

**FALKIRK COUNCIL**

**Subject: FALKIRK LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN –  
SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDANCE  
FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION**  
**Meeting: EXECUTIVE**  
**Date: 17 MARCH 2015**  
**Author: DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Members will recall that a report outlining the process for preparing Supplementary Guidance (SG) in Falkirk was presented to the Executive on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2014. The Executive authorised officers to prepare and undertake consultation on the sixteen SG notes referred to in the Proposed Falkirk Local Development Plan (LDP). It was agreed that the outcome of these consultations and the proposed content of the finalised SGs would be reported back to the Executive on an ongoing basis.

1.2 As previously noted consultation on the majority of the SGs is being undertaken in several batches throughout 2014/15 as and when they are produced or revised. Two batches of SGs have already gone through their statutory consultation process, with the results of consultation and recommendations reported to the Executive on 27<sup>th</sup> May and 19<sup>th</sup> August 2014.

1.3 The third batch of SGs has now gone through its statutory consultation process. The following three SGs were included in the third batch:

SG02 Neighbourhood Design Guide  
SG03 Residential Extensions and Alterations  
SG14 Spatial Framework and Guidance for Wind Energy Development

1.4 This report sets out the results of the consultation and recommends a number of amendments to draft SG02 and SG14. Once the SGs are finalised they will be submitted to the Scottish Ministers along with the LDP and, subject to the views of Scottish Ministers, will be adopted with the Plan.

**2.0 SUMMARY OF SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDANCE**

2.1 For background information purposes this section of the Committee Report includes a summary of the three SGs contained in the third consultation batch.

**SG02 Neighbourhood Design Guide**

2.2 SG02 is an updated version of the previous SPG Housing Layout and Design (February 2007). It provides design guidance for housing layout and design which reflects the Scottish Government's policy on 'Designing Streets'. The intention is not to replicate national policy but to show how it can be applied in the Falkirk area.

### **SG03 Residential Extensions and Alterations**

- 2.3 SG03 is an updated version of the previous SPG House Extensions and Alterations (May 2006). It provides guidance to anyone wishing to make a planning application in the Falkirk Council area for an extension or alteration to a residential building. The guidance sets out the general principles which are considered important to achieving good design and offers more detailed guidance on the most common forms of development.

### **SG14 Spatial Framework and Guidance for Wind Energy Development**

- 2.4 SG14 is an updated version of the previous SPG Spatial Framework and Guidance for Wind Energy Development (March 2013). The guidance provides a spatial framework by setting out areas where wind farms will not be acceptable, areas of significant protection where wind farms may be appropriate in some circumstances and areas with potential for wind farm development. It also provides guidance against which planning applications for wind turbine development can be assessed.

## **3.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS**

- 3.1 Over 500 key agencies, organisations and individuals were notified by letter or email of the commencement of the consultation process and the availability of the three Consultative Draft SGs on the Council website. All Community Councils were included in this mailing. Copies of the three SGs were also deposited at Council Offices (Abbotsford House and the Municipal Buildings), all Council Libraries and One Stop Shops.

- 3.2 Consultation took place over a 7 week period between 28<sup>th</sup> November 2014 and 16<sup>th</sup> January 2015.

- 3.3 Responses were received from the following 9 organisations:

The Coal Authority (SG14)  
Transport Scotland (SG02 and SG14)  
Historic Scotland (SG14)  
Scottish Natural Heritage (SG14)  
Forestry Commission (SG14)  
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SG14)  
Scottish Water (SG03 and SG14)  
Scottish Government (SG02 and SG14)  
Architecture & Design Scotland (SG02)

- 3.4 Detailed summaries of the comments received and the Council's draft responses are contained in Appendix 1. The issues raised by these organisations and the Council's responses are summarised under the relevant SG headings. No comments were received on SG03.

## **4.0 PROPOSED CHANGES TO DRAFT SGs**

- 4.1 In the light of the responses to the consultation a number of minor changes are proposed to SG02 and SG14 in order to provide clarification/additional

information or remove errors. The revised wordings are set out in Appendix 1. No changes are proposed to SG03. Subject to the insertion of the proposed changes into the finalised versions of SG02 and SG14, the three SGs are recommended for approval.

## **5.0 IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Legal: The requirements and procedures for the preparation of SG are set out in Section 22 of the Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended by the Planning, etc (Scotland) Act 2006. Details are contained in the Town & Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008.
- 5.2 Financial: None
- 5.3 Personnel: None.
- 5.4 Policy: Supplementary Guidance once adopted, will constitute a part of the Statutory Development Plan for the Falkirk Council area.

## **6.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 6.1 **That the Executive approves the following Supplementary Guidance notes, including modifications in response to consultations as detailed in Appendix 1, and to submit these to Scottish Ministers for approval, along with the Falkirk Local Development Plan:**

**SG02 Neighbourhood Design Guide**  
**SG03 Residential Extensions and Alterations**  
**SG14 Spatial Framework and Guidance for Wind Energy Development;**

**and authorises the Director of Development Services to make minor adjustments to text arising from change of circumstances.**

.....  
**Director of Development Services**  
**10 February 2015**

Contact officer: Louise Blance, Planning Officer, ext 4717

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 Summary of Comments and Proposed Responses

## **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

SG02 Neighbourhood Design Guide

SG03 Residential Extensions and Alterations

SG14 Spatial Framework and Guidance for Wind Energy Development

Proposed Falkirk Local Development Plan

Any person wishing to inspect the background papers listed above should contact Louise  
Blance on 01324 504717

## APPENDIX 1

### SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND PROPOSED RESPONSES

#### SG02 Neighbourhood Design Guide

Organisation	SPG Para/ Section	Comment	Proposed Response
Scottish Government	Page 3	The guidance's scope should be widened to apply when making improvements in existing neighbourhoods too, especially as the analysis includes significant areas of older parts of towns that can be examples for any future investment in retrofit or improvement.	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> In section entitled "Where does the guidance apply", modify second sentence to read "It applies at all scales from large greenfield releases to small infill sites, as well as to public realm enhancement schemes and improvement schemes in existing neighbourhoods".
	Pages 8- 21	Could each 'place analysis' have an overall summary box of say 3 points - perhaps 2 clearly positive points and one 'constructively critical' point?	<b>Comment not accepted.</b> The format of the place analysis pages was much debated and agreed through review with external as well as internal partners at workshop sessions and was found to be appropriate.
	Pages 20 - 25	Could an example be found that describes where a network structure idea (like page 22) has successfully been followed through into a layout so good parts of streets and junction(s) can be illustrated? Pages 22-25 begin to do this. Perhaps annotating 'the Drum' plan and linking it with its case study (p20/21) could start to achieve this? We would be interested to hear developers / designers feedback on this.	<b>Comment accepted.</b> The plan of the Drum will be annotated and used to demonstrate how a network structure has successfully been followed through. However, the timescale or procedures would not permit further consultation with developers / designers.  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Amend Drum plan as described above
	Pages 8 - 21	Notes on 'Resource Efficient' could be widened to include comments on land-use /	<b>Comment not accepted.</b> The format and content, including images, of the place analysis pages was much debated and

		density and connectivity to amenities (local services such as a corner shop). Where materials are referenced please identify these more specifically perhaps with a small photo – are the materials referred to on buildings, or on street surfaces?	agreed through review with external as well as internal partners and was found to be appropriate. The definition of “resource efficient” applied in this Guidance complies with the definition as set out in Designing Streets.
	Page 4	Any ‘Regional Variations To National Roads Development Guide’ (referred to in page 4) should be fully complementary and supportive of the implementation of this guidance.	<b>Comment noted.</b> Falkirk Council’s regional variations were approved at the Executive in December 2014. The regional variations are limited; it can also be confirmed that they do not conflict with this Guidance.
Transport Scotland	Page 2	Transport Scotland worked with SCOTS in the preparation of the National Roads Development Guide and I note that the document is referred to. However, I would suggest that on page 2 of SG02 its purpose is highlighted as the enabling document for Designing Streets, and as such the two documents should be read together.	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> In section entitled “ How does it relate to Designing Streets ?”, add the following sentence to the end of the first paragraph to read : “ It should be noted that the National Roads Development Guide is the enabling document for Designing Streets; accordingly the two documents should be read together.”
A+DS	General	Whilst A+DS would not normally have capacity to review SPG’s we were wondering if you were intending any consultation workshops as a forum to present and discuss the guidance and the neighbourhood design guide in particular? We would welcome this type of involvement as a means of sharing knowledge and learning from other agencies and industry, particularly in relation to the use of the Designing Streets toolkit.	<b>Comment noted.</b> Workshops are not part of the consultation. This is partly due to time pressures imposed by Council committee cycles. However, as part of the development process for the SG, several workshops took place last year in conjunction with the Architecture and Planning Unit of the Scottish Government who assisted on story boarding the structure and layout. The workshops were attended by representatives from the Architecture and Planning Unit of the Scottish Government and various roads engineers and planners from within Falkirk Council as well as representatives from some other interested local authorities

			who are working on similar guidance.
--	--	--	--------------------------------------

### SG03 Residential Extensions and Alterations

Organisation	SPG Para/ Section	Comment	Proposed Response
Scottish Water	General	In a separately sewered system it is crucial that there are no cross-connections when plumbing in new infrastructure. Surface water should only be connected to surface water and foul to foul.	<b>Comments noted.</b> The issue is dealt with through the requirements for a drainage assessment to accompany planning applications and is considered to be outwith the scope of SG03 which primarily focuses on improving design quality and the guidance for achieving this.
	General	Any additional surface water should ideally be discharged to a soakaway on-site thereby using SUDS to avoid eroding capacity in the sewer. When this is not possible attenuation will be required.	<b>Comments noted.</b> No amendments necessary. The use of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) is supported for larger developments but single houses are usually an exception. Therefore it is not considered it should be a requirement for minor residential extensions and alterations.
	General	It is the developer's responsibility to ensure that any property extensions are not built over existing water or wastewater infrastructure. If this is identified as a possibility, Scottish Water will need to be contacted to find out whether a diversion will be required. Copies of water and wastewater network drawings can be provided free of charge to private homeowners	<b>Comments noted.</b> No amendments necessary, as this practical information should be picked up during the development management process and is considered to be outwith the scope of SG03 which primarily focuses on improving design quality and the guidance for achieving this.

### SG14 Spatial Framework and Guidance for Wind Energy Development

Organisation	SPG Para/ Section	Comment	Proposed Response
Transport Scotland	16.7	I note that for Trunk Roads you have used the Highways Agency Advice Note. We have a draft policy which is different and I would ask that the wording is changed to "at least 1.5 times the	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Replace 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point of 16.7 with: "at least 1.5 times the height of the wind turbine (from

		height of the wind turbine (from ground level to the uppermost tip of turbine blade) away from the nearest kerbline of the Trunk Road carriageway"	ground level to the uppermost tip of turbine blade) away from the nearest kerbline of the Trunk Road carriageway. If a turbine can be seen from a trunk road, this may also cause visual distraction and safety issues. Further advice should be sought from Transport Scotland.
	16.5	<p>There is a section on Visual Impact and Shadow Flicker (although in discussion with wind farm developers this has been classified as “Shadow Effect”).</p> <p>At the end of 16.5 add: “Other constraints may need to be considered where the wind turbine(s) can be seen from the trunk road. For further advice on these constraints please contact Transport Scotland”</p>	<p><b>Comment accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Modification:</b> This point is covered by the modification above</p>
	17.2	<p>After 17.2 add the following paragraph:</p> <p>“Abnormal Load Routing. Transport Scotland co-ordinates the movement of abnormal loads throughout Scotland’s trunk and non-trunk road network, ensuring that the requirements of industry are met, while minimising the risk to road safety and delays to other road users, and also safeguarding bridges from damage by overweight or over height vehicles. The primary function of Transport Scotland’s Abnormal Routing Section is to investigate on behalf of the Highways Agency, the suitability of proposed wide, high and heavy load movements within Scotland that require VR1 or Special Order authorisation under Section 44 of the Road</p>	<p><b>Comment accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Insert new para 17.3 after 17.2 with wording as requested.</p>

		Traffic Act.”	
	Appendix 6	The reference to Transportation with the Highways Agency link should be replaced by the following: Trunk Road Consultation <a href="http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/road/planning/consultation-transport-scotland">http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/road/planning/consultation-transport-scotland</a> Abnormal Load Routing <a href="http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/road/maintenance/prioritising-and-maintaining/prioritising-bridge-maintenance/Abnormal-load-routing">http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/road/maintenance/prioritising-and-maintaining/prioritising-bridge-maintenance/Abnormal-load-routing</a>	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Amend Appendix 6 accordingly to include links as per response.
Scottish Government	2.2	Scottish Government recommend removing the phrase “plan hook” and replacing it with “express reference”, which follows the wording of the regulations more accurately.	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Amend paragraph 2.2 accordingly as per SG response.
	Figure 1	Figure 1 is a welcome interpretation locally of SPP Table 1 Group 2. We would recommend that Map 1 be brought forward into part 1 of the SG for ease of reference	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Relocate Map 1 to sit alongside Para 6.
	6.9	Scottish Government consider this interprets the policy well. In addition, the division between parts 1 and 2 of the SG appears to be clear.	<b>Comment noted.</b>
	8.8	Scottish Government consider this paragraph makes appropriate reference to the status of locally designated sites.	<b>Comment noted.</b>
	9.14	It is unclear what perceived impacts on the Falkirk Wheel would be from wind energy development? It is itself a large industrial structure and there do not appear to be any clear	<b>Comment not accepted.</b> The Falkirk Wheel is an iconic structure for the area and was identified by the 2012 Landscape Capacity Study as an important tourism/recreation resource. Accordingly, the LCS identifies

		objectives set for what it is the Council are seeking to protect the Wheel from.	a viewcone highlighting the sensitivity of this viewpoint. This is shown in map 2E.
	Figure 2	Figure 2 would appear to approach analysis in the way suggested by the Scottish Government on dealing with accommodating landscape protection, accommodation or significant change.	<b>Comment noted.</b>
	10.1	This would appear to misquote SPP with green belt being afforded “significant protection”. SPP does not put it in that term so this paragraph may overplay. However, paragraph 10.2 acknowledges there may be some opportunities and the discussion is in the right part – part 2 of the SG. In addition, we do acknowledge the greenbelt protection reference in Policy RW01.	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Amend Para 10.1 to read “SPP suggests that green belts are areas requiring additional protection in terms of safeguarding their landscape and recreational function.”
	Section 11	Section 11 will benefit from the SNH consultation on peat. The consultation is now live and can be accessed from <a href="http://www.snh.gov.uk/consultations/our-consultations/">http://www.snh.gov.uk/consultations/our-consultations/</a> Dataset is also live on <a href="http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/natural-spaces/index.jsp">http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/natural-spaces/index.jsp</a> labelled “Soil and peatland data (consultation draft dataset)”.	<b>Comment noted.</b> SNH have advised that consultative draft data is largely based in existing dataset. Therefore, we should retain the existing dataset used within the Spatial Framework.
	11.9	Reference could be made to the carbon calculator within para 11.9. Details at: <a href="http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Business-Industry/Energy/Energy-sources/19185/17852-1/CSavings">http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Business-Industry/Energy/Energy-sources/19185/17852-1/CSavings</a>	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Include reference to carbon calculator. Include link in Appendix 6
	18.1	Scottish Government are content with the reference to decommissioning bonds, however, future developments in relation to this issue	<b>Comment partially accepted.</b> The appropriateness of decommissioning bonds will be considered in relation to individual planning applications.

		should be monitored. There may be relevance here in identifying repowering potential with operational wind farms.	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Insert additional paragraph after 18.1 to read: “There may be potential for the repowering of existing wind energy schemes once their operational life has concluded. These proposals will be assessed on a case-by-case basis against development plan policy at the time of submission.”
	Map 1 – Spatial Framework	There appears to be an inconsistency with map 2A along the Skinflats/Grangemouth section of the Forth Coastline. Group 3 areas are identified on Map 1, however these areas are deemed as Ramsar sites, SSSIs and Special Protection Areas on Map 2A?	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Correct Map 1 to reflect the correct boundary of the SPA/SSSI.
	Whole document	Overall we found the diagrams helpful, however, consideration could be given to having each diagram represented within the relevant sections of the SG rather than all at the end of the document.	<b>Comment partially accepted.</b> Map 1 to be relocated within Part 1. Part 2 Maps should remain together at end of document.
	Map 2E	We welcome the use of view cones and, for example, views into Falkirk district from points outside e.g. Cairnpapple and TacMaDoon, as long as they are just a test in part 2, not a barrier to all development. This applies equally to Map 2F.	<b>Comment noted.</b> The location within a viewcone does not automatically exclude development. It is intended to highlight potential visual sensitivity.
	Map 2H	Scottish Government would highlight that this may need revised once the SNH consultation on peat is concluded.	<b>Comments noted.</b> SNH have advised that consultative draft data is largely based in existing dataset. Therefore, we should retain the existing dataset used within the Spatial Framework.
	Appendix 6	Please note reference to Scottish <u>Environmental Protection Agency</u> . In addition please note recent SNH guidance on guyed met-masts <a href="http://www.snh.gov.uk/docs/A1240025.pdf">http://www.snh.gov.uk/docs/A1240025.pdf</a> .	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed Modification:</b> Correct text to Scottish Environment Protection Agency.
		.	

Scottish Water	12.11	<p>In relation to the section on Drinking Water Catchments and Private Supplies, we request that the following amended text is considered for inclusion:-</p> <p>“Scottish Water owned reservoirs and catchments within Falkirk Council are identified in Map 2C. Impacts and specific requirements should be identified on a site-by-site basis by consulting Scottish Water. This would be a likely component of any Environmental Statement for EIA applications. Drinking water catchments are not considered to be a significant spatial constraint.”</p>	<p><b>Comment accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Modification:</b> Amend text and Map 2C as requested.</p>
SEPA	11.10 and Appendix 6.	<p>We welcome the reference to the <a href="#">Guidance on the Assessment of Peat Volumes, Reuse of Excavated Peat and Minimisation of Waste</a> and to the <a href="#">Regulatory Position Statement – Developments on Peat</a> in paragraph 11.10.</p> <p>Please also find additional guidance in version 2 of SNH <a href="#">Good practice during windfarm construction</a> (2013) and the SNH/Forestry Commission Scotland guidance document on <a href="#">Floating roads on peat</a>.</p>	<p><b>Comment Accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Modification:</b> Update Appendix 6 accordingly.</p>
		<p>We welcome the map 2H which shows the broad locations of carbon-rich soils (as mentioned in par 11.2) and we agree that assessment must be undertaken on a case- to-</p>	<p><b>Comment noted.</b></p>

		case basis. In some cases it may be necessary to submit a Peat Management Plan.	
	11.10	As mentioned above, we welcome the reference in section 11.10 to the guidance available for dealing with re-use and waste of peat. We would however welcome more specific reference to the issues to be considered directly in the text of the SG. We therefore repeat the comments from the 2012 response in relation to this issue.	<p><b>Comment partially accepted.</b> There is no need to replicate large parts of existing guidance within the SG.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification:</b> Insert new para before 11.10; “SEPA consider the generation of waste material (particularly peat) from wind energy developments to have the potential to cause significant environmental effects. This should be specifically addressed in the Site Waste Management Plan and the Construction Method Statement.”</p>
	Section 12	SEPA note that reference is made to water quality rather than to the quality of the water environment. We would welcome reference to be made to the ecological status of the water environment. The term ecological status includes water quality, water quantity, ecology and physical impacts (including culverting and engineering of watercourses) and the water environment includes all surface waters (including wetlands and transitional waters) and groundwater (including drinking water supplies). Wind energy development can have a detrimental effect on the water environment and, although this is covered by the policies mentioned above, the more information is made available as part of the SG, the better, especially because the SEA topic of water was scoped out of the ER. In general we would welcome more information on this section 12 of the SG on the water environment to help supporting the	<p><b>Comment partially accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Replace 12.1 with the following;</p> <p>“Wind energy can have a significant impact on water quality and the ecological status of the water environment, particularly during the construction phase. Impacts on can include wetland degradation and habitat loss or disturbance, and pollution of water courses. There can be impacts on the quality and ecological status of groundwater, including drinking water and a potential increase in flood risk, including through loss of wetland/bogs.</p> <p>Replace 12.2 and 12.3 with the following;</p> <p>“<u>Wetlands</u> Wetlands can be internationally and nationally important because of their ecological value and their key role in the water environment. Key functions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing risk of flooding by attenuation</li> </ul>

		<p>developers with their application.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protecting surface and ground water from diffuse pollution</li> <li>• Reducing climate change by storing carbon in organic soils</li> <li>• Supporting a range of wetland dependent habitats.</li> </ul> <p><u>Water courses, surface water and groundwater</u>  Falkirk Council, as well as SEPA, have a duty to ensure that wind energy proposals and their associated development do not have an adverse impact on the ecological status and quality of watercourses, surface water and groundwater, including drinking water resources. Wind energy development can result in unacceptable impacts. Examples of impacts could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct construction impacts (including pollution) through engineering works</li> <li>• Culverting of water courses</li> <li>• Hydrological/drainage impacts”</li> </ul>
	Maps	<p>SEPA request the inclusion of a map showing the location of water bodies and their ecological status (see <a href="#">River Basin Management Plan – RBMP</a>) in order to ensure that the SG provides comprehensive information on the protection of the water environment. Map 2G considers flooding but not other water related issues. Please note SEPA holds information in the <a href="#">RBMP interactive maps</a> and in the <a href="#">waterbody data sheets</a>.</p>	<p><b>Comment partially accepted.</b> The relevance of this information is accepted. However, it is considered that the provision of a link to the information on SEPA’s web site is the best approach, especially as the status of water bodies may change.</p> <p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Provide link to RBMP maps and data sheets in Appendix 6.</p>
	Section 20	<p>SEPA would also welcome the consideration of water-related issues in the section ‘Overview of</p>	<p><b>Comment not accepted.</b> The water environment is a complex constraint which would be difficult to summarise within this section. It would be more appropriate to assess</p>

		key areas of constraint' of the SG.	this on a case-by-case basis. Where there are sites subject to ecological designations, these referenced in this section.
	Sections 11, 12, 17	<p>Although the spatial strategy includes areas of peatland and wetlands as a constraint, isolated pockets of these habitats may still be present on chosen development sites. If there are wetlands or peatland systems present, the planning application should demonstrate how the layout and design of the proposal, including any associated borrow pits, hard standing and roads, avoid impact on such areas. Peatland (active blanket bog in particular) should be avoided. A Phase 1 habitat survey may be required to identify areas of wetland and demonstrate that they have been avoided. Where the proposed infrastructure will impact upon peatlands, a detailed map of peat depths should be submitted. The peat depth survey should include details of the basic peatland characteristics.</p> <p>For areas where avoidance is impossible, details of how impacts upon wetlands and peatlands are minimised and mitigated should be provided as part of the planning application. This should consider the drainage, pollution and waste management implications and include preventative/mitigation measures to avoid significant drying or oxidation of peat through, for example, the construction of access tracks, dewatering, excavations, drainage channels, cable trenches, or the storage and re-use of</p>	<b>Comment noted.</b> It is considered that this is sufficiently addressed within existing guidance. There are relevant links within Appendix 6.

		excavated peat.	
	Section 12	As best practice we recommend a buffer distance of 100m between ground water dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTE , a particular type of wetland) and roads, tracks and trenches, and a larger separation distance of 250m from borrow pits and foundations. These separation distances will ensure that these ecosystems are adequately protected and prevent habitat loss.	<b>Comment noted.</b> It is considered that the current suite of SNH guidance specifically addressed GWDTE. This is referenced in Section 12 and also within Appendix 6.
	16.11	We welcome in paragraph 16.11 the reference to AQMA and wind turbines. Please note that traffic due to construction phase can also impact on air quality issues.	<b>Comment accepted.</b> <b>Proposed modification:</b> Insert sentence in 16.2 “Construction traffic can also impact on air quality.”
	17.3	We welcome the reference to borrow pits as part of the ancillary works section (paragraph 17.3). We repeat the comments from our 2012 response.	<b>Comment noted.</b> <b>Proposed modification:</b> Include link to <a href="#">Planning Advice Note 50 Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings</a> within Appendix 6.
	Section 9	Although not directly relative to SEPA’s interests we note that this SG does not make reference to the Kelpies as a landmark feature and we are not sure if there is a reason for this or it is an oversight.	<b>Comment noted.</b> The Kelpies were not constructed at the time of preparation of our 2012 Landscape Capacity Study. For this reason they have not been included as a sensitive visual receptor. Potential impacts on the Kelpies and other sensitive receptors will be included as viewpoints within any LVIA prepared for a specific proposal.
	Section 17	As mentioned in our 2012 response, it may also be helpful to include a list of supporting information that potential applicants will need to submit with the planning application in the additional guidance section. In terms of our interest this would include; site layout plans	<b>Comment partially accepted.</b> Section 17 covers a number of these issues, but this can be expanded.  Proposed modification: Insert additional paragraph prior to para 17.2 as follows:

		<p>which illustrate the location of all built elements, including access roads, turbines, crane hardstanding, borrow pits, construction compound, welfare facilities, oil storage, cabling and substation so that we can assess their location in relation to sensitive receptors such as peatlands, the water environment (water courses, lochs, wetlands and ground water), and public and private water supplies.</p>	<p>“In order to safeguard environmental resources in and around the site, applicants should submit detailed site layout plans for all proposals which show the location of all built elements, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Access tracks</li> <li>● Turbines</li> <li>● Crane hardstanding</li> <li>● Borrow pits</li> <li>● Construction compound and welfare facilities</li> <li>● oil storage</li> <li>● Cabling and substation”</li> </ul>
Forestry Commission	8.13-8.19	<p>Forestry Commission would request that on page 13, under the heading 'Additional Guidance', an additional paragraph is included which helps to highlight the importance of the Woodland Removal Policy in relation to wind energy developments proposed within Falkirk's woodlands.</p> <p>We can suggest the following text:          "The Scottish Government has developed a policy on the control of woodland removal to provide direction for decisions on woodland removal in Scotland. The Policy presents the criteria for determining the acceptability of woodland removal, information and implementation. All wind energy developments should be designed in accordance with the Policy.”</p>	<p><b>Comment accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Insert new paragraph as proposed by Forestry Commission after para 8.19.</p> <p>Include link to policy in Appendix 6.</p>

		The policy can be found at <a href="http://scotland.forestry.gov.uk/supporting/strategy-policy-guidance/woodland-expansion/control-of-woodland-removal">http://scotland.forestry.gov.uk/supporting/strategy-policy-guidance/woodland-expansion/control-of-woodland-removal</a>	
Scottish Natural Heritage	General	The draft Supplementary Guidance is largely a succinct, clear piece of guidance which avoids repeating information that is available elsewhere. We welcome this approach and consider that it creates a document that is of more use to stakeholders.	<b>Comment noted.</b>
	Section 8, Part1: Framework, and Map 2B.	<p>We note that the approach you have taken to Group 2 (as set out in Table 1 of Scottish Planning Policy) is to include supporting habitat for the Firth of Forth SPA and Slamannan Plateau SPA. Our understanding of the groupings set out in Table 1 of SPP is that additional measures that would move Group 3 areas into Group 2, such as site buffers or supporting areas, are not to be included in the spatial framework.</p> <p>We would therefore recommend that Section 8, the spatial framework shown at Map 1 and the supporting information on Map 2B are reviewed with the supporting habitat for the Firth of Forth SPA removed due to the very broad extent of this area.</p>	<p><b>Comment partially accepted.</b> The Firth of Forth SPA supporting habitat is shown on Map 2B, but is not included in Group 2, and is not represented within the areas of significant protection on Map 1. This has been clarified with SNH, who have suggested that further clarification on this point is provided within the text</p> <p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Add explanatory note to para 8.6 and Map 2B: “Firth of Forth SPA supporting habitat is not included as an area of significant protection for the purposes of the Spatial Framework, due to the broad extent of the area and the lack of information on its use”</p>
	Part1: Framework	We agree that the supporting habitat for the Slamannan Plateau SPA, i.e. the bean geese	<b>Comment noted.</b>

		feeding fields, could be included within Group 2 as they form a discrete, well-defined area.	
	8.18	We welcome the clear direction on timing of ecological surveys provided at paragraph 8.18 of the draft Supplementary Guidance.	<b>Comment noted.</b>
	9.6	The rationale for assessment is generally clear, however, we feel that further clarity can be brought to Section 9, paragraph 9.6 – entitled landscape sensitivity – as the reference to overall landscape capacity (and associated Map 2D and Figure) could be confusing. A short introductory paragraph to this part of the report might be helpful.	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Delete para 9.6 and replace with the following: “The LCS assessed the overall landscape sensitivity of each of the 16 landscape character units. The LCS then assessed the capacity of each landscape character unit to accept the different wind farm typologies, assigning to them capacities ranging from Low to High, based on the landscape sensitivity assessment. This capacity assessment is shown on Map 2D and Figure 2.”
	Figure 2	SNH suggest removing reference to Table H in Figure 2, or alternatively adding in an explanation that this originates in the LCS. More generally we suggest that clearer cross-references are included for dealing with landscape and visual issues.	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Remove reference to Table H in Figure 2
	Appendix 6.	Up-to-date links to SNH landscape guidance can be found on our website at <a href="http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/renewable-energy/onshore-wind/landscape-impacts-guidance/">http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/renewable-energy/onshore-wind/landscape-impacts-guidance/</a>	<b>Comment Accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Update Appendix 6 to reflect consolidated suite of SNH Guidance.
	Appendix 5.	The guidance on Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) for different turbine typologies in Appendix 5 is a useful addition to the Supplementary Guidance.	<b>Comment noted.</b>

Historic Scotland	13.5-13.8	Historic Scotland welcome that paragraph 13.8 states that impacts on historic environment assets should be assessed on the basis of their heritage value, rather than using a landscape and visual impacts methodology. In view of this, you could consider amending paragraph 13.5, which could be read as suggesting that those heritage assets identified within the Landscape Capacity Study should have potential impacts assessed principally or solely through a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). HS also welcome that you have flagged up the need to assess those heritage assets not identified within the LCS, but these will include assets of national importance, as well as those of local/regional importance. It is recommended that you consider amending the wording of this section to reflect this.	<b>Comment not accepted.</b> Para 13.8 sufficiently covers the requirement for historic environment study in addition to LVIA.
	13.12	Paragraph 13.12 also focuses on LVIA issues, rather than emphasising the need for assessment using an appropriate historic environment methodology. The second sentence appears to suggest tensions between the protection of the setting of the Forth and Clyde and Union Canals and their tourism and recreation values; in view of this you could consider rephrasing more positively if you wish to refer to the multiple values of these heritage assets.	<b>Comment accepted.</b>  <b>Proposed modification:</b> Replace second sentence of 13.12 with: “Their setting is important and they also form important areas for tourism and recreation”. Insert sentence at end of 13.12 “Where appropriate, direct impacts and impacts on setting should be addressed within a separate historic environment study”
	13.5-13.7	Historic Scotland notes that the additional	<b>Comment partially accepted.</b> Paragraph 13.5 acknowledges

		<p>guidance section headed ‘Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes and Battlefield Sites’ does not contain any guidance relating to listed buildings or scheduled monuments, (with the exception of the Forth and Clyde and Union Canals). It is unclear why this is the case, and you could consider ensuring that the guidance provided is comprehensive across the historic environment designations, and more balanced in terms of level of detail. For information, scheduled ancient monuments are normally now referred to simply as scheduled monuments.</p>	<p>listed buildings and scheduled monuments in the same way as other historic environment assets, through cross-reference to Map 2. The changed terminology for SAM is noted and will be changed.</p> <p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Remove all references to “Scheduled Ancient Monuments” and refer to them as ‘Scheduled Monuments.’</p>
	13.14	<p>Paragraph 13.14 states that Historic Scotland will provide advice on impacts on archaeology. It is unclear whether this section is intended to cover designated and undesignated archaeology, or undesignated archaeology alone (if the latter it would be for the planning authority to provide advice, rather than Historic Scotland).</p>	<p><b>Comments accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Add sentence at end of para 13.14 “For non-designated sites, input will be primarily from the Council’s Keeper of Archaeology.”</p>
Coal Authority	Section 17.	<p>Given the importance of ground stability in determining the layout of wind farms and the consequential effect that then has on other planning considerations such as landscape impact The Coal Authority considers that the Supplementary Guidance should address the issue of land instability.</p> <p>In the additional guidance section we would suggest the following wording:</p>	<p><b>Comment accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Add new paragraph as proposed within section 17.</p>

		<p>“Ground Stability. Proposals for wind energy need to have secure and stable ground conditions. Potential instability can arise from former mining activity, soil composition or other natural geological conditions. Where proposals involve the development of unstable land, it will only be permitted where appropriate remediation or mitigation measures have been undertaken.”</p>	
--	--	---	--

**ABBREVIATIONS USED:**

- AQMA** Air Quality Management Area
- EIA** Environmental Impact Assessment
- ER** Environment report
- GWDTE** Ground Water Drainage Treatment
- LCS** Landscape Capacity Study
- LVIA** Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
- RBMP** River Basin Management Plan
- SAM** Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SCOTS** Society of Chief Officers for Transportation Scotland
- SEA** Strategic Environmental Assessment
- SEPA** Scottish Environment Protection Agency
- SG** Supplementary Guidance
- SPG** Supplementary Planning Guidance
- SNH** Scottish Natural Heritage
- SPA** Special Protection Area
- SPP** Scottish Planning Policy
- SSSI** Site of Special Scientific Interest
- SUDS** Sustainable Urban Drainage System