STRATHBLANE
COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MINUTES
Meeting Monday 12th October 2026 in the Village Club.
draft

Members Present: - Julie Hutchison; Kate Ramsden; Grace Edmonds; Rob Davies; Pamela Lee.
In attendance: Councillor Rosemary Fraser; M Vass, SCDT; + 4 residents
Apologies: Andrew Thompson; John Gray; Ian Boardley
*(SC = Stirling Council. CC = Community Council. CDT= Community Development Trust * Denotes an action)*

1. Welcome from the Chair and declarations of Interest

JH welcomed everybody to the meeting.
There were no declarations of interest.

2. Minutes of September meeting and matters arising.

The minutes had been circulated to all CC members and were accepted. Proposed by KR, Seconded by RD
Matters arising: JH and MV were supposed to go to a LPP meeting in Stirling, but this was postponed until February. JH, GE and MV are meeting three Stirling Council planners on Wednesday 14th October. JH said that we are happy that the planners suggested meeting with us here. Brian Roberts attended our September meeting and left with several things that he was going to report back on. We have not heard from him. GE and JH will email to remind him.

3. Confirmation of Co-option of new member

We advertised two positions for co-option but had only one response. Helen Mullen has completed the necessary paperwork and has agreed to join the Community Council. JH asked for a vote to accept her nomination and this was agreed by the members present. Her co-option was proposed by PL and seconded by JH. Helen has now joined the CC as a co-opted member.
JH welcomed Helen and reminded everybody present that Stephen Bly is in post to deal with Community Councils and not individual issues we may have as residents.

4. Police Report

There was little of note in the Police Report this month.
A driver was given a fixed penalty ticket for careless driving after colliding with three parked cars within in a car park.
A taxi driver was racially abused in the village after having a dispute over the fare. Enquiries are ongoing.
A driver failed to exchange details after having collided with the rear of another vehicle. Enquiries are ongoing.

The whole report will be on the CC website.

,

5. Roads

JH thanked residents for their responses to the proposed traffic calming measures. JH asked if there would be a Roads officer present at the meeting tonight to give us some feedback on the proposed measures but said that they may still be looking at the responses. She has asked Stephen Bly to let us know when Roads will get back to us.
There was some controversy from some residents. JH read out an email from a resident criticising the CC and how transparent we are. JH said that the email made her angry as everything we do is transparent. We are all volunteers and it is very disheartening when we all work hard in our own time and it is not appreciated.
RF said that she is trying to source money for other villages which also have speeding problems but did not make the top ten.
JH asked what would happen if the work were not completed this year. RF said that the money will still be there.

6. Elected Members' Report - Councillor Rosemary Fraser

There is a proposal that the protein part of school meals will be prepared off site, frozen and sent out to schools. This will result in some staff having to move. SC meals currently have Silver Status from the Soil Association, and it will be hard to maintain this with food prepared off site. A resident asked if this new proposal only applied to primary schools and RF said that it does. The resident said that the food provider at BHS has changed this year and the quality of the food has gone down.
RF put forward a motion at the Council meeting to apologise to the women accused of being witches. This eventually passed. An area near the Vue in Stirling might be used for a memorial to these women.
The Council has started looking at the next budget.
RD mentioned that there was a byelection recently. We have had issues with our email account and Kate Harrison, our new councillor, has been unable to contact us. JH will email her with our details.
JH thanked RF for her report.

7. Planning and Licensing

26/00451/FUL: Strathblane Community Council requests always that planning applications are handled in accordance with the lawfully adopted policies and guidance. In the highly-pressured situation of the Strathblane green belt and especially the Mugdock area, residents expect this handling to be especially rigorous, so that dangerous precedents are not created. This position was confirmed in the consultations around the Strathblane Area Local Place Plan that was adopted earlier this year.

- After consideration, Strathblane Community Council [OPPOSES] the application. To allow this application would violate the applicable policies and guidance and create a dangerous precedent for development in the green belt. Reasons are given below.

The applicant's Planning Policy Statement refers to the Green Belt location and identifies the policies governing for development in the Green Belt, under NPF4 (Policy 8) and refers also to the cur-

rent Local Development Plan LDP2 Policy 2.10 (Housing in the Countryside) and associated Supplementary Guidance (Housing in the Countryside, May 2020).

According to NPF4 Policy 8, development proposals within a green belt will ONLY be supported IF (a) they are for one of the specific purposes listed AND (b) a number of specific requirements are met.

  - According to the applicant's own Planning Policy Statement, the present proposal does NOT meet any of the purposes listed in policy 8(a) (i), so it must obviously be refused.
  - First among the requirements of Policy 8(b)(ii) is that reasons are provided why a green belt location is essential. Nothing in the Planning Policy Statement, so the application has to be refused on that ground also

- According to LDP2 Policy 2.10 (b), "*Support may be given to single houses in the Green Belt (outwith Building Groups or Infill situations) for specific purposes where consistent with Policy 1.5 and Supplementary Guidance on Housing in the Countryside and Green Belts*." The Supplementary Guidance says *something* about development in "walled gardens" being permitted in the green belt, but the effect of that is very unclear.
  - On our understanding, the SG cannot override the requirement for "specific purposes" in the Policy itself, and all of the current policies are subject to the newer NPF4 policy mentioned above.

- Furthermore, even if the applicant *could* benefit from some interpretation of the 'walled garden' provisions of the SG 2.15, it would apply to proposals "located within a substantially intact walled garden". As can be seen clearly from the image on page 11 of the Design Statement, pasted below:
  - There is no "walled garden" as that phrase is commonly understood: there is only an L-shaped garden wall.
  - Even if the L-shape were regarded as defining some kind of walled garden, the proposed house and garage extend far beyond it to the North, so that the development would not be "within" the walled garden anyway.

The Planning Policy Statement argues that this proposal is exceptional in some way, but that only seems to amount to a claim that it complies with a range of *other* policies. It may seem harsh, when such a proposal could be acceptable in another location, but the green belt policy precludes new housing on this site.

- In the event that the authority considers the application to be allowable, we would expect to see detailed reasoning and policy justification for this exception.

With regard to biodiversity and environmental impact, the proposal involves the removal of 9 trees and a length of hedgerow. If there is to be replacement planting, should this not form part of the proposal, or would it be dealt with in conditions?

The members present agreed to reject the proposal with RD dissenting

26/00393/NPA | Peatland restoration | Ballagan Burn Killearn. JG said that a resident has asked if we can ensure that walkers' access be preserved. We could also ask for signage regarding increased traffic on Campsie Road if necessary. The CC members present agreed with JG's suggestions.

8. Finance

We have £4842.71p in the account. This includes our admin grant of £432.32p

Our banking is now on-line.

JH mentioned that the SCDT treasurer has told er that we have about £1300 left in the BVB account. It costs almost £200 per edition to produce so we need to start thinking about ways to keep it going when the trust money runs out. RF suggested applying for a Community Pride grant to tide us over if necessary.

9. Correspondence

There was no correspondence this month.

10. AOCB

The defibrillator at the Edmonstone Hall has reached the end of its life. The hall committee has applied for a community pride grant towards purchasing a replacement. They will keep us updated on progress. We will put an article in the BVB reminding people where the other three are.
JH, AT and MV attended a virtual meeting about the model for local democracy. Very interesting discussion about potential changes to local government including the role of CCs. There was a suggestion that CCs will no longer exist from February, but RF said that this is not the case.
There are three on-line sessions about Planning and land use. MV and JH will attend one of these. There is also a survey
There is a resilience meeting in Killearn on October 26th. KR will attend this.
We have had confirmation that DWE are available to play at the Christmas tree switch on, on November 27th.
JH thanked Chris Edmonds for standing in for JG.
MV said that she had praised the SC legal team at the September meeting for their work on the land transfer for the library, but they have not contacted her since. She asked RF if she can ask about this.

10. Date of next meeting

November 2nd 2026

Contact us at contact@strathblanecc.org.uk Also on our website www.strathblanecc.org.uk. Telephone numbers for Community Councillors are on the notice boards, in the library and in the Blane Valley Bulletin