policies 1.4, 2.10 and SG10. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to these representations.

Scotia House (SLDP\_1272/001) - The Council's Strathblane Green Belt Study (CD54) only considered objectives 2 and 3, leaving the Local Development Plan, and a further review to look at the justification for Green Belts in particular locations in the context of the future development strategy. This is discussed under Issue 8 - Green Belts. The Central Region Landscape Character Assessment formed the basis for the Green Belt Study but included a review and refinement of that earlier work.

The Council's review of the Green Belt (CD55) did not presuppose the retention of a Green Belt at Strathblane. The review methodology (Para 1.1) looked at the need for specific designations considering whether land currently designated as Green Belt should remain as such. In the case of Strathblane (Paras.5.34 – 5.42 of CD55) indicates that the Green Belt has a different function in different areas. Immediately south of Strathblane it has a strategic role in terms of contributing to settlement setting and identity, and provides separation between Mugdock and the dispersed properties in the south of Strathblane. Elsewhere the Green Belt further contributes to settlement setting and identity and has a wider strategic role in relation to the Greater Glasgow conurbation. There is not therefore considered to be any justification for the wholesale removal of the Green Belt at Strathblane.

It is not considered that Scottish Planning Policy (CD1) (Para.159) has a far more permissive regime for development in Green Belts than was previously the case in Scottish Planning Policy 21 Green Belts (CD8). Para.163 of Scottish Planning Policy (CD1) still regards developments associated with agriculture, woodland, forestry, horticulture and recreational uses as appropriate uses within the Green Belt, similar to para.22 of Scottish Planning Policy 21. The only difference is that essential infrastructure has been added. Residential uses continue to be inappropriate.

The use of policies other than Green Belt to protect the identity and setting of settlements is responded to under Issue 8. The primary purpose of a landscape designation is to safeguard the character and quality of the landscape which would not therefore presume against inappropriate uses such as residential.

The Appeal Reporter (CD90) reflects further on the landscape character of Mugdock and refers to the "delicate balance between the natural and developed features in the area", and the need for any new development to be "in harmony with the existing landscape scale, which remains predominantly small to intimate" (Para.26). The Council agrees with this view

of the landscape character of Mugdock. There is a strong case for retaining a Green Belt designation at Mugdock to protect this character and the wider role and function of the Green Belt in this location. Given that the Council does not support the removal of the Green Belt and the identification of Mugdock as a Rural Village, neither of the two boundary options put forward have been considered further. The Council does not therefore agree to modify the Plan in response to this representation.

### **Reporter's conclusions:**

#### Settlement status

1. It is argued that Mugdock is recognised locally and by council departments as a village. Furthermore, it is claimed that it looks and feels like a settlement. However, the planning authority argues that there is no recognisable centre and local facilities and amenities are lacking. In turn, says the planning authority, Mugdock is not suitable for Tier 5 status in the settlement strategy. Furthermore, the dispersed characteristics of Mugdock would provide a practical difficulty in the identification of a boundary.
2. Mugdock is clearly “a place” and, indeed, roadside signs identify it as such. However, despite a significant number of houses in total, Mugdock does not give rise to a “sense of place”. Only a very small central section comes close to providing a sense of place. Even then, the lack of any ancillary facilities and amenities with no street lighting or footpaths ensure that there is a failure to instil village character.
3. In relatively recent appeal decisions, Mugdock has been described as somewhat “irregular scatter of buildings” and “a very informal scattering of residential properties”. The opinion was expressed that “it would be a serious exaggeration” to describe Mugdock as a village.
4. The situation does not appear to have changed significantly and this points to the conclusion that the planning authority was correct not to define Mugdock as a village defined by a settlement boundary.
5. On the basis of this conclusion it is not necessary to consider the planning authority's belief that the identification of a boundary would be a problem. Equally, the alternative boundary suggestions put forward by Scotia House do not require analysis although the wider “defensible boundary” appears to have little relationship to the built form of Mugdock.
6. The local development plan should not be modified to identify Mugdock as a settlement to be included in Chapter 10.

#### Green belt status

7. Scotia House believes that the countryside policy could be applied in this vicinity. This would provide a suitable policy basis for restricting unacceptable development and could therefore replace the green belt designation. The historic identity of nearby Strathblane could be further protected by the additional designation of a local landscape area.
8. Strathblane Community Council supports the retention of the current green belt provisions, “in particular throughout Mugdock”. The planning authority emphasises that the green belt shown in the local development plan has been proposed following a review.

9. As explained in the review, the green belt in this area has a local importance insofar as there is significant development pressure in the vicinity of Strathblane and Blanefield. Indeed, the hope of Scotia House that land at Mugdock could be released for housing reflects this pressure. The green belt also has strategic relevance in terms of the relationship between Strathblane and the greater Glasgow conurbation.

10. Although Scotia House argues that the provisions of SPP are more permissive in terms of green belt, the planning authority disagrees.

11. SPP confirms that the purpose of green belt designation as part of the settlement strategy is to direct planned growth to the most appropriate locations; to protect and enhance the quality, character, landscape setting and identity of towns and cities; and to protect and give access to open space within and around towns and cities. Whilst SPP recognises that other policies and designations can provide an appropriate context for decision-making, in this instance, the green belt serves a recognised and important purpose. The objectives of the green belt, the extent of which has been the subject of review, are worthy of support. Accordingly, modification of the local development plan is neither necessary nor justified. The green belt designation should therefore be retained.

**Reporter's recommendations:**

No modifications.