

Comments for Planning Application P/21/0046/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: P/21/0046/FUL

Address: Site To The West Of Castlewood Glen Road Torwood

Proposal: Erection of 9 Dwellinghouses with Associated Garages and Engineering Infrastructure

Case Officer: Brent Vivian

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Joanna Stevenson

Address: Yew Bank Central Park Avenue Larbert

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other Organisations / Bodies

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: As Chair of Torwood Community Woodland Group Ltd, I am writing to lodge a formal objection to planning application P/21/0046/FUL which seeks to erect nine houses on Glen Road, Torwood. This application involves a woodland site recently felled under licence from Scottish Forestry. Contrary to the assertion made in the application, our Woodland Group is unaware that any change of use has taken place and we consider this site as woodland which is awaiting re-stocking under Scottish Forestry rules. I have contacted Scottish Forestry to alert them to this application and seek their view.

Local Development Plan 2 (LDP 2) clearly denotes the site as being outside the village boundary and therefore designated as countryside. We therefore expect Falkirk Council to apply the provisions and policies underpinning LDP 2 to protect the woodland in Torwood from housing development and further reduction in the extent of the woodland. There are currently two housing developments underway in Torwood (as set out in LDP 2) which will add 25 houses to the village, a significant increase in terms of its size. To allow any further development would, in our view, completely disregard the due process involved via public consultation in forming the LDP 2 and would adversely affect the character and countryside setting of the village. The proposed development constitutes ribbon development north of the Castle Loan up to the village limit.

The applicant makes three further assertions in his Planning Statement which we also refute:

1. That residents on the north side of Glen Road welcomed the removal of woodland on the site - in actual fact, residents are looking forward to the site being replanted to restore the woodland edge with a mix of coniferous and deciduous trees
2. That the addition of nine houses on the upper stretch of Glen Road will reduce vehicular traffic speed - we believe the opposite to be true. Torwood has experienced significant traffic problems recently with the blind summit at the top end of the road outside Woodside making visibility difficult, speeding vehicles and the weekend congestion which sees cyclists and walkers parking on both sides of the road in order to use the woodland for recreation. The Police have had to

attend on several occasions as a result of traffic issues.

3. That existing development downstream is at no greater risk of flooding as a result of the proposed housing - again, we know this is untrue. Flooding down the Castle Loan and down Glen Road has worsened in recent years and the recent felling activity which has removed a large number of trees has exacerbated the problem. For the first time in many year residents on the north side of Glen Road have had to use sand bags to divert water away from their homes and this water gathers in a large pool at the bottom of Glen Road at the exit onto the A9.

To sum up, the woodland is at the heart of the village of Torwood and gives it its rural and peaceful character. Local people appreciate the woodland for its greenspace and its biodiversity as well as for recreational pursuits. There has been a great deal of development in the past 20 years in the village, and residents are currently seeing two further large sites being developed with all the associated upheaval and disturbance. We therefore oppose this new proposal for a further nine houses on the grounds that the site is outside the village boundary, it is a woodland site and the proposal will only serve to diminish Torwood's woodland and increase traffic and flooding problems for existing residents. In our view the application is contrary to the provisions set out in LDP 2 and should be rejected.