



Colin Bell, Case Officer  
Planning and Environmental Appeals Division  
4 The Courtyard,  
Callendar Business Park,  
Falkirk FK1 1XR

By email: [colin.bell@gov.scot](mailto:colin.bell@gov.scot); [dpea@gov.scot](mailto:dpea@gov.scot)

7 February 2021

Dear Mr Bell

**PPA-390-2060-1 (Planning Authority ref:17/00434/PPP)**

**PLANNING PERMISSION APPEAL: LAND 160 METRES SOUTH OF BROADGATE HOUSE  
CAMPSIE ROAD STRATHBLANE G63 9AB**

Strathblane Community Council has noted the correspondence on your file, in which the appellant and the authority comment on the decision of the Scottish Ministers revising guidance on calculation of housing land requirements and on the application of the “tilted balance”. We would be grateful if you would pass our comments to the Reporter.

As noted by the appellant, the authority has advised that not only 5 years, but 6 or more years’ land supply is currently provided, by the calculation method preferred by the ministers. On that basis, we trust that the appeal proposals will be rejected without further ado.

Notwithstanding the new guidance from the ministers, we note that the appellant presents their own “alternative truth”. We trust the Reporter will be able to reconcile these views, or the ministers’ recent efforts will have been somewhat in vain. We comment only on the fact that the appellant has chosen to exclude “windfall” sites in its calculation. This is unrealistic. Particularly in the rural areas, and particularly in those constrained by Green Belt and Countryside policies, windfall sites are the sites that steadily deliver development opportunities, and sustainable ones at that.

Regardless of the exact calculation, the decision paper makes clear now:

*The presumption was never intended to be used to support development which is not sustainable development and the changes we make will make it clear that the policy is to support development that is sustainable development rather than development that contributes to sustainable development.*

For reasons we have explained previously, the appeal proposal is not sustainable development.

The decision further makes clear that, even in a case where a tilted balance is to be applied, the tilt is to apply gradually, according to the circumstances. This confirms very much the proportional approach which we urged in our letter of 16 July 2020.

Accordingly, even if the Reporter would see a basis for applying a tilted balance to any degree, the grounds for refusing the proposal are so many and varied that refusal remains the only possible conclusion. Detailed reasons and evidence are provided in the earlier submissions, and we urge the Reporter to give these careful attention.

Finally, we mention for information that the LDP-allocated housing site H153, which the appellant alleged to be “undeliverable”, is in the process of receiving planning permission (20/00564/FUL), delivering in in the near future 11 dwellings by a local developer, including 4 flats for social rent by Rural Stirling Housing Association. An adjacent site

### Conclusion

Again we say, nothing has changed to alter our original objections, and the policies and circumstances have only changed against the proposal in the meantime.

Needless to say, if anything is not clear, or if new information should arise, we would request the opportunity to provide further comment.

Yours sincerely,  
for **Strathblane Community Council**



John Gray  
Planning Correspondent  
[planning@strathblanecouncil.org.uk](mailto:planning@strathblanecouncil.org.uk)  
Telephone 07860 945348