

## Summary of Responses to Main Issues Report and the Council's Response

<b>Issue 1</b>	<b>Queen's Quay, Clydebank</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> The Council's preferred option is to continue to implement the existing strategy and the proposals within the approved design framework for the central Queens Quay area, but also to reallocate areas of land</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> The alternative option is to continue to implement the existing strategy and retain the current designations for the areas of land outwith the central area. This would not reflect the current position of the Council of developing this area in a comprehensive manner. It could also lead to these areas of land being undeveloped, potentially due to the market not being interested in those original uses.</p> <p>Due to the proposed expansion of the Golden Jubilee Hospital, it is considered that there needs to be a better mix of uses within these areas to allow them to be developed.</p>	
<b>Responses received from</b>	
<p>Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council          Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council          Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council          Visitscotland          Clyde Marine Planning Partnership          Vale Of Leven Trust          SNH          SEPA          Clydebelt          Scottish Water          Anonymous (Your Place, Your Plan event)</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>General support for the preferred option of the revised Strategy and proposals. The following points were also made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council</b> request that disabled access/parking to rear of Library is provided. Improved access from Clydebank railway station to Queens Quay is also required as is upgrading to the Glasgow Road/Dumbarton Road corridor.</li> <li>• <b>Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council</b> state the need to minimise pollution and disruption to nearby Inner Clyde SSSI &amp; SPA. Support Green Network improvements through the site.</li> <li>• <b>Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council</b> state that the Council must strengthen active travel routes for sustainable commuting and enhance green infrastructure. Any mixed use must not conflict with Clyde Shopping</li> </ul>	

Centre. They are disappointed with removal of Fastlink.

- **VisitScotland** ask how the Council will ensure that any business/commercial uses are compatible with residential? Plots 4 and 5 adjacent to the riverside would be better suited to leisure/recreation/tourism/food and drink businesses to take advantage of waterfront location and views.
- **Clyde Marine Planning Partnership** state, through SNH, that a sea level rise report: 'Impacts of sea level rise and storm surges due to climate change in the Firth of Clyde' has been commissioned .
- **SNH** state that careful consideration to design, massing and scale, including materials and colour to integrate the development within the landscape and wider views. Need for improved connections between the waterfront and wider assets including the town centre and canal. Support the intention to explore green infrastructure and recreation opportunities at the railway bridge/embankment. All factors that may have implications for the conservation objectives of the SPA must be considered.
- **Clydebelt** state inadequate greenspace provision in masterplan for the size of future population. Need more open spaces. Provide fitting memorial/tribute to this famous former shipyard. Provide adequate parking for public buildings-especially for elderly/infirm.
- **Anonymous (Your Place, Your Plan event)** is of the view that we need to create an extension to Town Hall for expanded museum.

### **Our response**

There is overall strong support for the revised Strategy set out in the MIR. Issues of green infrastructure, parking and access will be refined as the Strategy and masterplan is finalised. The SPA will be protected. Individual proposals for business/commercial use will be assessed against the Strategy and on their own merit in terms of benefits and fit with other uses.

LDP 2 will reflect the latest proposals in the Masterplan.

**Issue 2****Dumbarton Town centre and Waterfront****Preferred Option and Alternative Option**

**Preferred Option:** The Council's preferred option is to update the Strategy to reflect the progress that has been made and to improve the existing strategy by revising the existing proposals and including new proposals as detailed in "Does the strategy for Dumbarton Town Centre and Waterfront need to be revised?" It is proposed that the footbridge from the town centre to Levensgrove Park is also retained within the strategy even though the aspiration for the footbridge is a long term ambition of the Council.

**Alternative Option:** To include within the revised strategy, support for a retail development opportunity to the east of St James Retail Park and for the revision of existing floorspace, including the introduction of smaller scale retail development, within the retail park.

This is not the preferred option as the current strategy for the Network of Centres Retail Strategy restricts small-scale retail development at out-of-town-centre locations in the interest of protecting the vitality and viability of the town centre as required by Scottish Planning Policy, in particular, the Town Centre First Principle. Further to this, it is not considered necessary to identify a commercial centre development in Local Development Plan 2 where the retail related policies will allow for consideration of any new proposals that come forward.

The alternative option also removes the aspiration of the footbridge over the River Leven due to it being a long term goal.

**Responses received from**

David Harvie(Dumbarton Stations Improvement Trust)  
Mr Jeremy Watson  
Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council  
Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council  
Theatres Trust  
Montagu Evans on behalf of Dumbarton Football Club  
Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council  
Visitscotland  
LaSalle Investment Management Ltd  
Clyde Marine Planning Partnership  
Vale of Leven Trust  
Montagu Evans on behalf of Legal and General - St James Retail Park  
SNH  
SEPA  
Scottish Water  
"Rose" (Your Place, Your Plan event)

## Summary of responses

There is general support for the preferred option of revising the existing Strategy and including new proposals. The following points were also made:

- **Dumbarton Stations Improvement Trust** is of the view that the station needs to be within the town centre boundary and public realm improvements are required for the surrounding area.
- **Mr Jeremy Watson** is of the view that enhanced links and public realm are required to link the Castle and Central Station and that they must include the station within the town centre. The Council should consider designating a conservation area to include Station and environs to provide a 'Gateway to Dumbarton'. Consideration needs to be given to setting up a Planning Forum to take forward work of Charrette. Improved river access for boats/ferries also needs to be included.
- **Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council** state that improved access and signage for Dumbarton Castle is required and that the Dumbarton Central should be included within the town centre. Glencairn House on High Street needs proper restoration and reuse. They oppose the footbridge over River Leven.
- **Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council** request the inclusion of Dumbarton Central within the Town Centre Strategy.
- **Theatres Trust** supports the preferred approach but state that any redevelopment/refurbishment of Artizan Centre must be mindful of operation and future of Denny Theatre, especially links to High Street.
- **Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council** state that the Council should consider a Simplified Planning Zone for the town centre. They welcome a new footbridge across the River Leven but do not support residential development on Dumbarton Football Club site; the existing Football Club ground should remain and be enhanced rather than relocating the existing facilities. Do not support any proposals at Young's Farm. Dumbarton Central train station should be included in the town centre boundary and Sandpoint Marina should be developed at lower density.
- **Montagu Evans for Dumbarton Football Club** state that the current stadium should be redeveloped in line with Charrette and a new stadium built at Young's Farm.
- **Visit Scotland** state that there should be provision of a step-ashore facility in the River Leven.
- **LaSalle Investment Management Ltd** is of the view that the Council should exclude riverside redevelopment areas from town centre boundary and retain a compact core shopping area around High Street and Artizan Centre. Any move away from large scale, bulky goods units at Retail Park

should be resisted.

- **Montagu Evans on behalf of Legal and General** state that Phase 2 (extension) of Retail Park should be acknowledged as retail opportunity. Smaller units and High Street uses (Class 1 or 3) should be allowed at Retail Park.
- **SNH** is of the view that the Council should recognise the Special Protection Area in the Town Centre policy. Careful consideration should be given to design, massing and scale, including materials and colour across the wider area.

#### **Our response**

The Local Development Plan will take forward the Preferred Option and include the Railway Station within the town centre boundary to recognise its role in the functioning of the town centre. There is no additional evidence to justify changing the policy status, with regard to the retail function of the St James Retail Park, from its current complementary role to the town centre.

**Preferred Option and Alternative Option**

**Preferred Option:** The preferred option is for Local Development Plan 2 to reflect the route of the realigned road, as detailed in map 6, to accord with City Deal proposals and the draft Masterplan. It is considered that the realigned road can be accommodated without having an adverse impact on natural heritage and flood risk, although this still requires to be demonstrated. It is proposed to retain the existing strategy for Scott's Yard.

**Alternative Option:** The alternative option is to retain the existing strategy with no change to the road alignment. This does not reflect the technical work undertaken for the City Deal project and the preferred route within the draft Masterplan, which is subject to consultation and planning permission being granted.

**Responses received from**

Systra on behalf of Transport Scotland,  
Susan Dick,  
Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council,  
Silverton and Overtoun Community Council,  
Susan Jameson,  
Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council,  
G Parton,  
Visitscotland,  
Peter Brett Associates on behalf of City Deal,  
Clyde Marine Planning Partnership,  
Vale of Leven Trust,  
SNH, SEPA,  
Clydebelt,  
Scottish Water

**Summary of responses**

There was general support for a relief road but not the route that was detailed within the preferred option. The following points were also raised:

- **Transport Scotland** state that further discussion regarding the level of development and the impact on the existing road network is required.
- **Susan Dick, Susan Jameson and G Parton** state that the proposed line of road is incorrect. It runs through private land, is greenbelt and there is considerable opposition to it.
- **Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council** provide support for A82 relief road, although the route needs to be reconsidered, and support for industrial development. Explore funding to facilitate restoration of Dunglass Castle, and ensure access to it and the Henry Bell monument is maintained.
- **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council** support the need for a

relief road, but not the proposed route. Disagree in principle with any industrial development on this site, with a preference for a nature reserve.

- **Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council** support the relief road, but have concern regarding deliverability due to ownership. There is sufficient existing business and industrial space; preferred use would be marina with opportunity for cruise ships to dock.
- **Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council, Vale of Leven Trust and Clydebelt** state that good pedestrian and cycle links should be provided along the new road
- **Peter Brett Associates** advise that the road alignment shown during the PAN consultation events is the current preferred option, but some flexibility may still be required. The strategy shown in Map 6 requires to be updated in a number of respects.
- **Clyde Marine Planning Partnership** advise that a recent publication on sea level rise and storm surges in the Firth of Clyde should be taken into consideration in order to direct development away from coastal areas at risk of future flooding.
- **SNH** do not support proposed route of road as it does not reflect most recent discussions and would result in habitat loss within the SPA.
- **SEPA** support the emerging strategy for the site and the new road. Some concern over changing Scott's Yard to residential use which is more vulnerable to flood risk.
- **Clydebelt** query the value of developing the road when there is no proven demand for commercial development. Support residential development on Scott's Yard. Consider the future river passenger transport and a possible heritage centre, ensure access to Dunglass Castle, and clean up Bowling Harbour.
- **Scottish Water** state that discussions are on-going regarding the most appropriate water and waste water strategies whilst retaining access to Scottish Water's assets .

#### **Our response**

The road layout shown in the MIR was the current one at the time of preparation of the MIR. It is clear that there is opposition to this route and the current draft masterplan has revised it.

The development of this site is through the City Deal project and the future uses of the site will be reflective of the aims of this project. An assessment of existing business and industrial land is currently being undertaken by Ryden, on behalf of the Council, which may help assess the need and demand for these uses.

The concerns raised through the MIR consultation will be addressed through the

Proposed Plan and the masterplan for the site. It will take into account any new information in relation to updated flood risk and ensure no adverse impact on the SPA.



<b>Issue 4</b>	<b>Lomondgate</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred option:</b> The Council's preferred option is to adopt a more flexible approach when considering potential uses for the proposed business park area. The majority of the site would still be reserved for Business and Industrial uses, but the Council will allocate a portion of the site for alternative uses, such as commercial leisure and tourism uses associated with a garden centre, hotel, gym etc. These types of uses will only be considered acceptable where they are complimentary to the development and where there would not be a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of Dumbarton town centre. This approach would provide greater flexibility and allow the marketing of the business park to a wider market.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate or necessary to designate the Roadside services site as a commercial centre.</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> The Council will continue to safeguard the business park as an industrial/business opportunity reserved for use classes 4 and 5 as is the current situation within the Proposed Plan (2016) and any proposals for alternative uses will be considered against the appropriate policies within Local Development Plan 2. The Council will also continue to identify the Roadside Services site for the same types of uses which are currently on the site but only where they do not significantly impact on trade within town centres, which is the existing approach within the Proposed Plan (2016).</p>	
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Systra on behalf of Transport Scotland,  Parkhall, North Kilbowie &amp; Central Community Council,  Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council,  Strathleven Regeneration CIC/Walker Group,  Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council,  VisitScotland,  Vale of Leven Trust,  SNH,  SEPA,  Scottish Water.</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>There was general support for the preferred option but the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strathleven CIC/Walker Group</b> seek the flexibility of having the mixed use zoning extended to cover the full current business and industrial opportunity site.</li> <li>• <b>Transport Scotland</b> requires further information to understand the potential trip generation differences between the existing land use</li> </ul>	

allocation any new proposed land use allocation.

- **Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council** are in general agreeance with the preferred option but think that this could be extended to include hotel/tourist information centre.
- **Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council** suggest a tourist information centre use for the site.
- **Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council** and the **Vale of Leven Trust** generally support flexibility here subject to the vitality/viability of town centres not being affected and support a use which is not in the vicinity of the area, is different to elsewhere and suggest more wet weather activity centres.
- **Visit Scotland** support the option to allocate mixed use at Lomondgate Business Park.
- **SNH** recommend where new development is proposed that consideration is given to factors to help integrate the development in wider views, as well as setting out developer requirements and active travel connections.
- **SEPA and Scottish Water** have no specific comment but Scottish Water recommend early engagement by developers once uses are known
- **Susan Cuthbert** supports use of creches, gym and garden centres at this location.
- A note of support of the preferred option was recorded at the Your Place, Your Plan events.

### **Our response**

In relation to the representation from Strathleven CIC/Walker Group, the Council will explore the request to extend the mixed use coverage to the full site. However, this decision will be influenced by the Business and Industrial Review that is currently being carried out by Ryden on the behalf of the Council. The requirement to have flexibility is understood; however, this is a key site for business and industrial development and the majority of the site must be reserved for this purpose. Therefore, should the Council's views be quantified by the Ryden study, then a strong policy framework would be required to ensure that the site is predominantly developed for business and industrial and that any other use on the site is appropriate and based on the types of uses suggested within the MIR preferred option. The Council has held a subsequent meeting with Systra and Transport Scotland and has agreed to provide further details on the likely uses within the site once these have been agreed.

Consideration for the mixed-use zoning to be extended to hotel/tourist information centre will also be considered as these could be compatible uses within the site

and due to Lomondgate's prominence on the A82, these could be beneficial to the development of the site.

LDP 2 will include a new development policy to be developed to ensure that the majority of the site is developed for business and industrial use and that the other acceptable uses for the site are in line with the MIR preferred option and protect the vitality and viability of Dumbarton Town Centre.

When deciding on the final allocation and composition of the site, the comments of SNH will be considered and these could become requirements for developers to include within their development proposals. Similarly, a requirement to consult Scottish Water at an early stage on development of the site can also be included.

<b>Issue 5</b>	<b>Vale of Leven Industrial Estate</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> The Council will review the Greenbelt and Local Nature Conservation Site designations in light of the consent granted for Macphersons to ensure that the boundaries of these areas are current. It will not reflect the proposals from Chivas at this point as this may prejudice the consideration of the forthcoming planning application, but the future Proposed Plan will revisit the boundary should the planning permission for Chivas be granted.</p> <p>The Council will also ensure that significant protection is given for the remaining areas of open space and habitats, the woodland setting of the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate and its current recreational use. Further protection through planning policy will ensure that there is no significant and adverse loss of leisure and recreational resources as a result of development with the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate. This will also ensure that there is no significant and adverse loss of open space and habitats within the Greenbelt and River Leven Local Nature Conservation Site.</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> There was not considered to be an alternative option for this Issue.</p>	
<b>Responses received from</b>	
<p>Parkhall, North Kilbowie &amp; Central Community Council  Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council  Visitscotland  Vale of Leven Trust  Muir Smith Evans on behalf of Chivas  SNH  SEPA  Clydebelt  Scottish Water</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>There was general support for the preferred option of the revised Strategy and proposals. The following points were also made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council and Vale of Leven Trust</b> state that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Areas GE1(5) &amp; GE1(3) as outlined on Map 9, should be returned to green space. This area has historically always been open space (at least 75 years) and has significant biodiversity, flora &amp; fauna. In any case it is within the HSE notification zone so has limited use. Supports no further incursion into the greenbelt.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

- The Council should consider a pedestrian/cycle route from Bonhill to Dumbarton.
  - BH3 – Strathleven Estate – on the map, area of estate protection overlaps with development opportunity shading, which is confusing. Which takes precedence?
  - Further site opportunity at GE1(2) should be held back as plenty of existing vacant units. Concentrate on filling those before releasing more land.
  - Would support the reinstatement of the footway around the Kilmalid Extension Boundary GE1(5).
- **Muir Smith Evans on behalf of Chivas** state the following–
    - MIR should have been more proactive in seeking to support business and employment creation.
    - Measures to accommodate the sustainable expansion of Kilmalid by Chivas could and should have been identified as a main issue. The preferred option should have clearly stated support for the Chivas proposals and should have confirmed the proposed amendment of the LDP in order to accommodate them instead of through a planning application.
    - In relation to Question 5 in the MIR, Chivas does not agree that protection of the greenbelt and local nature conservation site is the key issue facing the Vale of Leven Industrial Estate.
  - **SNH** agree with the preferred option for a review of the Green Belt and Local Nature Conservation Site to protect remaining areas of open space and habitats, the woodland landscape framework of the Industrial Estate and to support recreational uses.
  - **Clydebelt** state that areas GE1(2), GE1(3) and GE1(5) contain mature trees, particularly in the designed landscape to the east of Strathleven House. The MIR shows these as being suitable for industrial/business use. These woodlands should be enhanced rather than destroyed and have a TPO put on them.

### **Our response**

Most responses were supportive of the preferred approach to review the Greenbelt and Local Nature Conservation Site designations in light of the consent granted for Macphersons to ensure that the boundaries of these areas are current.

It is considered that this approach best maintains a balance between protecting open spaces, the green belt and nature designations on the one hand, and allowing for suitable development opportunities for new and expanded businesses.

It would not have been appropriate to make changes to the designations to

support/accommodate the Chivas extension proposals in advance of the determination of a planning application, as it would have prejudiced the consideration of the application. However the planning application has now been approved and the boundaries will be updated in the Proposed Plan to reflect this permission.

LDP 2 will also ensure that the correct boundaries are shown on the Proposals Maps for Strathleven Estate to address the comments of Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council, Vale of Leven Trust and Clydebelt. The Proposals Map will also be updated based on the review of the Greenbelt and Local Nature Conservation Site in light of the consents granted for Macphersons and Chivas.

<b>Issue 6</b>	<b>Young's Farm</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> The preferred option is not to allow residential development to enable the relocation of Dumbarton Football Club. There is currently no requirement for significant additional housing land and it would be difficult to provide a satisfactory residential environment and a successful place connected to the existing built form. Young's Farm will remain within the Greenbelt and the relocation of the stadium will continue to be supported in line with the provisions established in the Proposed Plan (2016).</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> The alternative option, which is not preferred, is to allow housing on the site as enabling development, limited to the minimum amount of housing required to enable the stadium to be built, which has not been justified at this stage.</p>	
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Systra on behalf of Transport Scotland,  Susan Dick,  Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council,  Silverton and Overtoun Community Council,  Montagu Evans for DFC,  Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council,  G Parton,  VisitScotland,  Vale of Leven Trust,  SHN,  SEPA,  Clydebelt,  Scottish Water,  Susan Cuthbert (Your Place, Your Plan Event)</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>Most responses were supportive of the preferred option. However, the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Susan Dick, Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council, Silverton and Overtoun Community Council, Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council, G Parton, VisitScotland, Vale of Leven Trust, Clydebelt, and Susan Cuthbert</b> do not support residential development at Young's Farm.</li> <li>• <b>Silverton and Overtoun Community Council, Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council and Vale of Leven Trust</b> state that there should be no development proposed at Young's Farm at all given the technical uncertainties about whether development is feasible and the impacts on access, traffic, nature conservation, habitat loss etc.</li> </ul>	

- **Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council** state that the Proposed Plan should provide clarity over whether development is supported by the Council or not as the previous Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) was unclear on this.
- **Montagu Evans on behalf of Dumbarton Football Club** are of the view that the enabling residential development is the only viable option to fund the new stadium, and this in turn will help promote the vision of the Dumbarton Rock and Castle Charrette on the existing stadium site. An application has been submitted for Young's Farm, the proposals of which differ in some respects to those shown in the Main Issues Report.
- **SNH** state that there is sufficient land to meet housing requirements and the Local Development Plan needs to align with the SDP's compact city model.
- **SEPA** advise that there is a need to ensure no development occurs in the functional floodplain and that the site can be suitably drained.
- **Scottish Water** advises that the site would drain to Ardoch Waste Water Treatment Works, which is currently undergoing an assessment of capacity. A growth project may be required here to serve development.
- **Transport Scotland** advised that a revised Transport Assessment is awaited in relation to the planning application.

#### **Our response**

A planning application has been submitted for the relocation of the football and enabling residential development which is currently under consideration. Local Development Plan 2 will therefore reflect the decision made on the current planning application.



<b>Issue 7</b>	<b>Clydebank Town Centre</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> The Council's preferred option is to update the Strategy and to include new proposals aimed at improving Clydebank town centre.</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> The alternative option is to retain the existing strategy as outlined in the Proposed Plan (2016). This option is not preferred as parts of the strategy would be out of date and, as a result, would not reflect the current aspirations of the Council, existing and future development proposals or the Clydebank Charrette proposals.</p>	
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Zander Planning on behalf of Henry Boot, Parkhall, North Kilbowie &amp; Central Community Council, Savills on behalf of Clyde Retail Park, Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council, VisitScotland, SNH, SEPA, Scottish Water, Anonymous (Your Place, Your Plan event), Martin Aird (Your Place, Your Plan event)</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>There is general support for the preferred option. The following points have also been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Zander Planning on behalf of Henry Boot</b> agree with the preferred option to identify a mixed use proposal at the Playdrome site.</li> <li>• <b>Parkhall, North Kilbowie &amp; Central Community Council</b> outline the need for a recognisable town centre with evening and day activities. Issues need addressed surrounding the existing provision of uses (low quality/vacant shops. Bookmakers etc) and connections between A82 and Glasgow Rd/Dumbarton Rd needs to be rethought.</li> <li>• <b>Savills</b> propose that the preferred strategy should include Clyde Retail Park as part of the town centre, given its complementary role.</li> <li>• <b>Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council</b> agree with preferred option for Playdrome site but state that this should not impact negatively on the existing retail offer of the shopping centre. They are fully supportive of transport improvements at the Clydebank interchange.</li> <li>• <b>VisitScotland</b> agree with the preferred strategy.</li> <li>• <b>SNH</b> support delivery of green infrastructure and high quality active travel, as well as, outlining any developer requirements.</li> </ul>	

- **SEPA and Scottish Water** have no specific comments on the issue but **Scottish Water** encourage early engagement once uses are agreed and developers in place.
- **A range of comments from those attending the Your Place Your Plan events included the following:** the need for another big supermarket retailer in the town centre; more outdoor facilities (West Dunbartonshire wide); concern regarding traffic impact from development; do people use/need an interchange; disabled access to train station is poor and more low carbon transport should be encouraged; the shopping centre should have been moved to Queens Quay and redeveloped for housing; and vehicular access onto Kilbowie Road is required.

### **Our response**

The existing town centre provides for a mix of uses including the Clyde Shopping Centre, as well as, traditional retail, leisure, commercial and residential uses. Scottish Planning Policy identifies commercial centres as those which have a more specific focus on retailing and/or leisure uses. The existing uses at Clyde Retail Park have a specific retail focus and therefore fit the context of a commercial centre.

Widening the town centre boundary could have impacts for the existing retail offer within Clydebank, particularly where there are already vacant units in prime retail locations (closures of BHS and Dunnes in the last couple of years have left large vacancies in the shopping mall).

Therefore, it is considered that the town centre boundary should not be amended to include the Clyde Retail Park and it will be reviewed through the approach to Stanford Street and the Forth and Clyde Canal as per Main Issue 9.

The proposed strategy for the town centre encourages a further mix of town centres uses, including activity and connections with the canal area and supports improvements to and connections between the town centre and Queens Quay across the A814. Traffic impacts from proposed developments are assessed as part of the planning application process.

Local Development Plan 2 will therefore proceed to implement the preferred option.

<b>Issue 8</b>	<b>Clyde Crossing City Deal Project</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> The Council is working with Renfrewshire Council to understand the proposals for the new crossing and how this will impact on Clydebank. The Council is waiting for the conclusions of the various studies and will take an informed decision on how best to proceed following the outcomes of these studies.</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> There is not considered to be an alternative option for this issue.</p>	
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council;          Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council;          SNH;          SEPA;          Scottish Water;          Claire McDonald;          Mr Alan Speirs;          Martin Aird;          Anonymous comments (Your Place Your Plan event)</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>The following points were raised in relation this Issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council</b> are in favour of the new bridge linking Renfrew and the east end of Clydebank. The Community Council state that while the proposals for the project south of the river are quite detailed and realistic; the scheme on the north bank lacks much detail, especially with respect to traffic management. Further they state that they were informed as part of the consultation on the proposed crossing at the new bridge would not become a primary route across the river and that the traffic flows would be relatively small. They state they don't believe this and that any closure of the Erskine Bridge or repair works would cause a huge surge in traffic heading through Clydebank to the new crossing. Kilbowie Roundabout and the existing road connections between the A82 and Dumbarton Road and Glasgow Road are already very badly congested at peak hours so additional traffic would result in gridlock. Before the new bridge receives planning permission there has to be a logical, well developed and fully funded plan in place to improve traffic flow through and around Clydebank. Failure to do this will result in even greater economic malaise and further pollution of the environment from stationary traffic.</li> <li>• <b>Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council</b> would support in principle the new connection over the River Clyde, particularly if this allowed better access to employment opportunities and also to the airport, etc. However more details of the bridge would require to be set out, to show what</li> </ul>	

benefits West Dunbartonshire would gain from the bridge, also what plans the Council has to attract people, business, and commercial interests along with employment to West Dunbartonshire to gain maximum benefit from the bridge and to prevent all the benefits going to surrounding areas such as Renfrewshire.

- **SNH** have responded to a recent planning application for the Clyde Waterfront and Renfrew Riverside City Deal proposal and are continuing to advise with regards to the impact of the proposal on bats.
- **SEPA** advise that this main issue is unlikely to prejudice their interests, however they highlight the need of awareness on the siting of the new bridge structure associated with this project and the provision of the infrastructure associated with the district heating systems in the adjacent areas.
- **Scottish Water** request continued engagement with the planning of the Clyde crossing to determine the impacts on Scottish Water infrastructure.
- **Ms Claire McDonald** thinks the bridge would be a good idea in terms of commuting.
- **Mr Alan Speirs:** advises that there are a number of issues with this proposal:
  - 1) The 'pull' of visitors from Clydebank to Braehead - example of Paisley Town Centre as an example;
  - 2) - Lack of contingency should bridge be out of use/inaccessible;
  - 3) Unsuitability of feeder roads which would serve the bridge on Clydebank side; and
  - 4) Lack of informed discussion with locals around this issue. No real attempt made to engage locals.
- **Mr Martin Aird** is of the view that the bridge would help access to new hospital and airport.
- **Anonymous comments:** one respondent was worried that the new bridge will hurt shops in Clydebank and questioned how the town centre would ever compete with Braehead. Also stated that Clydebank town centre needs another supermarket as ASDA is not enough of a draw.
- Another respondent stated the new bridge would be good for getting to Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but was worried about extra traffic and delays in Clydebank.
- The final respondent stated that the bridge will have negative impact on Glasgow Road due to the increased traffic and wondered what how the bridge proposal would affect the Glasgow Road street improvements at Clydebank Town Hall?

**Our response**

The planning applications for the City Deal project have been referred to the Scottish Ministers for determination.

Local Development Plan 2 will reflect the decision of the Scottish Ministers where appropriate in terms of land use planning within West Dunbartonshire.

<b>Issue 9</b>	<b>Stanford Street and the Forth and Clyde Canal</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> A Design-led approach will be undertaken to guide the future development of Stanford Street and to improve connection with surrounding areas, in particular the town centre and the Clyde Retail Park and any future development on the Playdrome site. It will also look at proposals to improve the Forth and Clyde Canal for leisure and recreation and how the Canal can become a central feature in establishing night time uses within the town centre and how this could extend to include the retail park.</p>	
<p><b>Alternative Option:</b> The alternative option would be to continue with the existing strategy within the Proposed Plan (2016). This approach would not use the Forth and Clyde Canal as an integral part of encouraging night time uses within the town centre and beyond. It would also not allow for consideration of the adjacent retail park as a possibility for contributing towards an improved evening economy.</p>	
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Ms Susan Dick;  Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council;  Savills on behalf of Clyde Retail Park;  Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council;  G Parton;  VisitScotland;  SNH;  SEPA;  SportScotland</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>There was general support for the preferred option, however, the following points were also raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ms Susan Dick and G Parton</b> are of the view that the canal should be left to wildlife and nature. They state that the wildlife areas are being destroyed everywhere for commercial, residential and even leisure uses. They are firmly of the opinion that natural areas are needed in West Dunbartonshire and are not in favour of more cafes or shops as there are plenty of places for commercial uses but there are fewer areas of untouched, natural wildlife and they need to be preserved for future generations to enjoy.</li> <li>• <b>Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council:</b> concur with the preferred option but they do not think that trying to “improve the canal for leisure and recreation” is very realistic. Many millions of pounds have been lavished on the Forth and Clyde Canal in recent times but the outcomes in many cases have been poor.</li> <li>• <b>Clyde Retail Park</b> support a design-led approach which would improve connections for pedestrians between the town centre and the Clyde Retail Park. This approach would also seek to establish a stronger evening</li> </ul>	

economy within the town centre and aim to extend this to the Clyde Retail Park. In parallel with the implementation of these approaches, it would also be logical to designate Clyde Retail Park within the town centre boundary.

- **Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council** state they are not clear on how a design-led approach would work and list a number of questions on this matter. The Community Council would support proposals to improve the Forth and Clyde canal for recreation, but state that the types of night time economy cannot be to the detriment of the amenity of the area, nor can it result in an over concentration of bad neighbour developments in one area or have them across three areas such as the Town Centre, retail centre as well as the canal.
- **VisitScotland** state that the integration of the canal as a community/heritage/tourism/recreation/leisure/transport asset and investment catalyst is an important consideration and neighbouring local authorities are already exploring action plans that embrace the waterways network and Scottish Canals as strategic and commercial partners.
- **SNH** support the preferred option and agree that a design-led approach should be undertaken for the site, including consideration of its relationship to the canal as an important strategic green network. SNH recommend that clear developer requirements and developer contributions should be set out in the Proposed LDP.
- **SEPA** advise that they have no comments to make on this issue.
- **SportScotland** support the preferred option and state that new development should incorporate existing and provide for new walking and cycling infrastructure and should link to both functional and recreational networks, including to routes that may extend into the wider countryside. Multi-use should form the starting point providing shared use for walking and cycling. They welcome the reference to future opportunities for leisure and recreation as this may include sporting uses linked to the canal-side location with benefits for sport.

#### **Our response**

The Council acknowledges the need to maintain the natural beauty of the canal; however, disagrees that this cannot be maintained whilst sensitively introducing uses within town centre which creates a night time economy. By making more recreational use of the Canal, it will help with creating walkable communities whilst introducing activities which make the Canal a focal point for activity.

The Council were successful in obtaining funding from the Scottish Government's Making Places Fund to take forward further design and community capacity building work in relation to this Issue. Consultants have been appointed to undertake this project which focuses on Clydebank Town Centre and the Forth and Clyde Canal. The Final report, masterplan etc is due by the end of May 2018. Where practical this will be included within Local Development Plan 2 but is more likely to form Supplementary Guidance to the Plan.

<b>Issue 10</b>	<b>The Lomond Canal</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> The preferred option is for the proposed route of the Lomond Canal to be removed from Local Development Plan 2 as it is unlikely to be delivered in the short to medium term. Full consideration of its environmental impact has not taken place within the period of the Proposed Plan (2016). By removing the route from Local Development Plan 2 any uncertainty regarding its potential impact on development sites would also be removed. The Plan should also remove its support for a project that is not being progressed and is restricting development on other sites.</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> The Local Development Plan should continue to offer support to the concept of the Lomond Canal subject to full consideration of its environmental impact. Any proposals for development affecting the route of the canal should be assessed against their economic impact and the probability of the canal being developed.</p>	
<b>Responses received from</b>	
<p>Jeremy Watson, Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council, Silverton and Overtoun Community Council, Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Planning Authority, Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council, VisitScotland, Vale of Leven Trust, SNH, SEPA, Clydebelt, SportScotland, Scottish Water.</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>The majority of those who responded supported the preferred option to remove the proposed route of the Lomond Canal from Local Development Plan 2, as it is generally considered over-ambitious and undeliverable. The following points were also raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>VisitScotland</b> supports the alternative option and considers the scheme could be transformational for the area.</li> <li>• <b>Sportscotland</b> encourages any proposals which would maximise opportunities for canal-side recreational and leisure activities. Concern about impact on existing communities was raised, although it could be beneficial if offering permanent solution to flooding in Dumbarton (Vale of Leven Trust).</li> </ul>	
<b>Our response</b>	



It is agreed that this proposal has deliverability issues and safeguarding the route in the plan has certain disadvantages. No progress has been made over the lifetime of the current Plan.

Local Development Plan 2 will therefore remove the route of the proposed Lomond Canal and any reference to safeguarding the route and supporting its development from the Plan.

<b>Issue 11</b>	<b>Bowling Basin</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p>The minor revisions to the existing strategy were not considered to be a Main Issues on their own. Therefore, there is no preferred or alternative option.</p>	
<b>Responses received from</b>	
<p>Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council,  Silverton and Overtoun Community Council,  Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council,  G Parton,  VisitScotland,  Clyde Marine Planning Partnership,  Susan Dick,  Lesley McEwan,  SNH,  SEPA,  Clydebelt.</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>There is general support for the strategy for Bowling Basin. The following points were also raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council, Silverton and Overtoun Community Council and Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council</b> support revising the strategy as proposed and in addition suggest the need for improvements to Bowling Harbour.</li> <li>• <b>G Parton, Susan Dick, Lesley McEwan and Clydebelt</b> request that the woodland areas are kept as natural as possible and retain existing flora.</li> <li>• <b>G Parton, Susan Dick</b> are of the view that there should be no housing on land between the Clyde and the canal. There is also the need to enhance equestrian access.</li> <li>• <b>Clyde Marine Planning Partnership</b> highlight that a recent publication on sea level rise and storm surges in the Firth of Clyde should be considered in order to direct development away from coastal areas at risk of future flooding.</li> <li>• <b>SNH</b> are very supportive of enhancement of waterfront areas and improved access; however there is a need to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the Inner Clyde SPA.</li> </ul>	

**Our response**

There is general support for the strategy for Bowling Basin and therefore the revisions to the strategy based on the Masterplan will be undertaken.

Local Development Plan 2 will also ensure that any development proposed will take into consideration the revised advice on future flood risk and ensure that there is no adverse impact on the SPA. The proposed green network enhancements will be required to take into account comments regarding the woodland areas.

<b>Issue 11</b>	<b>Alexandria Town Centre</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p>The proposed revisions to the existing strategy to reflect development progress on housing opportunity sites at Kippen Dairy and Leven Cottage was considered to be a minor revisions and therefore it was not a Main Issue on its own. As a result, there no preferred or alternative option.</p>	
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council,  Vale of Leven Trust,  Alice Fletcher (Your Place, Your Plan event),  Anonymous respondent (both Your Place, Your Plan event)</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>The following points were raised in relation to Alexandria Town Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council and the Vale of Leven Trust</b> suggest a Simplified Planning Zone.</li> <li>• <b>Vale of Leven Trust</b> seek further detail on new developments/investment in the town including former medical centre site and would like to see additional parking and raise issue with parking in surrounding streets.</li> <li>• <b>Alice Fletcher</b> is of the view more retail provision and leisure facilities such as soft play, clothes and shoe shops are required.</li> <li>• <b>Anonymous respondent</b> asked why replace old flats and shops in Alexandria with more shops and flats (with flat roofs); stated the need for more facilities to cater for population if building more houses; and raised issues with the A82 from Lomondgate to Luss particularly if there's an accident.</li> </ul>	
<b>Our response</b>	
<p>A Simplified Planning Zone needs careful consideration as it would relax planning restrictions and allow more permitted development which could result in possible undesirable town centre uses. It is important to note that there is no core retail area restriction in Alexandria like Dumbarton and Clydebank; therefore, other uses could be acceptable within the Town Centre without the need for an Simplified Planning Zone.</p> <p>Therefore, it is intended to make the revisions to the existing strategy within Local Development Plan 2 and it is not proposed to take forward a Simplified Planning Zone for Alexandria Town Centre due to the size of Alexandria itself and the potential delays this could have on the preparation of the Proposed Plan.</p>	

<b>Issue 11</b>	<b>Carless</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p>At the time of writing the Main Issues Report there had been some interest shown in the site, but no proposals had progressed to the planning application stage. At that point, the existing strategy was considered to be relevant and, as a result, Carless wasn't considered to be a Main Issue.</p>	
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Peter Brett Associates on behalf Malin Group Properties Ltd</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>The response seeks changes to the existing strategy for Carless. The Malin Group request that Local Development Plan 2 should allow for, and promote, a phased approach to development with the removal of the requirements for a comprehensive masterplan and remediation strategy and should contain a development strategy for the Carless site. This would set out high level development parameters for the site, identifying the initial and subsequent phases of development on the site in a sequential manner, alongside indicative land uses. By allowing for the phased approach to development (alongside the necessary phasing of remediation works), it would permit works to proceed in an expedient way that is aligned with the financial viability of each phase. The Malin Group would also work with the Council to develop a development strategy and would be guided by the principles currently set out in Main Issue 12: Creating Places.</p>	
<p>The Malin Group state that the advantages of this approach are that it allows development to proceed in a phased manner according to the needs of each phase, without having to prepare proposals for the whole site before the plans for the eastern area are fully crystallised. At the same time, it provides the Planning Authority with the assurance of a development strategy for the site that is embedded in Local Development Plan 2 and that can be used to assess planning applications for future phases. It is considered that this approach balances the commercial considerations of site development with the need for a co-ordinated approach to planning.</p>	
<p>The Malin Group also state, in relation to the two references to the site within Chapter 5 of the Main Issues Report, that this dual reference to the site under two separate headings is confusing and that it would be better to identify it as a mixed use redevelopment opportunity, recognising that the site is potentially suitable for both business and industry and, in parts, for housing.</p>	
<b>Our response</b>	
<p>Local Development Plan 2 will provide an updated Development Strategy and place based policies for the Carless site which give certainty to the developer but also to ensure that as, one of our key regeneration sites, the uses of the site are appropriate to its context; that the current proposals for green network enhancement as contained within the Proposed Plan are reflected and delivered;</p>	

and ultimately that the site is brought back into active use.

<b>Issue 11</b>	<b>Kilpatrick Hills</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> The current strategy for the Kilpatrick Hills remains relevant, appropriate and is in accordance with the Renewable Energy Planning Guidance. Wind energy proposals will be supported where they involve small/medium scale turbines located within less visually prominent parts of the Kilpatrick Hills. Wind energy developments involving large/very large scale turbines are unlikely to be supported.</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> An alternative option would be to have a more open approach to large and very large scale wind turbines where the benefits of providing renewable energy are considered to outweigh the impact on the local landscape.</p>	
<b>Responses received from</b>	
<p>Mr John Mullen,  Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council,  Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council,  Loch Lomond and the National Park Planning Authority,  Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council,  G Parton,  VisitScotland,  Susan Dick,  Lesley McEwan,  Vale of Leven Trust,  SNH,  Stirling Council,  SEPA,  Clydebelt,  East Dunbartonshire Council,  John Smith SCOTPLAN,</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>Most responses are in favour of the preferred option of keeping the existing policy with regard to windfarm development in the Kilpatrick Hills. The additional points were also made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council</b> state that the Local Development Plan should make reference to Lang Craigs Community Woodland, on Maryland Farm and the surrounding 400 hectares, to the immediate north-east of Dumbarton, and owned by the Woodland Trust. It is a valuable community resource and western gateway to the Kilpatrick Hills.</li> <li>• <b>Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council</b> are concerned about proposals for Papperthill Windfarm – it would harm visual amenity, scenery, wildlife and community use of the area - should this be a separate</li> </ul>	

Main Issue. Would like clarification in the Local Development Plan on what constitutes small/medium/large scale turbines. Would also like clarification on Policy DS2 - Green Belt zoning along with Policy GN4 Local Landscape Area Designation, in particular, the area to the north east and east of Dumbarton. Unclear which Policy took precedence, or whether this meant there was double protection for these areas. This should be made clearer in the next iteration of the Plan.

- **G Parton** disagrees with all Main Issues Report options and feels that no wind developments of any scale should be allowed.
- **Susan Dick** is of the opinion that no wind developments of any scale should be allowed.
- **Vale of Leven Trust** state that the Council appears to support a windfarm at Papperthill and enquire how does that proposal relate to the Policy and as a Council-led project should it not be a Main Issue? Need clarification in LDP of what constitutes small/medium/large scale turbines.
- **Stirling Council** fully supports the preferred approach not to allow large scale wind farms into the Kilpatrick Hills. This would accord with their own policy approach.
- **East Dunbartonshire Council** support the preferred approach.
- **John Smith** states that windfarm policy should be criteria based rather than area based. He is also of the view that the Council should also develop a Masterplan for Kilpatrick Hills to also include tourism and access opportunities/potential.
- **Loch Lomond & Trossachs National Park Planning Authority** support the existing strategy and preferred option. Any proposals in the Kilpatrick Hills should ensure that they do not have an adverse impact on the special landscape qualities of the National Park.

### **Our response**

This Main Issue relates specifically to wind energy policy for the Kilpatrick Hills, so greenspace/tourism issues will be addressed under the relevant Main Issues Report heading. As part of the update to the 'Our Green Network' planning guidance, there will be an opportunity to make greater reference to the Lang Craigs Community Woodland, which is only briefly mentioned in the current guidance.

There is general support for the preferred option and no additional information has been presented to suggest this is not appropriate. Local Development Plan 2 will therefore proceed with the implementation of the preferred option.



<b>Issue 11</b>	<b>Green Network</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p>The current strategy will require be updated to more accurately reflect the agreed “Our Green Network” Planning Guidance. However, these are revisions and are not considered to be a Main Issue on their own and have already been subject to consultation through the preparation of the Planning Guidance document.</p>	
<b>Responses received from</b>	
<p>Susan Dick  Vale of Leven Trust  SEPA  Clydebelt  G Parton  Faifley Community Council</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>The following comments were raised in relation to the Green Network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Susan Dick</b> stated that more provision should be made for horse riding areas/routes. Green network approach is focussed too much on new play parks and there should be greater attention on creating new greenspaces and equestrian routes.</li> <li>• <b>Vale of Leven Trust</b> is of the view that there should be greater provision of cycle and pedestrian routes within road infrastructure to reduce dependence on cars. They support the provision of better active travel routes for commuters and would welcome the opportunity to work alongside the Council in getting the right routes in place. The Trust is fully supportive of the existing strategy to safeguard the Green Network and suggests that further enhancements to the network should be provided; cycle provision should be increased and further connections to green space should be made.</li> <li>• <b>SEPA</b> consider Local Development Plan 2 should include ‘blue networks’ and should link green network with improvements to the water environment, as required by the Water Framework Directive and river basin planning. Multiple benefits could be realised for integrated habitat networks, biodiversity, flood management etc. SEPA welcome the preferred approach and acknowledge that the current strategy proposes a direct connection with delivery at site level as part of development briefs and design frameworks.</li> <li>• <b>Clydebelt</b> support the Main Issues Report strategy but request that wildlife corridors are built into and enhanced as part of green network to help protect and promote wildlife diversity.</li> </ul>	

- **G Parton** is of the view that no parks and natural spaces are being created by the Council only play parks. Better equestrian routes are required – e.g. at Overtoun House and disused railway lines are required.
- **Faifley Community Council** state that maintenance of open spaces, woodlands and green networks/routes is poor: paths are overgrown and blocked, and it encourages fly tipping and vandalism and discourages outdoor access. They are of the view that the Council needs to improve access and surfaces of paths. Also need to improve and replace play areas, some of which were lost in the 1980's and were never replaced.

### **Our response**

The policy detail and site guidance for greenspace is set out principally in the “Our Green Network” Guidance. This is being reviewed alongside the preparation of Local Development Plan 2.

The Council will review whether a “blue network” of river basins should be identified and better integrated with the Green Network: however SEPA's comments appear to overlook that the existing Strategy already recognises the Rivers Clyde and Leven and the canal as part of the Green Network. As such, it may be more appropriate to consider whether the network could be re-labelled.

The responses concerning specific open spaces and maintenance will be forwarded to the Greenspace Team.

**Issue 12****Creating Places****Preferred Option and Alternative Option**

**Preferred Option:** The preferred option is to expand on Policy DS 1 of the Proposed Plan (2016) and develop a suite of policies to ensure that new development considers the needs of people first and that new places are integrated into existing neighbourhoods and communities, thereby ensuring that liveable and walkable places are created.

The Council will establish a framework within Local Development Plan 2 which allows for place-making maps to be produced, in conjunction with communities, taking into account the place standard. Place-making maps will help to focus on what improvements are required which can be delivered through Local Development Plan 2, to help improve the quality of existing places.

Local Development Plan 2 will give much more visual and design guidance on how medium to large-scale sites, or sites within sensitive areas, should be developed and integrated with existing communities. Local Development Plan 2 will illustrate, for example, where connections should be made; where development and green infrastructure could be located; how development should be orientated etc. These design guidelines should be incorporated into the layout of the site by the developer.

**Alternative Option:** The alternative option is to continue with the approach advocated in the Proposed Plan (2016). This is not the preferred option. Local Development Plan 2 requires a much stronger emphasis on place to ensure that development creates new high quality places and strengthens existing ones by putting people first and involving the community in the production of placemaking plans to enhance the attractiveness of existing places and West Dunbartonshire as a whole.

**Responses received**

Mrs MacKay,  
Parkhall Community Council;  
Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council;  
Persimmon Homes;  
Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council;  
VisitScotland;  
Cameron Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey;  
Homes for Scotland;  
Vale of Leven Trust;  
SNH;  
SEPA;  
East Dunbartonshire Council

## Summary of responses

There was general support for the preferred option; however, the following points were also raised.

- **Mrs Mackay** supports the renovation of pavilion at Mountblow playing fields only if good quality materials used.
- **Parkhall, North Kilbowie & Central Community Council** state that creating high quality spaces in the public and private domains is a very desirable aim. Ambitious initiatives abound but they nearly always lack the planning, funding and persistence to ensure their long term viability. A good example of such failure is the raised beds along the centre of Dumbarton Road and Glasgow Road in Clydebank. They agree that the Local Development Plan 2 should give much more visual and design guidance on how sites should be developed especially to avoid passing architectural fads like timber cladding and deliberately rusting metal.
- **Silvertoun and Overtoun Community Council** agree with the preferred option in principle, but do not feel qualified to comment in detail. They are aware, however, of the placemaking maps idea, and will be exploring this idea at a strictly local (Silvertoun and Dumbarton East) level in the coming months. They are strongly in favour of each town and village having identifiable identities; of giving greater consideration to visual and design guidance on developments, in particular the incorporation wherever possible of green infrastructure.
- **Persimmon Homes** state that clear and concise policies will ensure that developers can address design requirements whilst ensuring that development viability is not compromised. Key to this is also recognising that no two developments are the same and the way policies are applied should reflect this. The creation of the new Design Panel and Design Officer post will also be of assistance in ensuring that design and place-making form part of initial pre-application discussions.

They are of the view that sites promoted for development would benefit from 1-2 page design briefs to accompany diagrams detailing how a site could be developed. These briefs would be informed by Call for Sites submissions and discussions with landowners/developers in order to set out opportunities and constraints. There should however be scope through pre-application design discussions to allow for alternative approaches to site development to be justified where they do not conform fully to potential briefs/place-making maps.

- **Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council** support a range of policies aimed at creating new places and delivering high quality development. It is key that development proposals integrate well into existing neighbourhoods and communities and support liveable and walkable places.

Although the Plan may provide more clarity and certainty on the standards of new development, the Council as whole should aim to adopt this

approach as the Community Council currently find that the current policies & procedures of different departments can directly contradict what is best for areas and places. They would like to see the heart put back into communities; however they feel that at times the different Council departments are at odds with each other which is detrimental to towns and villages. The Community Council propose that each town and village should have identifiable identities that are different in character and that stop the faceless generic town centre look.

The Community Council would welcome the establishment of a framework which allows for place-making maps to be produced but would like more clarification of when the maps would be produced; whether they would be a part of the Proposed Plan and what the involvement of the Community Council would be in influencing these place-making maps.

- **VisitScotland** support the preferred option.
- **Taylor Wimpey** note the content of this Main Issues Report.
- **Homes for Scotland:** state that the LDP should ensure that it is as clear as possible in its expectations and aspirations regarding new places and quality of developments. The Council must also be reasonably flexible and pragmatic in how any policy is applied and should accept that there may be circumstances and clear reasons given as to why a particular approach cannot be adopted without adversely affecting development viability. Delivering sufficient new homes to meet all housing needs and demands must remain a priority.

In relation to the production of place-making maps, Homes for Scotland would support the principle of this in that it can provide a clear view of settlement wide expectations and aspirations. However, Local Development Plan 2 is a key policy document that must also contain clear and unambiguous policy statements to reduce the level of necessary interpretation and assumption that could arise with an over-reliance on visual presentation.

- **Vale of Leven Trust** support a range of policies aimed at creating new places and delivering high quality development and support liveable and walkable places particularly in relation to many of the comments provided above. However although the Plan may provide more clarity and certainty on the standards of new development, the Council, as a whole, should aim to adopt this approach as the current policies and procedures of different departments can directly contradict what is best for areas and places. It is a key ambition within the Trust to see the heart put back into local communities; however, they feel that at times the different Council Services appear at odds with each other about this issue and this is something which can only be detrimental to our towns and villages.

The Trust would welcome the establishment of a framework that allows for place-making maps to be produced. They suggest that each town &

village is developed with their individual and identifiable identities and want a mandatory requirement for all reasonable sized developments, regardless of developer to provide in depth visual and graphic information at the pre-planning stage.

**SNH** support the continued emphasis on place and the ambition to deliver high quality places and development. In particular they welcome the intention to ensure that new development considers the needs of people and the emphasis on the need to deliver well integrated, liveable and walkable places. SNH also support the inclusion of place making maps and highlight green infrastructure and active travel considerations, the likely relationship to the green network strategy and the need for alignment. Further support is given to the intention to provide more visual and design guidance. They highlight the range of design tools set out in paragraph 57 of Scottish Planning Policy.

- **SEPA** advise that this main issue is unlikely to prejudice their interests provided that Policies DS1 – DS8 (revised versions) continue to be an integral part of the decision making process and that they are used in conjunction with the proposed use of place-making maps. They should jointly better deliver high-quality development. In the place-making maps SEPA would encourage highlighting the presence of blue corridors/the water environment and the buffer strips/ no development zones that should be provided in these areas, linking to the provision of green infrastructure and again visual presentation of this in allocated sites better defines the developable footprint of the site.
- **East Dunbartonshire Council** is supportive of the preferred option to develop a suite of policies, ensuring new development considers the needs of people first to create liveable and walkable neighbourhoods and communities. This reflects their policy position of taking a design-led approach, as set out in Policy 2 of their adopted Local Development Plan and the Design and Placemaking Supplementary Guidance.

### **Our response**

Local Development Plan 2 will provide a suite of design policies that aim to raise the standard of design. Careful consideration will be given to ensure that development viability is not affected; however, these policies will be a step change and it will be up to the development industry to embrace them in order to create a place that people want to live, invest, visit and explore. Local Development Plan 2 will also require to give policy weight to the work of the Place and Design Panel and when the panel should be consulted.

It is proposed that visual design guidance for sites will take the form of development briefs to be contained within Supplementary Guidance due to the time required to prepare these.

In relation to placemaking, the Council is currently looking at how locality planning can be incorporated within Local Development Plan 2 and as such, placemaking

maps may be better undertaken as part of Locality Planning. Locality plans will also have to reflect the comments in relation to green and blue networks

Consideration will be given on how Local Development Plan 2 will incorporate and give policy weight to the provisions of the Locality Plans. However, locality plans will have to consider spatial planning and placemaking within them in order to be adopted as Supplementary Guidance.

Issue 13	Private Sector Housing Land (see also Review of Development Sites and New Sites)
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Homes for Scotland, Knowes HA, Claire Marshall, Stuart Macdonald, Claire MacDonald, Pierre de Fence, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council, Silverton and Overtoun Community Council, Persimmon Homes, Jessie Turner/Hugh Kinloch, Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council, Savills on behalf of Logan Factoring and Management, SNH, Vale of Leven Trust, SEPA, Clydebelt, Cameron Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey, Houghton Planning on behalf of Church of Scotland, Keppie Planning on behalf of Craigelvan, Montagu Evans on behalf of Dumbarton Football Club, SNH and Transport Scotland.</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>The housing supply targets should be updated to reflect the approved SDP. The Housing Land Audit 2017 has been agreed by Homes for Scotland. The deletion of some non-effective sites is supported, with the addition of <b>Bonhill Quarry, Carless, North Douglas Street and Dalquhurn</b>. Despite agreeing the 2017-24 programming, <b>Homes for Scotland</b> are now saying it is a reasonable assumption that only 80% of this programming is 'reasonable', and that that would result in a 'finely balanced' supply to meet targets, and to be 'truly generous' there should be additional allocations. <b>Persimmon Homes</b> similarly are of the view that additional allocations are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde</b> support the inclusion of Clydebank and Hardgate Health Centres</li> <li>• <b>Knowes Housing Association, Claire Marshall, Claire MacDonald, Stuart Macdonald and Pierre de Fence</b> request that Faifley Bowling Club is allocated for affordable housing . However, <b>Clydebelt</b> are of the view that the site should not be developed for housing but allotments or community gardens due to density and road congestion</li> <li>• Vale of Leven Trust and Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council are concerned that too many flats are being built and no regard for services and infrastructure required</li> <li>• <b>Parkhall North Kilbowie and Central Community Council and Silverton and Overtoun Community Council</b> agree with the preferred option.</li> <li>• <b>Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council and the Vale of Leven Trust</b> do not agree that Dumbain Crescent, Former Carman Waterworks, Bonhill Quarry, Overtoun Road should be allocated</li> <li>• <b>Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council</b> are of the view that Strauss Avenue and Dumbuckhill should not be allocated.</li> <li>• <b>Jessie Turner on behalf of Hugh Kinloch</b> support the continuing</li> </ul>	



allocation of Jamestown IE BC2(7) and it's extension into industrial area GE1(14)

- **Savills on behalf of Logan Factoring and Management** support the allocation of Strauss Avenue for residential development of 100 houses
- **SEPA** do not objection to preferred approach, but advise that the development footprint of some sites could be constrained by flood risk
- There are various objections to Young's Farm and Dumbuckhill as they are in greenbelt.
- **Old Mill Garage** – should only develop to south of the burn.
- **William Street** – withdraw as a site (Clydebelt).
- **Duntiglennan** - allocate for residential (Cameron Planning for Taylor Wimpey)
- **Old Kilpatrick Glebe** – allocate for limited residential development (Houghton Planning on behalf of Church of Scotland).
- **Young's Farm and DFC stadium** support for residential use (Montagu Evans for DFC).
- **Main Street, Jamestown** – allocate area for 3-4 dwellings (Keppie on behalf of Craigelvan)

#### **POST-MIR NEW SITES**

- **Former RHI Site, Clydebank** – site is now disused and has been marketed for potential residential use.
- **Former Council Office, Church Street, Alexandria** – site is now vacated and Council Estates Team are keen to dispose.

#### **Our response**

It is agreed that the LDP will conform to the approved SDP with the amended Housing Supply Targets. We do not believe the land supply position requires any further allocations to be considered generous. Of the four additional sites that Homes for Scotland suggest should be deleted –

**Bonhill Quarry** – this site has been brought to us as a response to the Call for Sites exercise. It has previously been identified as a housing opportunity site since 2004 with a lapsed planning consent. No information from the developers re deliverability has been provided. Its redevelopment is not supported by some community groups. As the site's deliverability is questionable and given the issues of potential site contamination and its status as a Local Nature Conservation site, it is not preferred for allocation.

**Carless** – agreed that the capacity will reduce, but developers are still promoting residential use on part of the site.

**North Douglas Street** – this is a small vacant brownfield site which is likely to be developed by a local builder and will be retained as a development opportunity.

**Dalquhurn** – this is the remainder of a major redevelopment site supported by the Scottish Government. The majority of the remaining houses will to be social rented, with some shared equity, as reflected in the latest SHIP.

**Faifley Bowling Club** – acknowledge the support for affordable housing here; limited residential development is possible to allow for a retained community use, such as community gardens, and to address potential site access and parking issues.

In relation to **SEPA's** comments, the design policies within Local Development Plan 2 will help to ensure that the right dwellings are built in the right locations with the required infrastructure. The development footprint of sites will reflect the latest information in relation to flood risk.

**Dumbain Crescent** – as it is within the greenbelt, may have potentially negative landscape impacts and is not required to provide a generous housing supply, as a result, this is not suggested for allocation in the Proposed Plan.

**Carman Waterworks** – Although in the greenbelt, this is a derelict site where limited and sensitive development could improve the environment and road safety.

**Strauss Avenue** – the development of a part of this part of this site was promoted as a preferred site. Ownership is split between West Dunbartonshire Council and Logan Factoring and Managements, who have submitted a development framework and an access strategy assuming the whole site will be developed for housing. The site currently offers a large area of poor quality greenspace which is not well used. There is an opportunity to create a high quality development on this site as an eastern gateway to West Dunbartonshire. Discussion with the Roads authorities for West Dunbartonshire Council and Glasgow City Council indicate that the site would require a primary access to be formed from the A82, or from a suitable access, within Glasgow City Council's Boundary. A Transport Assessment for the site will also be required, which satisfactorily demonstrates that safe access from the primary route into the site can be achieved. Strauss Avenue can only provide a secondary access for Emergency Vehicles and as an emergency access.

There will also be a need to provide improved greenspace, to protect and animate the canal, and to remediate surface flooding on parts of the site.

**Dumbuckhill** – this is a large, elevated site within the greenbelt which would have significant landscape and settlement boundary impacts. There is no requirement to release any significant greenfield sites to achieve a generous housing land

supply.

**Jamestown IE** will be retained as a housing site. The review of business and industry sites did not recommend deallocating the remaining industrial land at Jamestown.

**Overton Road** – as this area of open space acts as an important buffer zone between residential areas and the main A82, and due to the elevated nature of the site relative to the existing houses, this is not a preferred residential site.

**Young's Farm** – see response to Issue 6. The refusal of the Young's Farm planning application means there is no immediate prospect of Dumbarton Football Club relocating. As such, the existing stadium site should also be removed from the Plan as a residential opportunity. Nonetheless, it remains in the established land supply and may be suitable for a housing site in the future, should the Football Club decide to relocate.

**Old Mill Garage** – the work undertaken on the site has implemented the current application which remains live.

**William Street** – agree that this site is deleted.

**Duntiglennan** – there is no requirement to release any significant greenfield sites to achieve a generous housing land supply. This site was rejected during the previous Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) and at the planning application stage by Council in 2017. Therefore, this site will not be allocated in the Proposed Plan.

**Old Kilpatrick Glebe** – the Church of Scotland are intending to market this site within the next two years for a limited housing development. It is zoned as existing residential in the adopted Local Plan. This changed to open space in the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) because the site was considered non-effective due to ownership. It is currently used as horse grazing and not as public open space. Limited development of the site could improve accessibility to the area and enhance the quality of the greenspace.

**Main Street, Jamestown** – this site is zoned as existing residential in the adopted Local Plan. It is currently used as informal open space and is zoned as such in the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016). It is identified in the Scottish Vacant and Derelict Land survey as contaminated land. A limited development here would address the issue of contamination, and should improve connectivity and place-making in this area.

**Former RHI Site, Clydebank** – residential use would allow for environmental improvement of site and would align with wider residential-led redevelopment of Stanford Street and the adjacent canal side area.

**Former Council Office, Church Street, Alexandria** – offers a small scale residential opportunity to improve the site within an existing residential area.

## Impact on Proposed Plan

Local Development Plan 2 will ensure there is a generous and effective supply of land to meet housing need and demand. The promotion of a place-making approach and a high quality of design should ensure the right development in the right place, and taking all considerations into account.

**Bonhill Quarry** – no information has been provided on the effectiveness and deliverability of the site and, as there are also concerns with the ground conditions/stability of the site, it is proposed to delete the site as a residential opportunity.

**Carless** – reflect latest proposals – the residential element is likely to be retained but the capacity significantly reduced, but this will be dependent on the layout and design of the site. Also see Issue 11.

**North Douglas Street** – no change - retain as residential development opportunity.

**Dalquhurn** – no change - retain as a residential development opportunity, reflecting SHIP proposals.

**Clydebank and Hardgate Health Centres** – no change - retain as residential development opportunities.

**Faifley Bowling Club** – support limited social rented housing, with appropriate parking provision and greenspace accommodating community use if possible.

**Dumbain Crescent** – delete as a residential opportunity and retain as greenbelt.

**Carman Works** – no change - retain as a small greenfield release which would redevelop a derelict site and improve road safety.

**Strauss Avenue** – a design framework/masterplan will be required to indicate how this site could accommodate residential development and achieve suitable site access, as well as, improved greenspace, flood alleviation, gateway design and animation of the canal, taking into consideration the constraints of the site.

**Dumbuckhill** – no change - retain as greenbelt.

**Jamestown IE** – retain as a residential development opportunity. Any extension to the south will depend on the outcome of the business and industrial land survey.

**Overton Road** – not a preferred site.

**Young's Farm** – not a preferred site - see Issue 6. Existing stadium also not a preferred site, due to the refusal of relocation proposals.

**Old Mill Garage** – no change - retain as a residential development opportunity.

**William Street** – no change - delete as a residential development opportunity.

**Duntiglennan** – no change – retain site in the greenbelt.

**Old Kilpatrick Glebe** – change from open space to limited residential development opportunity.

**Main Street Jamestown** – allocate as a residential opportunity to allow minor residential development and greenspace enhancements.

**Former RHI Site, Clydebank** – change to a residential allocation site.

**Former Council Office, Church Street, Alexandria** - change to a residential allocation site.

<b>Issue 14</b>	<b>Affordable Housing</b>
<b>Preferred and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> There is no justification or evidence contained within the Local Housing Strategy (2017 – 2022) for an Affordable Housing policy in West Dunbartonshire. The More Homes Better Homes aspirations of the Council can be delivered within the current generous land supply and through the financial support available to the Council from the Scottish Government. The inclusion of such a policy could reduce the viability of private sector sites. Instead, land will continue to be allocated for Affordable Housing in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> An Affordable Housing policy requiring a percentage contribution towards meeting Affordable Housing requirements from every private sector housing site would be introduced. This could have an adverse impact on the delivery of private housing.</p>	
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council,  Silverton and Overtoun Community Council,  Persimmon Homes,  Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council,  Savills on behalf of Logan Factoring and Management,  Homes for Scotland,  Swan Real Estate PLC,  Vale of Leven Trust,  SEPA,  Scottish Water.</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>There is general agreement with the preferred option that whilst there is a desire to see more affordable homes provided, <b>Persimmon, Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council, Logan Factoring and Management, Homes for Scotland, Swan Real Estate, Vale of Leven Trust</b> agree that there is no justification for an affordable housing policy to achieve this goal.</p> <p>Whilst agreeing with the preferred option, <b>Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council and Silverton and Overtoun Community Council</b>, consider that the private housing sector should provide a certain percentage of affordable housing on their sites where possible.</p>	
<b>Our response</b>	
<p>We welcome the general support to the preferred approach to the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The approach to affordable housing provision will therefore not change within Local Development Plan 2 and no percentage affordable housing contribution will be required from private developers, but a generous supply of land for social rented housing will be allocated in the Plan.</p>	

**Preferred Option and Alternative Option**

**Preferred Option:** The Council will undertake a comprehensive review of business and industrial land supply within West Dunbartonshire. Based on the outcomes of the review, it will consider whether further business and industrial land should be allocated within Local Development Plan 2 or, where appropriate, existing sites should be re-allocated to suitable alternative uses. This approach will ensure that the Council will have an up to date effective and marketable supply of business and industrial land allocated within Local Development Plan 2.

**Alternative Option:** The alternative option will continue to implement the approach to business and industrial land as detailed within the Proposed Plan (2016). This approach is not considered to be in accordance with the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy as a review of business and industrial land supply will not have been undertaken. This approach could also provide a barrier to new Investment within the area as the safeguarded business and industrial sites may not be attractive to the market, which could result in potential new businesses with an interest in moving to West Dunbartonshire choosing to locate elsewhere. Also it could involve existing business moving outwith the area, due to a shortage of land for relocation and/or expansion which meets their requirements.

**Responses received**

Dalglish Associates Limited on behalf of William Thompson & Son (Dumbarton) Ltd,  
 Parkhall, North Kilbowie & Central Community Council,  
 Silverton & Overtoun Community Council,  
 Persimmon Homes,  
 Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council,  
 Vale of Leven Trust,  
 Smith Muir Evans on behalf of Chivas,  
 SEPA,  
 East Dunbartonshire Council,  
 Susan Cuthbert

**Summary of responses**

There was a general consensus in favour of the preferred option; however, the following points were also raised:

- **Dalglish Associates Ltd** propose a new allocation for industrial land adjoining Sheephill Quarry.
- **Parkhall, North Kilbowie & Central Community Council and Silverton & Overtoun Community Council** agree that the Council should undertake a review of industrial/business land and should resist development within the greenbelt.
- **Parkhall, North Kilbowie & Central Community Council** also suggest that the Council should support small businesses in finding suitable

premises and Rosebery Place should be considered for start-ups.

- **Persimmon Homes** suggest that the Council should consider alternative uses in industrial areas, in appropriate locations.
- **Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council and the Vale of Leven Trust** support the industrial/business land review and suggest that there is an oversupply.
- **Chivas** agree with the option to undertake a review of industrial and business land and wish to see their proposals for expansion reflected in Local Development Plan 2.
- **SEPA** outline that this issue is unlikely to prejudice their interests provided any existing sites where the 'use' class is changed are fit for purpose.
- The preferred option is supported by **East Dunbartonshire Council** and **Susan Cuthbert**.

#### **Our response**

The Council have commissioned Ryden to undertake the Business and Industrial Review and the findings of that report will be incorporated into Local Development Plan 2. The Council will also give due consideration to the request from the Community Councils that the plan can further encourage start up business. The Clydebank Town Centre Charrette indicated that the preferred use for Roseberry Place was for residential. Further consideration will be given to including small scale business use within the site.

Ryden are also investigating if the approach promoted within the Planning Guidance for Clydebank Business Park is suitable for other business and industrial areas. The Council will give due consideration to the findings of Ryden when the report is received.

The recent consent for expansion of Chivas will be reflected in the Plan, or if development is underway soon, it should be reflected as existing industry and business. This should be considered in line with any changes that are proposed in relation to representations and the preferred option in relation to Main Issue 5: Vale of Leven Industrial Estate.

In relation to Sheephill Quarry, should the Ryden study indicate that new business and industrial land is required then the request to allocate business and industrial land next to the Quarry will be considered further.

Local Development Plan 2 will reflect the findings of Ryden's report, which will also form a Background Report as part of the Plan.



**Preferred Option and Alternative Options**

**Preferred Option:** The retail core policy applicable to Clydebank and Dumbarton town centres should be less restrictive towards uses which are considered as being suitable for a vibrant town centre, such as cafes and restaurants, dentists, offices for the visiting public. The policy (or similar) should also be in accordance with the provisions of the Pay Day Lending and Betting Shops planning guidance (2016). This is the preferred option as it will encourage a mix of suitable town centre uses whilst also allowing protection against over-provision/clustering of uses, such as pay day lending and betting shops.

**Alternative Option 1:** This alternative option proposes that the existing retail core policy, which currently requires further (criteria-led) assessment of all non-Class 1 proposals within the identified ground floor units of the retail core, is retained. This option is not preferred. It does not actively encourage support for a further mix of suitable town centre uses which could affect the attractiveness of the town centres as shopping destinations. This may be seen as a barrier to potential occupiers and make the town centres less favourable locations. This approach could also discourage the occupancy of vacant units, which is particularly an issue for Dumbarton town centre as it has the highest vacancy rate of the three town centres within West Dunbartonshire.

**Alternative Option 2:** This alternative option proposes the removal of the retail core policy and to have no policy restrictions in order to retain Class 1 uses within the town centres. This option is not preferred. Complete removal of the policy and consideration of the recent planning guidance may risk an over-provision/clustering of less favourable uses, such as betting offices and pay day loan shops, to the detriment of the town centres.

**Responses received from**

Parkhall etc Community Council  
 Silverton & Overtoun Community Council  
 Savills(Valad) Clyde Retail Park  
 Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council  
 Visitscotland  
 Vale of Leven Trust  
 SEPA  
 East Dunbartonshire Council  
 Susan Cuthbert

**Summary of responses**

There was strong general support for the preferred option. The following points were also made:

- **Silverton & Overtoun Community Council** state that there is a strong case for radically altering Dumbarton High Street; restricting vehicle

parking and encouraging 'through traffic' from a more-pedestrianised High Street to an improved riverside area, and a pedestrian bridge across the Leven. Perhaps even opening the west side of the High Street.

- **Savills(Valad) Clyde Retail Park** support a more relaxed policy to attract greater range of uses in Clydebank town centre, especially leisure. They also state that the Town Centre boundary should include Clyde Retail Park and allow the same flexibility of uses for the retail park.
- **Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council** support measures to avoid clustering of betting shops, etc. They consider the adoption of a Simplified Planning Zone in Alexandria town centre would be worthwhile as well as preparing a simplified planning zone scheme which can help with clustering but also allow some flexibility for a range of other uses.

The Main Issues Report preferred option should be extended to Alexandria Town Centre - there is a real need for investment and a focus on trying to encourage a range and choice of uses into this centre along with improving the public realm, parking, seating and connections to and from the centre.

- **VisitScotland** is of the view that streetscape experiences (food and drink, performance, public art, exhibition space, cultural activities) will save town centres, as will, the flexible use of buildings and open spaces. They are strongly of the opinion that the Main Issues Report approach should apply to Alexandria too as previous policies appear not to have had desired outcomes.
- **Vale of Leven Trust** consider the adoption of a Simplified Planning Zone in Alexandria town centre would be worthwhile as a well prepared simplified planning zone scheme can help with clustering but also allow some flexibility for a range of other uses. The Trust would like to see all different approaches extended to Alexandria Town Centre and ask why is it excluded? Alexandria and other town centres / villages should start to develop their own unique identity.
- **East Dunbartonshire Council** supports the preferred option, which is similar to the approach to town centres taken by East Dunbartonshire Council.

#### **Our response**

There is strong support for the preferred option to retain core retail areas, but to allow a greater range of uses that complement and support the retail function of town centres.

With regard to Alexandria, the existing Strategy already promotes and supports improvements to the public realm, buildings and accessibility/movement. It also supports significant flexibility to permit a wide range of retail and non-retail uses. Creating core/non-core retail areas in Alexandria would be difficult, due to its

smaller size and as there is no real identifiable 'prime' retail area, where shops dominate. It may also limit the ability to attract a suitable, diverse range of uses to the town centre, and achieve regeneration of key sites.

Similarly, it is not clear that a Simplified Planning Zone would introduce any extra flexibility over the current Strategy that would help attract additional investment or users to the town. Indeed a Simplified Planning Zone may lead to unwelcome or unsuitable uses in the town centre and would potentially entail significant resources to set up (see also response to 'Main Issue 11: Alexandria Town Centre').

It is not considered appropriate to include the Clyde Retail Park within the boundaries of Clydebank Town Centre, or to extend to it the same range of permissible uses as the Town Centre. The Retail Park provides a different, but complementary function to the Town Centre: predominantly bulky-good and food retail uses. Allowing a full range of town centre uses, including leisure, could introduce greater competition with, and divert investment away from, the existing Town Centre. The role of the Retail park and its linkages with the Town Centre will be reviewed through the approach to Stanford Street and the Forth and Clyde Canal as per Main Issue 9.

<b>Issue 17</b>	<b>Heat generation and networks</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> Using the Scottish Government’s heat mapping, the Council will investigate opportunity areas where significant developments, such as large scale housing, within such areas should create or link into heat networks. New developments within this area should consider connection to, or creation of, a new heat network. Developers must provide detailed reasoning and financial costings to support why connection to or creation of a new heat network is not viable. From this investigation, the Council will seek to introduce a policy within Local Development Plan 2 to support this and indicate what measures may be required both now and in the future if creating/linking into a heat network is not possible. Consideration will be given to providing Supplementary Guidance if necessary. This option is preferred as it is considered to help support Scottish Government and Council targets.</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> All new developments must create or link into heat networks, regardless of scale or location. This is not the preferred option. Although it would tie in with national targets, it has the possibility of restricting development where it may not be viable and may therefore impact on the delivery of development.</p>	
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Parkhall, North Kilbowie &amp; Central Community Council,  Silverton &amp; Overtoun Community Council,  Persimmon Homes,  Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council,  Homes for Scotland,  Vale of Leven Trust,  SNH,  SEPA,  Clydebelt,  East Dunbartonshire Council</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>There is general support for the preferred option; however, the following points were also raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Parkhall, North Kilbowie &amp; Central Community Council and Silverton &amp; Overtoun Community Council</b> are in support of the preferred option and support this for all housing developments where possible.</li> <li>• <b>Parkhall, North Kilbowie &amp; Central Community Council</b> also outline that there must be contingency plans in place for system failures and consideration to residents rights to choose an energy supplier.</li> <li>• <b>Silverton &amp; Overtoun Community Council</b> further urge the Council to condition into planning consents solar heating/micro energy generating/ground source heat schemes where possible into housing and</li> </ul>	

industrial developments. The Community Council would also support applications for such projects.

- **Persimmon Homes and Homes for Scotland** are of the view that district heating systems will not be suitable for all sites and in which case an energy statement outlining this is the case where a development is not close to an existing/proposed heat source or part of a large mixed use development with the potential to share/sell heat. Energy statements can address how developments will address climate change.
- **Homes for Scotland** urge caution in how district heat networks are sought and while they support reducing carbon emission reduction, it must be through a pragmatic and balanced approach. They further outline that for housing developers to deliver such infrastructure and absorb the risks is misplaced and inappropriate; new buildings should avoid specified and rising proportion of project greenhouse gas emissions from their use; improvements have already been made through Building Standards changes and new installations have the potential to be temporary, bring maintenance and user implications; a 'fabric first' approach should be taken through the Local Development Plan policy; and they would not support a detailed quantification of the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the use of the proposed development at the planning application stage.
- **Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council and the Vale of Leven Trust** agree with the preferred option but should extend this further than to just large scale housing developments and link in uses requiring energy over long/consistent periods. They do not see the need for supplementary guidance if a good policy framework is in place.
- **SEPA** support the preferred option and consider that a stronger position is taken requiring all new substantial developments to have their heat demand met through district heating. They recommend that the Local Development Plan /Supplementary Guidance ensures that such new developments incorporate space to be safeguarded for future pipework/piperuns and energy centres, and to provide a robust framework to support a sustainable approach to resource management and specific reference to SEPA's Thermal Treatment of Waste Guidelines when referring to energy from waste. They also encourage an approach in policy DS5 which will incorporate energy from waste plants.
- **SNH, Clydebelt and East Dunbartonshire Council** agree with the preferred option.
- **Clydebelt** further outline that all new buildings should have methods of eco-friendly heat production considered and also suggest the use of the river Leven to produce electricity from turbines.

**Our response**

Scottish Planning Policy does not require developers to provide an energy statement. The Council is required by the the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) to provide a policy on low and zero carbon buildings which must improve upon the carbon reduction emission standards contained within the Scottish Building Standards (2010). This requirement is contained within Appendix 1 of the Local Development Plan (Proposed Plan) (2016) and it is proposed to review the appendix, update where necessary, and to include it within Local Development Plan 2. Consideration will be given to requiring developers to provide an energy statement demonstrating they have complied with the policy on low and zero carbon buildings.

The comments from Homes for Scotland are understood; however, Scottish Planning Policy provides clear requirements in terms of what Local Development Plan 2 is required to support and provide policy on. Taking this into consideration, there needs to be flexibility on how the policy is implemented in practice and the Council will ensure that the policy, whilst conforming to Scottish Planning Policy, does not provide a significant burden to developers.

Local Development Plan 2 will therefore incorporate a new policy on heat taking into account the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy and SEPA, but ensuring that it is flexible enough not to affect development viability.

<b>Issue 18</b>	<b>Green Infrastructure: Allotments/Community Gardens</b>
<b>Preferred Option and Alternative Option</b>	
<p><b>Preferred Option:</b> The Council will seek to allocate new sites for allotments/community gardens within areas of demand in West Dunbartonshire. The sites suggested through the Call for Sites will be considered against other areas of land with potential for allotment/community garden uses. The Council will also include a new policy or requirement to ensure that new residential developments, especially Affordable Housing developments, give due consideration to including an area of an allotment/community garden for use by the residents and potentially the wider community.</p> <p><b>Alternative Option:</b> The Local Development Plan will safeguard existing allotments/community gardens within West Dunbartonshire but will not allocate new sites. This is not the preferred option as it would not comply with legislation or Scottish Planning Policy as the Council would not be fulfilling its duty to take reasonable steps to provide allotments after the trigger points in legislation have been reached.</p>	
<b>Responses received from</b>	
<p>Parkhall, North Kilbowie &amp; Central Community Council,  Silverton &amp; Overtoun Community Council,  Persimmon Homes,  Bonhill &amp; Dalmonach Community Council,  G Parton,  Susan Dick,  Swan Real Estate PLC,  Vale of Leven Trust,  SNH,  SEPA,  Clydebelt,  East Dunbartonshire Council</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>The majority of those who responded supported the preferred option to seek to allocate new sites for allotments/community gardens within areas of demand in West Dunbartonshire and to also include a new policy to ensure that new residential developments, give due consideration to including an area of an allotment/community garden.</p> <p>In addition, the following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Silverton &amp; Overtoun Community Council</b> request sites at Townend Road and Millburn Crescent are allocated. Each urban area should have its own allotment provision. The Council should support community gardens for people with physical, social, and mental disabilities or deprivation.</li> <li>• <b>Parkhall, North Kilbowie &amp; Central Community Council</b> suggest that if a new community garden is proposed those there must be a plan and funding in place for its long term maintenance with a clearly identified line</li> </ul>	

of responsibility. The Council must also take steps to ensure that allotments are not neglected or underused.

- **Persimmon Homes** argue that within new housing developments valuable development land should not be sacrificed for allotments or community gardens. Concern that such allotments can be seen as unsightly and may not be of benefit to the new homeowners. Furthermore the allocation of such areas may become contentious.
- **Bonhill & Dalmonach Community Council** suggest the contaminated land behind the new housing at Bonhill Primary School (old school Football Park) could be decontaminated and made into allotments.
- **Swan Real Estate PLC** ask that the site at the former Distillery Site, Bowling be removed from the list of sites considered for allotments. This site has a planning consent for housing which has partly been implemented therefore still live. This site is now being proposed for Affordable Housing and discussions have taken place with the Council's Planning Service. Contained in the SHIP to commence in 2018.
- **Vale of Leven Trust** state that it is unclear what demand there is in the area of Vale of Leven and a feasibility study may be appropriate to gauge this.
- **SNH** consider that the Council is best placed to offer views on the appropriateness of sites, but in general suggest that these should be located in accessible locations, close to areas of population where there is demand. The former bowling greens at Faifley Bowling Club the location and previous site use might lend itself to community growing or allotment provision.
- **Clydebelt** ask if the site of the old manse glebe at the west side of Faifley Road north of the Cochno Burn could be considered for use as an allotment. It would however need considerable tree removal, root clearance and drainage.
- **East Dunbartonshire Council** are supportive of preferred option, which reflects their own strategy.

### **Our response**

Individual sites for allotments are still to be assessed but the preferred option remains in line with Scottish Government goals and there is broad support for it in the responses.

The preferred option does not require that community gardens/allotments are created in new developments but that "due consideration" is given to these as part of the required open space provision. Removing the need for "due consideration" for allotments/community gardens to be provided in new developments could weaken the Local Development Plan strategy for open space/greenspace



enhancement.

It is considered Local Development Plan 2 will move ahead with the preferred option.

<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>Developer Contributions</b>
<b>Responses received</b>	
NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde; Network Rail	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p><b>NHS GGC</b> note that there is no information in relation to developer contributions or infrastructure provision as a result of the sites allocated within the proposed development plan.</p> <p>Healthcare bodies need to be involved within the Local Development Plan process to establish the health service needs arising from new site allocations and healthcare issues, At present these are not addressed when detailed planning applications are submitted for major housing developments. The effect of this is that housing developments are not aligned with the NHS investment strategy and that developers are not required to provide contributions towards the development of new local healthcare facilities or to supplement and enhance existing facilities.</p> <p>They are aware of other Health Boards in Scotland who are part of the development plan and development management process and have agreements to receive developer contributions as a result of residential development and are seeking a similar agreement to be part of any developer contribution policy with West Dunbartonshire Council.</p> <p><b>Network Rail:</b> The Main Issues Report through the guidance issued through Clydeplan and in particular the emerging strategies set out in SESplan (which are extremely helpful and provide a new context Clydeplan could follow) set out clear strategic context for seeking developer contributions for required infrastructure enhancements or station improvements as a direct consequence of new development growth. This requirement for and pooling of contributions should be adopted and the lead of East Lothian Council in producing the Proposed Local Development Plan 2016 and Draft Developer Contributions Framework Supplementary Guidance, which sets out a range of pooled contributions which includes a levy on development to fund rail improvements at different rates on development close to the rail network. By considering and introducing the same approach as part of the West Dunbartonshire MIR and LDP it would allow for development which relies on sustainable rail transport to contribution to the funding to improve both services and capacity.</p> <p>The Main Issues Report and Local Development Plan should recognise that by directing growth towards public transport corridors, without the provision of additional capacity or where required, improved facilities, the network will become constrained and will not be able to provide increased service. Accordingly, Network Rail requests that the Main Issues Report is refined to ensure inclusion of the requirement that development must be accountable for resultant requirements to railway infrastructure and facilities. In addition, the Main Issues</p>	

Report should look to follow the Developer Contribution pooling approach, being advocated and endorsed through both Strategic Development Plans and Local Development Plans.

Given the proposed growth strategy of the Main Issues Report is very closely related to the existing rail network with future development linked to in particular to the stations, there will be an increase in demand for rail service. This increased provision may result in the requirement for upgraded rail infrastructure or to upgrade facilities at stations. This may require platform lengthening at some stations.

They state that they should be clearly excluded from having to make developer contributions as a publically owned company.

### **Our response**

The only developer contributions that the Council require are in relations to green infrastructure and parking related issues i.e. where suitable car parking cannot be provided on site a contribution to off-site provisions is required to be made.

No detail has been provided on what the NHS is precisely seeking developer contributions for and further discussions with the NHS and Network Rail on developer contributions will be required in this regard before the Council is in a position to form a final view on the necessity for developer contributions.

It must be reminded that LDP 2 must conform to Clydeplan and not any other strategy set out in the Plans that Network Rail suggest. The Council already in certain circumstances requires developers to provide contributions to public transport provision within the site and this is clearly evidenced in the Proposed Plan (2016) and this approach will be continued within LDP 2 where required

The proposed plan will contain a policy on developer contributions towards green infrastructure and this may, dependent on the impact on viability of development sites, be required to be extended, dependent on the discussions with the NHS and Network Rail. However, any contributions that these organisations are seeking will require to conform to the tests set out in Circular 3/2012

However, the Council is not in favour of developer contributions where there is a likelihood that these would prove to be unsurmountable obstacle to development within West Dunbartonshire, especially on our regeneration sites. Therefore, a balance may need to be struck in terms of the impact on health care; rail provision and the need for development.

<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>
<b>Responses received</b>	
<p>Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council, Network Rail, Anonymous (Your Place Your Plan event); Martin Aird (Your Place Your Plan event); Anonymous (Your Place Your Plan event); Gillian Clark(Your Place Your Plan event) ; Gordon Milloy (Your Place Your Plan event)</p>	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p><b>Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central CC</b> state that the main failing of Local Development Plan 2 and the resultant Main Issues Report is the lack of coherent proposals to ease the acute road transport problems that afflict West Dunbartonshire. It is widely acknowledged that traffic congestion has a high economic cost and is bad for the environment and so, for example, it is surprising that Local Development Plan 2 omits the references to improving traffic flow at Kilbowie Roundabout that were contained in Local Development Plan: proposed Plan (2016) especially when the problems at the roundabout are becoming ever more acute.</p> <p>In our opinion the following should be considered to improve traffic flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement well thought out plans for the A82 relief road without delay.</li> <li>• Improve the roundabout at Barloan and especially the disastrous one at Lomondgate.</li> <li>• In the short term install new traffic light equipment at Kilbowie Roundabout to replace the obsolete apparatus that is no longer fit for purpose.</li> <li>• Until a final solution can be developed for Kilbowie Roundabout four slip roads should be constructed to ease congestion.</li> <li>• The A82 from Dalnottar Interchange to the Glasgow boundary should be returned to trunk road status to enable Transport Scotland to maintain it properly.</li> <li>• The bus lane on the north section of Kilbowie Road should be removed.</li> <li>• Parking on Kilbowie Road between the roundabout and Hawthorn Street should be prohibited at peak periods.</li> <li>• The Connecting Clydebank proposals are misconceived. The A814 is a busy main road and sensible and practical plan for improving traffic flow should have been a part of the Local Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Network Rail</b> broadly supports the Main Issues Report on the need for investment in infrastructure to support the City Deal. Their comments endeavour to reinforce the policy framework set out in the Clydeplan and to ensure that it accommodates reasonable foreseeable future demands on both existing and future railway infrastructure in the City Region.</p> <p>They seek continued support for safeguarding and improving the safety and capacity of the existing and future railway network in tandem with new development, and that where improvements are required, to mitigate the</p>	

infrastructure and capacity issues required.

### Level Crossings

The Proposed Plan should provide strategic guidance for Local Development Plan spatial strategies to avoid allocating development required to use level crossings. Local Development Plan site assessments must take cognisance of the impact of development proposals affecting level crossings. Transport assessment and developer contributions policy and supplementary guidance must ensure infrastructure risks are identified and mitigation secured i.e. level crossing upgrades; alternative crossings etc.

### Notification Zones

We would request that the Main Issues Report provides a strategic context for Local Development Plan's to provide a designated notification zone around all operational railway infrastructure within which any development application proposals would be notified to Network Rail.

This strategy would be similar to that associated with the oil and gas pipelines which run through the SDP area.

**Anonymous (Your Place Your Plan event):** Kilbowie Roundabout should be a main issue - bad congestion and traffic lights are not doing a good job. Show it in the Local Development Plan!

**Martin Aird (Your Place Your Plan event):** Insufficient parking -especially in Drumry, Singer Avenue. Lack of bus service to new leisure centre.

**Anonymous (Your Place Your Plan event):** Congestion on A82 will get worse as more development proposed for Balloch. Single track railwayline to Balloch is an issue.

**Gillian Clark (Your Place Your Plan event):** If building new housing are the road networks going to be improved? Empty shops-can rents be reduced to encourage retailers to move in? Employ more traffic wardens, would pay for themselves. Parking on pavements is a problem - people with prams have to walk onto the road.

**Gordon Milloy (Your Place Your Plan event):** Currently there is increased traffic from traffic lights on Glasgow Road to HBR facility on Castlegreen St. With completion of housing currently underway on Castle Street it appears highly likely householders will use this route up to Glasgow Road. Roadside parking on Castlegreen St already restricts traffic flow. With increased vehicle movement I have concern for regular tailbacks and reduced air quality.

### **Our response**

The comments of Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council are understood. However, some of these cannot be addressed within Local Development Plan 2 but will be taken forward with the Council's Road Service. The strategy for the Kilbowie Roundabout, as detailed in the Proposed Plan (2016) will be taken forward into Local Development Plan 2.

Any new development which is likely to have an adverse impact in the Trunk and/or Local Road Network will be required to provide mitigation and enhancement measures to alleviate these impacts.

In response to Network Rail, the Council will ensure that Local Development Plan 2 provides continued support safeguarding and improving the safety and capacity of the existing and future railway network within the Plan. However, there are no operational road level crossings within West Dunbartonshire and the need for a policy on level crossings is not required.

The Council will give further consideration to Network Rail's request to provide a notification zone around their rail infrastructure.

In relation to the anonymous comments made during the Main Issues Report consultation events, the strategy for the Kilbowie Roundabout and comments on the impact of development proposals have been addressed above. In terms of the railway line to Balloch, this is an issue for Network Rail.

In relation to the comments regarding parking provision made by Martin Aird, Gillian Clark and Gordon Milloy, these will be forwarded to the Council's Road's Service to take forward. Local Development Plan 2 will provide, however, clear guidance on parking within new developments etc within its design guidance. In terms of the public bus provision to the Leisure Centre, the Council are aware of this issue and are investigating it further with public transport operators. However, this is not an issue that Local Development Plan 2 can address.

The proposed plan for Local Development Plan 2 will therefore take forward the Strategy for the Kilbowie Roundabout and introduce policies to deal with transport appraisals and significant travel generating uses to ensure that new development does not have an adverse impact on the road network within West Dunbartonshire.

The Proposed Plan will also include text to support safeguarding of the rail network and its capacity within Local Development Plan 2. However, there may be practical difficulties especially on the proposals maps, in terms of providing a notification zone for Network Rails infrastructure which could make the proposals map overly complicated and difficult to comprehend.

<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>Outdoor Advertising</b>
<b>Responses received</b>	
Communications, Culture & Communities, West Dunbartonshire Council	
<b>Summary of responses</b>	
<p>The revised Local Development Plan should create a more supportive environment for outdoor advertising in West Dunbartonshire. The Council faces considerable financial challenges in the coming year and needs to identify any means possible of raising income in order to protect key frontline services. One new income stream that could be easily sourced is from controlled-approach to outdoor advertising.</p> <p>One example of this would be discreet advertising signs on roundabouts in the local area. Another example would be to explore options for larger roadside billboard advertising sites which could be leased to third-parties. There is a fantastic opportunity for such a billboard at the scrubland beside Milton's BP garage and there was interest from a private company to pay around £10,000 per year. Precedent exists at the A82 billboard site near the West Park Hotel and there are countless examples elsewhere in Scotland. There could be further opportunities at other key points along the A82 and in central Clydebank.</p> <p>In summary, there is an opportunity for the Council to bring in income to support frontline services and with minimal impact on the local area. If the Local Development Plan was more open to such proposals then they could be taken forward in a sensitive manner.</p>	
<b>Our response</b>	
<p>The Proposed Plan (2016) contained a policy on Advertisements and this will be taken forward into Local Development Plan 2. At present, the proposals suggested by the respondent could potentially have health and safety implications of road users and could also set a precedent for other forms of advertising which are not connected to a business or needed for directional or tourism related uses; therefore, resulting in potentially detrimental impacts to the character and amenity of the areas in which they are located and also, as detailed above, have road safety issues.</p> <p>The advertisement policy within the Proposed Plan (2016) will be taken forward within its current format and will not be extended to accommodate the respondents' suggestions.</p>	

**Chapter 5****Review of Development sites/Call for sites/New sites****Responses received from**

SEPA, Jessie Turner/Hugh Kinloch, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Harry Borthwick, John Mullen, Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council, Silverton and Overtoun Community Council, Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council, Vale of Leven Trust, SNH, HSE, Scottish Water, Mr P Docherty, Karen King, Knowes HA, Claire Marshall of Faifley Community Council, Stuart MacDonald, Caroline MacDonald, Cameron Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey, Susan Dick, Robbie McEwan, Graham Dick, Lesley McEwan, G Parton, Homes for Scotland, Swan Real Estate, Clydebelt, sportscotland, Savills on behalf of Logan Factoring and Management, Houghton Planning on behalf of Church of Scotland Trustees, Vale of Leven Trust, Transport Scotland, La Salle Investment Management.

**Summary of responses**

- **Parkhall, North Kilbowie and Central Community Council** agree with the Council's approach within Chapter 5.
- **Mr P Docherty** in relation to **Sandpoint Marina** wishes the condition relating to donation to bridge over Leven to be deleted from LDP2. **SEPA** require further information re land raising on the site and the layout of the development required.
- **SEPA** object to residential use on **Castlegreen Street** (Former Leven Shipyard)
- **SEPA**, in relation to **Queens Quay**, acknowledge the principle of development has been established, but may require an updated Flood Risk Assessment to be provided to inform the detailed layout of the site. **Harry Borthwick** support the site for brownfield redevelopment in Clydebank
- **Karen King, Knowes Housing Association, Faifley Community Council, Stuart MacDonald, Caroline MacDonald, Scottish Water, SEPA, sportscotland**, in relation to **Faifley Bowling Club**, offer general support for the allocation of this site for affordable housing. A Flood risk assessment will be required. **Scottish Water** state that they have infrastructure within the site. There also may be the need to consider replacement outdoor sports facilities. **SNH and Clydebelt** support for the use of the site for community uses
- **Taylor Wimpey** wish **Duntiglenan Fields** to be allocated as to meet a perceived shortfall in the housing land supply. **Harry Borthwick and John Mullen** welcome its deletion as a residential opportunity site.
- **NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde** wish **Dumbarton Cottage Hospital** to be retained as an affordable housing opportunity.
- **Jessie Turner/Hugh Kinloch** in relation to **Levenbank Terrace and site**



**BC2(7)** state that access to site BC2(7) must be retained. They also seek the allocation of part of the industrial land to south for additional housing as it would provide a better developable area. They are of the view that there is no current justification for allocating so much land for any expansion of the timber yard

- **Susan Dick, Robbie McEwan, Graham Dick, Lesley McEwan, G Parton, SNH, SEPA, Scottish Water** raise the following points in relation to **Beardmore Place**. There is concern re over-development in Dalmuir and loss of open spaces and land for wildlife. The site is affected by HSE notification zone, Scottish Water infrastructure is present on site, a flood risk assessment required. The scale and design of development should be appropriate to the area and any development should provide natural surveillance to open space and this should be enhanced
- **Homes for Scotland, SNH, Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council and the Vale of Leven Trust** generally object to allocation of **Bonhill Quarry** for development because of impact on biodiversity, flooding etc. It is pointed out that 65% of the site is covered by native woodland and there is a presumption against its removal and it is likely to provide habitats for protected species.
- **Homes for Scotland** is of the view that **Carless, North Douglas Street and Dalquhurn** should be deleted as a residential development opportunities
- **Swan Real Estate** indicate that there is interest in **Littlemill Distillery** for social rented housing. **Silverton and Overtoun Community Council** support the sites allocation for an allotment.
- **Clydebelt** is of the view that **Ashtree Court** should be retained as a Care Home.
- **Parkhall, North Kilbowie, Central Community Council and Logan Factoring and Management** support limited development on **Strauss Avenue**. **Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council** object to its allocation for residential uses. **SNH** is of the view that landscape capacity needs to be considered, as well as, potential water retention to alleviate flooding. Scottish Water highlight their infrastructure and a surface water culvert is within the site
- **The Church of Scotland** seek the allocation of the **Old Kilpatrick Glebe** for limited residential development
- **Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council** and the **Vale of Leven Trust** object to the allocation of **Dumbain Crescent** as it is currently within greenbelt. **SNH** advise of the need to consider local landscape impact and **SEPA** request that flood risk assessment of Carrochan Burn is undertaken. **Scottish Water** request the protection of the water main within site

- **Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council and the Vale of Leven Trust object to the Former Carman Waterworks** as it is in the greenbelt. **SEPA** require a Flood Risk Assessment and **SNH** require that the site is appropriately sites not to have an adverse impact on the landscape and that the boundary stone wall is retained. **Scottish Water** advise that there is water infrastructure within the site.
- **Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council and the Vale of Leven Trust object** to the allocation of **Overtoun Road** in relation to amenity etc. Flood risk assessment is required by **SEPA**.
- **Dumbuckhill – Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council, Clydebelt** object to the allocation of the site as it is in greenbelt and would lead to significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, of which **SNH** agree with. **Transport Scotland** advise that access onto A82(T) would be resisted, and the **Health and Safety Executive** advise the site could be affected by HSE consultation zone.
- **Young’s Farm – Silverton and Overtoun Community Council, Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council, Vale of Leven Trust, and Clydebelt** object to the allocation of the site as it is in greenbelt
- **Dumbarton Football Club Stadium** – concerns linked to objection to Young’s Farm, could require compensation for loss of outdoor sports facilities, may need relocation of existing Scottish Water infrastructure (Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council, SportScotland, Scottish Water, Vale Of Leven Trust)
- **Clydebank Health Centre** – **SNH** advise of the need to retrain mature trees and active travel connection along West Thompson Street. **Scottish Water** advise that the relocation of their existing infrastructure may be required.
- **Haldane PS** – additional flood risk assessment required (SEPA)
- **Highdykes PS** – additional flood risk assessment required (SEPA)
- **Talisman Avenue Dumbarton** – additional flood risk required (SEPA)
- **Townend Road – Silverton and Overtoun Community Council, Bonhill and Dalmonach Community Council** support for the allocation of the site for allotments. **SportScotland** advise that compensation for loss of outdoor sports facilities could be required.
- **Braidfield and St Andrews Schools - SportScotland** advise that compensation for loss of outdoor sports facilities could be required.
- **Millburn Crescent, Dumbarton** – identify as a potential allotment/community garden site (Silverton and Overtoun CC)

- **Willox Park Care Home – Silverton and Overtoun Community Council** suggest identifying site of former Care Home for open space.
- **Lasalle Investment Management** in relation to **Castle Street West/East** do not support the proposed change from residential and mixed uses to residential and retail.

### **POST-MIR NEW SITES**

- **Former RHI Site, Clydebank** – site is now disused and has been marketed for potential residential use.
- **Former Council Office, Church Street, Alexandria** – site is now vacated and Council Estates Team are keen to dispose.

### **Our response**

**Sandpoint Marina** – SEPA’s latest advice will be sought when development proposals are discussed. It is intended to remove the requirement for developer contributions to the footbridge linking the town centre to Levensgrove Park and, in conjunction with comments received by SPT and Roads, to instead require the developer to improve bus infrastructure on Bridge Street and connections to it instead, as there is no firm commitment to provide the Bridge, due to the likely prohibitive costs the project.

**Castlegreen Street** – The undeveloped part of the site will be retained as a residential opportunity.

**Queens Quay** – SEPA’s requirements for additional Flood Risk Assessment will be included in Local Development Plan.

**Faifley Bowling Club** – in the current Local Development Plan this site is allocated as open space, and this was the original reason for the objection to its release for housing. Redevelopment for affordable housing is being pursued by Knowes Housing Assessment, and it is included in the West Dunbartonshire Council Strategic Housing Investment Plan. This proposal has the support of the local Community Councils and members of the community. Flood risk will have to be assessed by developer and congestion addressed.

**Duntiglennan** – there is no requirement to release any significant greenfield sites to achieve a generous housing land supply. This site was rejected during the previous Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) and at the planning application stage by Council in 2017. Therefore, this site will not be allocated in the Proposed Plan.

**Dumbarton Cottage Hospital** – agreed to be allocated for residential.

**Levenbank Terrace and site BC2(7)** - Access will be retained to site BC2(7). The review of business and industry sites recommended retaining the remaining

industrial land at Jamestown; therefore, this part will not be allocated for housing.

**Beardmore Place** – the HSE zone, flood risk areas and sewers/water main stand-off zones mean that very little of the site can be developed. As such it is very unlikely to be viable for a private developer or Register Social Landlord and therefore it is not considered to be an effective site and therefore will not be allocated for housing.

**Bonhill Quarry** – this site has been brought to us as a response to the Call for Sites exercise. It has previously been identified as a housing opportunity site since 2004 with a lapsed planning consent. No information from the developers re deliverability has been provided. Its redevelopment is not supported by some community groups. As the site's deliverability is questionable and given the issues of potential site contamination and its status as a Local Nature Conservation site, it is not preferred for allocation.

**Carless** – reflect latest proposals – the residential element is likely to be retained but the capacity significantly reduced, but this will be dependent on the layout and design of the site. Also see Issue 11.

**North Douglas Street** – this is a small vacant site in the urban area.

**Dalquhurn** – this is part of a major regeneration site, and features in the SHIP.

**Littlemill Distillery** – need to check demand for allotments in Bowling, and if there are any other possible sites.

**Ashtree Court** – to be marketed for residential use, which would include residential care home.

**Strauss Avenue** – a design framework will be drawn up to indicate how this site could accommodate residential development as well as improved greenspace, flood alleviation, gateway design and animation of the canal.

**Old Kilpatrick Glebe** – the Church of Scotland are intending to market this site within the next two years for a limited housing development. It is zoned as existing residential in the adopted Local Plan. This changed to open space in the Local Development Plan: Proposed Plan (2016) because the site was considered non-effective due to ownership. It is currently used as horse grazing and not as public open space. Limited development could improve accessibility to the area and enhance the quality of the greenspace.

**Dumbain Crescent** – site is within the greenbelt and may have potentially negative landscape impacts.

**Carman Waterworks** – limited development here would bring a derelict site back into use and improve road safety. Flood risk to be assessed by developer.

**Overtoun Road** – this is not a preferred residential site.

**Dumbuckhill** – this is not a preferred site. There is no requirement to release any significant greenfield sites to achieve a generous housing land supply.

**Youngs Farm** – this is not a preferred site – see Issue 6.

**DFC Stadium** – this site will not be completely redeveloped until a replacement stadium has been built. Not clear when this would happen due to refusal of Young's Farm planning application.

**Clydebank Health Centre** – comments noted.

**Haldane PS** – comments noted

**Highdykes PS** – comments noted.

**Talisman Avenue Dumbarton** – comments noted.

**Townend Road** – Council is continuing to explore for allotment use, but no firm commitment yet

**Braidfield and St Andrews Schools** – comments noted

**Millburn Crescent, Dumbarton** – consider potential for allotments.

**Wilcox Park Care Home** – consider all potential uses of former care home.

**Castle Street West/East** –reflects current developer interest.

**Former RHI Site, Clydebank** – residential use would allow for environmental improvement of site and would align with wider residential-led redevelopment of Stanford Street canalside area.

**Former Council Office, Church Street, Alexandria** – offers a small scale residential opportunity to improve the site within an existing residential area.

#### **Impact on LDP2**

**Sandpoint Marina** – incorporate SPT and Roads requirements in relation to public transport provision into the Plan and continue to allocate site for residential.

**Castlegreen Street** – retain undeveloped part of the site for residential use.

**Queen's Quay** – note need for FRA.

**Faifley Bowling Club** – support a limited social rented housing release, with appropriate parking provision and greenspace accommodating community use if possible.

**Duntiglenan** – no change - retain the site in the Greenbelt.

**Dumbarton Cottage Hospital** – no change - retain as an affordable housing

opportunity.

**Levenbank Terrace and site BC2(7)** – retain sites as residential opportunities, but adjoining business/ industrial land to remain as industrial.

**Beardmore Place** – remove as a residential opportunity.

**Bonhill Quarry** – delete as a residential opportunity site due to concerns about deliverability of the site and ground conditions/ stability issues on the site.

**Carless** – Local Development Plan 2 will reflect the latest proposals; the residential element is likely to be retained but the capacity significantly reduced – see Issue 11.

**North Douglas Street** – no change - retain as a redevelopment opportunity.

**Dalquhurn** – no change - retain, as residential development opportunity, reflecting SHIP proposals.

**Littlemill Distillery** – retain as a social rented site and look for alternative allotments site if there is demand in Bowling.

**Ashtree Court** – no change – retain as residential opportunity.

**Strauss Avenue** – a design framework will be drawn up to indicate how this site could accommodate limited residential development, as well as, improved greenspace, flood alleviation, gateway design and animation of the canal, taking into consideration the constraints of the site.

**Old Kilpatrick Glebe** – change from open space to residential development opportunity.

**Dumbain Crescent** – remove as a residential opportunity – leave as greenbelt.

**Carman Waterworks** – no change - retain as a small greenfield release which would redevelop a derelict site and improve road safety

**Overtoun Road** – not a preferred housing site

**Dumbuckhill** – no change – retain as greenbelt.

**Youngs Farm** - not a preferred residential site – see Issue 6.

**DFC stadium** - remove as a residential opportunity as redevelopment is no longer realistic within the Plan period.

**Clydebank Health Centre** – no change.

**Haldane PS** – no change.

**Highdykes PS** – no change

**Talisman Avenue Dumbarton** – no change

**Townend Road** – remove any designation - future allotment use is likely but not yet confirmed.

**Braidfield and St Andrews Schools** –no change

**Millburn Crescent, Dumbarton** – No change - a future potential allotment/community garden site.

**Willox Park Care Home** – no change.

**Castle Street West/East** – no change

**Former RHI Site, Clydebank** – change to a residential allocation site.

**Former Council Office, Church Street, Alexandria** - change to a residential allocation site.