

APPENDIX 1

FALKIRK COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN FINALISED DRAFT – DEPOSIT VERSION

LOCAL PLAN INQUIRY

STATEMENT OF DECISIONS ON REPORTERS' RECOMMENDATIONS (Committee Draft)

JUNE 2010

**FALKIRK COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN
FINALISED DRAFT – DEPOSIT VERSION
LOCAL PLAN INQUIRY**

STATEMENT OF DECISIONS ON REPORTERS' RECOMMENDATIONS

On 26 September 2008, Falkirk Council appointed a Scottish Government Reporter, Mr E K D Thomas, to consider and report on outstanding objections to the Falkirk Council Local Plan Finalised Draft (Deposit Version) and to the Council's subsequent Proposed Pre-Inquiry Modifications.

The objections were grouped into 142 issues, 62 of which were considered through oral evidence at a public local inquiry held between 18th March 2009 and 25th June 2009 in Falkirk Golf Club, Stirling Road, Camelon, Falkirk. Of these, 61 were dealt with through a hearing format, with one heard through a formal inquiry session. The remaining issues were dealt with by means of written submissions. In September 2009, the Council appointed two further Reporters, Mr D N Gordon and Mr M H Seddon to assist with consideration of the written submission cases.

The Reporter's report was submitted to the Council in two parts, Part 1 on 6th April 2010, and Part 2 on 29th April 2010. In accordance with Section 35 of the Town & Country Planning (Structure and Local Plans) (Scotland) Regulations 1983, the Council is required to prepare a statement of its decisions in respect of each matter considered at the inquiry, and the reasons for those decisions in the light of the Reporters' recommendations.

This statement generally follows the structure of the inquiry report, as follows:

Part 1: Area Wide Policy Framework

1. Environmental Quality – General Policies
2. Sustaining Communities – General Policies
3. Economic Prosperity – General Policies
4. Sustainable Transport & Infrastructure – General Policies

Part 2: Urban Settlements

5. Boness
6. Bonnybridge & Banknock
7. Denny
8. Falkirk Council
9. Grangemouth
10. Larbert & Stenhousemuir
11. Polmont Area.

Part 3: Rural North

12. Airth
13. Letham
14. Skinflats
15. South Alloa
16. Torwood

Part 4: Rural South

17. Allandale
18. Avonbridge
19. California
20. Greenhill
21. Limerigg
22. Shieldhill
23. Slamannan
24. Standburn
25. The Loan, Muiravonside
26. Other Rural South
27. Landfill Sites

PART 1: AREA WIDE POLICY FRAMEWORK

1. Environmental Quality – General Policies

| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
|--|--|--|
| 1.1 Skyline Protection <u>Objector:</u> S Simpson (34/56) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A policy on skyline protection in Polmont should be included in the Local Plan. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view there is no need to include such a policy in the Local Plan. |
| 1.2 Enabling Development in the Countryside/Green Belt <u>Objector:</u> Oneaxis (139/248-250) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Local Plan policies should be amended to allow for enabling development in the countryside/Green Belt to facilitate the restoration of traditional farm steadings, listed buildings or ancient monuments. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it would be inappropriate to amend the relevant Local Plan policies to allow for enabling development. |
| 1.3 General Rural Policies <u>Objectors:</u> J Wood (110/487) | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| W Waugh (111/488) Callendar Estate (187/317-373) Hendersons CS (188/376) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Local Plan policies on development in the countryside should be more positive and flexible. | | that the Local Plan policies on development in the countryside are appropriate and consistent with the Structure Plan and national policy. |
| 1.4 Policy EQ7 – Area Enhancement Priorities <u>Objector:</u> P Smith (9/24) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Additional priority enhancement areas relating to the Antonine Wall and River Valleys and should be included in the list within Policy EQ7. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the inclusion of additional priority enhancement areas is unnecessary. |
| 1.5 EQ17 – Antonine Wall <u>Objector:</u> Strathclyde Homes (99/177) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy EQ17 requires clarification and should include a test of acceptability in relation to impact on the Antonine Wall World Heritage Site and its setting. | That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Policy EQ17, as modified by the pre-inquiry modifications, provides satisfactory clarity and that an SPG is the appropriate place for a test of acceptability. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 3.4 |
| 1.6 Policy EQ19 - Countryside <u>Objector:</u> P Smith (9/25) | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the modification to Policy EQ19 suggested by |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy EQ19 is too restrictive and should be modified to allow the redevelopment of vacant or derelict land and buildings</p> | | the objector would be inappropriate. |
| <p>1.7 Policy EQ20 – Green Belt</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> P Smith (9/26) Homes for Scotland (101/176) AWG Property Ltd (151/271)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy EQ 20 should be modified to accord with SPP21 and to allow the redevelopment of vacant or derelict land and buildings. The Green Belt should be subjected to a full review to take account of the development needs of the area over the next 20 years.</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Policy EQ20 is worded satisfactorily, and that the Council's overall approach to the definition of the Green Belt has been appropriate.</p> |
| <p>1.8 Policy EQ21 – Falkirk Greenspace</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Redrow Homes (175/334)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy EQ21 does not adequately clarify what the requirements on developers will be in terms of contributions to Falkirk Greenspace in urban fringe locations.</p> | <p>That the Council's pre-inquiry modification to the supporting text of Policy EQ21 be extended as follows:</p> <p><i>"The Council will publish supplementary planning guidance to clarify the nature and level of contributions that will be required for the Greenspace Initiative as a whole and for the priority Helix project."</i></p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation, but to indicate that such supplementary planning guidance could be either a free-standing guidance note, or integrated into the proposed SPG on Open Space and New Development..</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council's accepts that additional clarification would be appropriate, and that this could be provided in one of two different ways.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 3.5</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>1.9 Policy EQ30 – Agricultural Land</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> AWG Property</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy EQ30 should be reworded to allow loss of prime agricultural land to meet Local Plan objectives.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Policy EQ30, as modified by the pre-inquiry modifications, is in line with national and Structure Plan policy and that there should continue to be presumption against the development of prime quality agricultural land.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 3.11</p> |
| <p>1.10 Policy EQ26 – Trees, Woodland & Hedgerows</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> KemFine UK Ltd (205/419)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy EQ26 should be amended to allow loss of trees where there are overriding economic development reasons.</p> | <p>That an additional sentence be added to the supporting text to Policy EQ26 as follows: <i>"In determining planning applications that involve the loss of woodlands, trees and hedgerows, the Council will have regard to their value as an environmental resource and clearly defined public benefits from the proposed development"</i>.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council considers the additional sentence to be acceptable and reflects the fact that environmental factors and social and economic benefits have to be balanced in assessing any development proposal.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 3.8</p> |
| <p>1.11 Policies EQ31/EQ38 – Protection of Mineral Resources/Opencast Coal Area of Search</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Scottish Coal (66/107,109)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Acknowledgement of Falkirk's proximity to Longannet power station should be made in the</p> | <p>(i) That additional text be added to the Local Plan acknowledging Longannet's status and stating that, <i>"with regard to the proximity principle, coal deposits in Falkirk could be of significance in the potential supply of indigenous coal to Longannet"</i>. (ii) That the Council's pre-inquiry modification with regard to the review of opencast coal areas of search be deleted and replaced with an updated statement reflecting the fact that this review was completed in 2009 and concluded that there was</p> | <p>To accept the Reporter's recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that information on Longannet and its proximity to coal reserves in the area could usefully be included in the supporting text. The revised modification on the opencast coal areas of search is a factual update which confirms that the review has been carried out.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Local Plan. The opencast coal area of search should be reviewed. | no justification for change in the areas. | <u>Modification Ref:</u> 3.13, 3.17 |
| 1.12 Coal Bed Methane <u>Objector:</u> Composite Energy (198/408) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A policy on coal bed methane should be included in the Local Plan reflecting the importance of reserves within the Falkirk Council area. | (i) That additional text be added to the Local Plan making reference to coal bed methane in NPF2, stating that extraction of CBM is supported subject to compliance with Policy EQ32 and other Local Plan policies, and highlighting that a Petroleum, Exploration and Development Licence (PEDL) for coal bed methane has been granted in the area. (ii) That a map showing that part of the Council area covered by the PEDL is included in the Local Plan. (iii) That the Council establish whether any other PEDLs have been approved in the area, and include these in the additional text and the PEDL map referred to above. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts that qualified support is given for the extraction of coal bed methane in NPF2 and the SPP and that, given the at there are coal bed methane resources within the area, the inclusion of the additional text and PEDL map in the Local Plan is appropriate. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 3.18 |

| 2. Sustaining Communities – General Policies | | |
|---|--|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| 2.1 Policy SC1 – Housing Land Provision <u>Objector:</u> Gladedale (195/386,518) Drumbow Homes (90/148) Homes for Scotland (101/181) MacTaggart & Mickel (103/187-188) AWG Property (151/278,503) Ogilvie Homes Ltd (182/345) KemFine UK (205/422,541) | (i) That the Local Plan be adjusted to reflect the site-specific recommendations on housing sites made in the inquiry report, which result in a net increase in housing land allocations of 476-496 houses, and that Table 4.1 in the Local Plan be replaced by the revised version reflecting these recommendations. (ii) That Policy SC1 be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, with subsection (1) replaced with the following: | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' views with regard to the deletion and addition of various housing sites, and the additional flexibility introduced to the housing land supply, which is in line with the SPP. Table 4.1 requires to be revised to take account of these changes. The changes to Policy SC1, which emphasise the provision of |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Firmin Coates Ltd (206/437,551) Syngenta Limited (207/452,552) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/467,553)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> More housing land should be brought forward generally by the Local Plan to ensure sufficient flexibility in the supply. The approach to over-allocation has been applied inconsistently with regard to the Denny and Bonnybridge areas. The Local Plan should be amended to make it clear that there is no housing shortfall in Grangemouth.</p> | <p><i>"The FCLP aims to meet the base housing land requirement of the Falkirk Council Structure Plan in each settlement area at least until 2015, and to ensure that there is sufficient additional land to allow continuity to supply in the period beyond 2015 up to 2020. Sites contributing towards the requirement are detailed under the relevant settlement statements".</i></p> <p>(iii) That minor consequential adjustments are made to the Council's pre-inquiry modification to the supporting text of Policy SC1.</p> | <p>continuity of supply to 2020, are considered acceptable and reflect the fact that the overall housing land requirement to 2020 is comfortably met.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 4.1</p> |
| <p>2.2 Policy SC2 – Windfall Housing Development in the Urban/Village Limit.</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> KemFine UK Ltd (205/423) Firmin Coates Ltd (206/438) Syngenta Limited (207/453) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/468)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy SC2 should be conditioned to exclude safety exclusion zones around hazardous installations.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that there is no need to modify Policy SC2 and that Policy EP18 adequately covers the issue of windfall housing within hazard consultation zones.</p> |
| <p>2.3 Policy SC4 – Affordable & Special Needs Housing</p> <p><u>Objectors:</u> Drumbow Homes (90/150) MacTaggart & Mickel (103/190) Redrow Homes (175/337)</p> | <p>That Policy SC4 and its supporting text be amended to introduce a sequential approach to the delivery of affordable housing whereby on site provision will be the first preference, followed by off site provision, and finally a commuted sum payment.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council considers that the proposed modification to Policy SC4 is consistent with the sequential approach outlined in the SPG on Affordable Housing.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The affordable housing requirement in Policy SC4 is too high and is not properly justified. The policy does not reflect all the options for contributing to affordable housing set out in PAN74.</p> | | <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 4.3</p> |
| <p>2.4 Policy SC6 – Housing Density and Amenity</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> KemFine UK Ltd (205/424) Firmin Coates Ltd (206/439) Syngenta Limited (207/454) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/469)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy SC6 should have an additional criterion added which requires that the design, scale and layout of development takes into account health and safety issues in order to minimise risk.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that an additional criterion to Policy SC6 as proposed by the objector is unnecessary.</p> |
| <p>2.5 Policy SC11 – Developer Contributions to Community Infrastructure</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Drumbow Homes (90/152) Homes for Scotland (101/183)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy SC11 contains insufficient detail on what will be required of developers.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections, other than to replace the reference to Circular 12/1996 with its recent replacement Circular 1/2010.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the Local Plan contains adequate information on developer contributions. The reference to the new Circular is a factual update.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u></p> |
| <p>2.6 Policy SC12 – Urban Open Space</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> KemFine UK Ltd (205/420)</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy SC12 should be amended to allow loss of open space where there are overriding economic development reasons.</p> | | that the proposed amendment to Policy SC12 is inappropriate. |
| <p>2.7 Policy SC13 – Open Space and Play Provision in New Development</p> <p><u>Objectors:</u> Drumbow Homes (90/158)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The proposed requirement of 60 sq m open space per household is too onerous. Further information is required on how off site contributions will be calculated.</p> | That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications. | <p>To modify Policy SC13 to take out the reference to to the interim 60 sq.m. open space standard, and insert cross-reference instead to the provisions and standards set out in the Council's Open Space Strategy.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Since the Local Plan inquiry the Council has approved the Open Space Strategy which sets out quantitative, qualitative and accessibility standards for open space and will, alongside the proposed SPG on Open Space and New Development, be the key reference point in determining how new development should contribute to open space. There is no longer any need to refer to the interim standard.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 4.7</p> |
| <p>2.8 Policy SC14 – Education and New Housing Development</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Drumbow Homes (90/159) Homes for Scotland (101/189) MacTaggart and Mickel (103/194) Ogilvie Homes (182/346)</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections, but that the Council produce a report, ideally each financial year, to give an overview of the position in relation to educational provision in the Council area, including actual school capacity, school roll projections and the Council's education capital programme for new schools and school extensions. | <p>To accept the Reporter's recommendation in respect of changes to the Local Plan, and to accept in principle the need for a report on education provision and planning, subject to further consideration of its scope and frequency.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Policy SC14 does not need to be amended.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy SC14 needs to contain more information about how the policy will operate and should be referenced to Circular 12/96.</p> | | <p>The provision of a report on education provision and planning would be of benefit to developers. However, its scope and frequency requires further consideration and discussion between Development Services and Education Services.</p> |
| <p>2.9 Travelling People/Gypsy Needs</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Forbes Rowan Spence Marr (72/117) Frank Stewart (74/121) John Reid (75/122)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Local Plan fails to provide for all the needs of gypsy/traveller households as required by SPP3 and other Scottish Government policies.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modification, which introduces a new policy on gypsy/travellers' sites, and that additionally the new policy be referenced in Table 3.3, which lists detailed policies for specific uses in the countryside.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the proposed new policy is appropriately worded. The provision of a cross-reference to Table 3.3 is considered acceptable.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 4.4</p> |
| <p>2.10 Criteria for Housing Allocations in the Rural Area</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Murdoch Smith (80/549)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The criteria for housing allocations in the Rural Area as stated in paragraph 6.4 of the Rural General chapter should be extended.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, with the addition of text indicating criteria for the selection of sites in the Rural North area.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council considers that the additional text setting out criteria for the selection of sites in the Rural North area is acceptable.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 14.1</p> |

| 3. Economic Prosperity – General Policies | | |
|---|---|--|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>3.1 Policies EP2/EP3 – Land for Business and Industrial Use/Business and Industrial Areas with Potential for Redevelopment</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> KemFine UK (205/426,427) Firmin Coates Ltd (206/441,442) Syngenta Limited (207/456,457) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/471,472)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Amendments should be made to Policy EP2 to safeguard these areas from the impact of new development elsewhere, and to Policy EP3 to ensure care is taken in respect of alternative uses adjacent to chemical installations.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that no changes are needed to Policies EP2 and EP3.</p> |
| <p>3.2 Policy EP6 – Town Centre Hierarchy</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Co-operative Group Property Division (142/253,275)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The wording of Policy EP6 fails to ensure that there is adequate protection to individual centres.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Policy EP6 is consistent with national and Structure Plan policy and provides a balanced approach to retail development in the centres.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>3.3 Policy EP7 – New Retail Development</p> <p><u>Objectors:</u> Aldi Stores Ltd (58/82) Co-operative Group Property Division (142/283) Sainsbury (171/328)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The threshold for significant retail development in Policy EP2 is too low, and does not fit with the Structure Plan's definition.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the threshold for significant retail development of 500 sq.m., as included in the modified Policy EP7, is appropriate.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 5.5</p> |
| <p>3.4 Policy EP8 - Neighbourhood and Rural Shops</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Aldi Stores Ltd (58/85) Co-operative Group Property Division (142/284)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy EP8 requires clarification, and more opportunities for retail development should be provided, either associated with neighbourhood centres or on stand alone sites.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, and that corresponding changes to the policy title and supporting text should be made to clarify that the policy relates to neighbourhood/rural services as well as shops.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Policy EP8, as modified by the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, provides sufficient clarity, and that opportunities for new retail opportunities are already included in the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 5.6</p> |
| <p>3.5 Small Shops</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Co-operative Group Property Division (142/287)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Council should formally recognise the important neighbourhood role provided by isolated shops in the Council area.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Policy EQ8 adequately deals with this issue.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>3.6 Policy EP18 – Major Hazards</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> R Menzies (163/311) KemFine UK (205/428) Firmin Coates Ltd (206/443) Syngenta Limited (207/458) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/473) Shell UK Oil Products Ltd (92/15)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The basis for Policy EP18 is challenged. Its criteria should be amended. The actual route of pipelines should be shown on the Proposals Map.</p> | <p>(i) That an additional criterion should be added to Policy EP18 on consideration of proposals within major hazard consultation zones as follows: <i>“...(3) the potential impact that the proposals may have upon chemical and petro-chemical establishments”.</i></p> <p>(ii) That otherwise the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council’s pre-inquiry modifications.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporter’s recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council’s view that the basis for, and general approach of Policy EP18 is robust. The Council accepts the Reporters’ view that the impact of new development on existing chemical and petrochemical establishments is a valid consideration and that an additional criterion in EP18 to take account of such impacts on is reasonable.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 5.9</p> |
| <p>3.7 Policy EP19 – Hazardous Substances Consent</p> <p><u>Objectors:</u> KemFine UK (205/429) Firmin Coates Ltd (206/444) Syngenta Limited (207/459) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/474)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> There is a lack of clarity in defining hazard consultation zones. The supporting information to Policy EP19 should be amended as it does not conform with the Structure Plan.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections, other than to amend the term <i>“hazardous substance consent”</i> to <i>“hazardous substances consent”</i>.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters’ recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council’s view that Policy EQ19 and its supporting text conforms with the Structure Plan.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 5.11</p> |
| <p>3.8 Major Hazard Safeguarding Zones</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> KemFine UK (205/430)</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections, other than to amend the Council’s pre-inquiry modification to refer to NPF2 rather than SPP2.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters’ recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council’s view</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Firmin Coates Ltd (206/445) Syngenta Limited (207/460) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/475)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A new policy is needed which introduces safeguarding zones for existing chemical/ petrochemical sites.</p> | | <p>that it would be inappropriate to designate safeguarding zones for chemical and petrochemical sites.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 5.10</p> |
| <p>3.9 Design in Safety Exclusion Zones</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> KemFine UK (205/432) Firmin Coates Ltd (206/447) Syngenta Limited (207/462) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/477)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A new policy is required for development within safety exclusion zones which requires the design, scale and layout of development to take into account health and safety issues and to minimise risk.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the new policy suggested by the objector is unnecessary.</p> |

| 4. Sustainable Transport & Infrastructure – General Policies | | |
|---|---|--|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>4.1 Policy ST6 – Improving the Road Network</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Forth Ports plc (184/360)</p> | <p>That additional text should be added to the Local Plan highlighting the status of the Grangemouth Freight Hub as a national development in NPF2 and the fact that Grangemouth road and rail upgrades have been identified in Transport</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> With the approval of NPF2, the Council considers it appropriate to include additional information on</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The need for road improvements to support Grangemouth Port and the Grangemouth industries' role as key economic drivers should be recognised. The transport network should be upgraded to cope with the growth of the port and plans for further development.</p> | <p>Scotland's Strategic Transport Projects Review.</p> | <p>the Grangemouth Freight Hub.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 6.5</p> |
| <p>4.2 Policy ST18 – Waste Management Facilities</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Marathi Ltd (150/276)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy ST18 should exclude landfill facilities. While landfill is a type of waste management facility, Policy ST18 and its text is not relevant.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the council's pre-inquiry modifications.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view, as clarified through the pre-inquiry modifications, that landfill sites are not meant to be within the scope of Policy ST18.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 6.12</p> |

PART 2: URBAN SETTLEMENTS

| 5. Bo'ness | | |
|---|--|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>5.1 Opportunity EN.BNS6 – Kinneil Estate</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> The Friends of Kinneil (153/286)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Opportunity EN.BNS6 contains no detailed proposals relating to development and upgrading of any of the features and facilities at Kinneil.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the Local Plan is not the appropriate place for further detail on proposals for Kinneil Estate.</p> |
| <p>5.2 Proposal H.BNS9 – Kinglass Farm</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Messrs Robert Pow (144/258)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Proposal H.BNS9 should be allocated, at least in part, for mainstream private housing rather than exclusively for affordable housing.</p> | <p>That the requirement for H.BNS9 to be reserved for affordable/special needs housing be removed.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that there is insufficient basis for requiring the reservation of the site for affordable/special needs housing.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 7.10</p> |
| <p>5.3 Proposal H.BNS14 – Bo'ness Foreshore</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> D McLeish (148/265)</p> <p><u>Summary of Issue:</u> Land along the south side of Bo'ness Dock should</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the boundary of H.BNS14 is appropriate.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| not be included within Opportunity H.BNS14. | | |
| 5.4 Bo'ness Foreshore SIRR <u>Objector:</u> West Lothian Council (141/252) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Impacts of the development on social and physical infrastructure in West Lothian should be assessed and mitigated. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that any impacts from the SIRR on West Lothian have been dealt with adequately through the development management process. |
| 5.5 Bo'mains Farm, Bo'ness <u>Objector:</u> AWG Property (151/279-281) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Bo'mains Farm, Bo'ness should be allocated for housing and the Bo'ness Urban Limit and Green Belt boundary amended accordingly. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and that the Urban Limit and Green Belt boundaries in this location should not be amended. |
| 5.6 Carriden, Bo'ness <u>Objector:</u> MacTaggart & Mickel (103/200) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Carriden, Bo'ness should be allocated as a housing proposal, included within the Urban Limit and removed from the Bo'ness South Area of Great Landscape Value. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and that the Urban Limit and the Bo'ness South AGLV in this location should not be amended. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>5.7 Bridgeness Road, Bo'ness</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Antonine Property Development Group Limited (146/260)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Bridgeness Road, Bo'ness should be allocated as a housing opportunity and should be removed from the area for business and industrial retention.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes.</p> |
| <p>5.8 Traffic Calming – Carriden Brae, Bo'ness</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Muirhouses Amenity Association</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Local Plan lacks any commitment to traffic calming on Carriden Brae within the village of Muirhouses which is needed in view of the volume and nature of traffic using the route.</p> | <p>That an additional sentence be inserted in the Muirhouses village statement highlighting local concerns about the detrimental effects on the village of traffic levels on Carriden Brae.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that that it would not be appropriate to identify traffic calming schemes within the Local Plan, but that the concerns of residents can be recognised.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 22.2</p> |

| 6. Bonnybridge & Banknock | | |
|---|---|--|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>6.1 Proposal H.B&B7 – Roman Road, Bonnybridge</p> <p><u>Objector:</u></p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the fact that the site</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>S Scott (65/100)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> H.B&B7 should not be developed.</p> | | <p>is now complete and the objection is no longer of relevance.</p> |
| <p>6.2 Proposal H.B&B21 - Dennyloanhead</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Gladedale (195/522) B & A Campbell (214/495) Banknock, Haggs & Longcroft CC (236/554) Allandale Properties Ltd (210/511) M Kane (213/491)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objections are made to the Council's proposed modifications to extend Opportunity H.B&B21 and to bring forward its phasing.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, and that the 'comments' section should be further amended to state that contributions to the DEAR should be "proportionate" and that the raising of developer contributions will be in accordance with the tests set out in national planning policy guidance.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the extension and change in phasing of the site are appropriate. The additional minor changes to the text in relation to developer contributions are considered acceptable.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 8.9</p> |
| <p>6.3 Milnquarter Farm, Bonnybridge</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Manor Forrest (97/167,168,170) Allandale Properties Ltd (210/509) I & H Brown (25/493)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Manor Forrest seek the allocation of a site at Milnquarter Farm for housing. Allandale Properties and I&H Brown object to the Council's modification to include the site within the Urban Limit.</p> | <p>That a part of the site be allocated for housing, with a capacity of 100 units. The allocation should exclude those parts of the site covered by the Antonine Wall World Heritage Site and the Milnquarter SINC. In the 'comments' section, it should be highlighted: that there will be a requirement to demonstrate that there will be no significant adverse impact on the Antonine Wall World Heritage Site and its setting; that it will be necessary to address all the possible effects of rail noise; that a proportionate contribution will be required towards the improvement of educational facilities, and that capacity constraints may affect the precise timing of development on site; that the site could potentially come forward in association with Broomhill Road; and that detailed proposals</p> | <p>To partly accept the Reporters' recommendation. The allocation of the site is accepted, but it is combined with the Broomhill Road site with a reduced overall capacity of 80 units, and further wording emphasising the need to safeguard the setting of the Antonine Wall World Heritage Site, and the need for a planning brief.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that the site should be allocated. However, in order to satisfactorily address concerns about the impact on the setting of the Antonine Wall World Heritage Site, and in particular the relationship between the line of the Wall and the Roman camp, it is considered necessary to include further</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | should consider linking Broomhill Road to Greenhill Road, improving accessibility to the local primary schools, and future options for that part of the site designated as a SINC and excluded from the allocation (including its possible use as open space). | safeguarding wording, a reduction in capacity, and a requirement for a planning brief. It is also considered that the site should logically be developed in tandem with the Broomhill Road site and the two sites included in the same allocation. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 8.8 |
| 6.4 Broomhill Road, Bonnybridge <u>Objector:</u> Manor Forrest (82/130) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Broomhill Road, High Bonnybridge should be identified as a housing opportunity. | That the site be allocated for housing, with a capacity of 30 units. In the 'comments' section, it should be highlighted: that it will be necessary to address all possible effects of rail noise; that a proportionate contribution will be required towards the improvement of educational facilities; that the development layout should address any flood risk on site; and that the site could potentially come forward in association with Milnquarter Farm. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation, but to include the site as part of the Milnquarter Farm allocation (see 6.3 above) <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that the site should be identified as a housing allocation. Combining the site with the Milnquarter Farm allocation is considered logical. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 8.8 |
| 6.5 Dykehead Farm, Bonnybridge <u>Objector:</u> Strathclyde Homes (99/171,172) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Dykehead Farm should be allocated for housing, and the extent of the Antonine Wall WHS buffer zone in the vicinity should be reduced. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and that the Urban Limit and the boundaries of the Antonine Wall WHS buffer zone in this location should not be amended. |
| 6.6 Broomridge, Dennyloanhead <u>Objector:</u> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Carronvale Homes (84/133)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Broomridge, Dennyloanhead should be allocated as a housing opportunity.</p> | | <p>The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and that the Urban Limit in this location should not be amended.</p> |
| <p>6.7 Urban Limit at Hillview Road, Bonnybridge</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Beepart Ltd (62/92)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Urban Limit should be extended to encompass the business and industry retention site at Hillview Road, High Bonnybridge.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the Urban Limit should not be changed in this location.</p> |

| 7. Denny | | |
|---|--|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>7.1 Opportunity H.DEN11/ED.DEN5 – Broad Street, Denny</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Hallam Land Management & Henry Boot Developments (191/381,382)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The boundaries of ED.DEN5 and H.DEN11 should be redrawn to create a mixed use site, with greater residential content, and to take account of development constraints.</p> | <p>(i)That the text for sites H.DEN11 and ED.DEN5 and the proposals map be modified to indicate that the two sites should be developed in association with one another through a comprehensive masterplan covering the entire site. Areas affected by flood risk and protected species constraints to be identified and excluded from the development envelope. The exact areas to be used for housing and business/industry should be identified on the masterplan, with the expectation that an area of 3-3.5ha of the developable area will be required for business/industry, and that the balance will be</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts that a comprehensive masterplanned approach to the two sites is appropriate, with the detailed extent of each site to be defined through the masterplanning process, subject to the provision of a minimum area of business land</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 9.3, 9.8</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>developed for housing. Further references to be made to landscaping, access, odour from the sewage works and the need for a contribution from H.DEN11 to the DEAR.</p> <p>(ii) That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modification which identifies the H.DEN11 site as a new allocation rather than an opportunity.</p> | |
| <p>7.2 Opportunity H.DEN12 – Mydub Farm, Denny</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Gladedale (195/387,388,390) Callendar Estate (187/366)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Land at Mydub Farm should be allocated for development. The alignment of the DEAR at Mydub should be amended to enclose a larger development area.</p> | <p>(i) That the western part of the site should be allocated for housing, extending to 15 hectares and with a capacity of 300 units. In the 'comments' section it should be highlighted: that the development of the site is linked to and dependent upon the construction of a new Denny Eastern Access Road, to which financial contributions will be required; and that a development brief and masterplan are required for the allocation, and that they should precisely define the line of the eastern boundary of the development and ensure that a robust edge is provided to the settlement..</p> <p>(ii) That the line of the indicative route for the Denny Eastern Access Road be adjusted to that proposed by the objectors.</p> <p>(iii) that the Green Belt be adjusted to run along the outer edge of the revised indicative Denny Eastern Access Road, and that the balance of the land within the indicative line of the road, which is not allocated for housing, be designated countryside.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that the western part of the site is appropriate as a housing allocation, that the revised line of the DEAR is acceptable, and that the boundary of the Green Belt should follow the revised line of the DEAR.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 9.4, 9.10, 9.11</p> |
| <p>7.3 Little Denny Reservoir, Denny</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Scottish Water (28/47)</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Land at Little Denny Reservoir, should be allocated as a housing opportunity site. | | housing purposes. |
| 7.4 Drove Loan, Denny <u>Objector:</u> P Smith (9/19,21) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Drove Loan should be allocated for housing, and removed from the Green Belt. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and that the Urban Limit and Green Belt boundary should not be amended. |
| 7.5 Nethermain Road/Castlerankine Road, Denny <u>Objector:</u> Gladedale (195/521) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objection is made to the Council's proposed modification to allocate a site at Nethermain Road/Castlerankine Road, Denny. | That this housing allocation, as proposed in the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, be deleted from the Local Plan and the site designated as open space under Policy SC12. | Not to accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> Having reviewed the site in terms of the objectives, standards and criteria of the Open Space Strategy, the Council considers that, provided the play area within the site is satisfactorily relocated and improved, the development of the site will not have a significant impact on the open space resource in the area. Balanced against the benefits of the release of the site in terms of assisting in the cross-funding of the Town centre regeneration, and providing additional choice and flexibility in the housing land supply, it is considered that it should be allocated for housing. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 9.5 |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>7.6 Duke Street, Denny</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Gladedale (195/521)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objection is made to the Council's proposed modification to allocate a site at Duke Street, Denny.</p> | <p>That this housing allocation, as proposed in the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, be deleted from the Local Plan and the site designated as open space under Policy SC12.</p> | <p>Not to accept the Reporter's recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Having reviewed the site in terms of the objectives, standards and criteria of the Open Space Strategy, the Council considers that the development of the site will not have a significant impact on the open space resource in the area. Balanced against the benefits of the release of the site in terms of assisting in the cross-funding of the Town centre regeneration, and providing additional choice and flexibility in the housing land supply, it is considered that it should be allocated for housing.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 9.6</p> |
| <p>7.7 Denny Eastern Access Road</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Gladedale (195/389,519) Mactaggart & Mickel (103/197)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Gladedale query the request for contributions to DEAR from various sites, and whether there is an effective mechanism for delivering the DEAR. Mactaggart and Mickel query the requirement for a contribution to DEAR from the site at Dennyloanhead.</p> | <p>(i) That text be added to the Local Plan stating that the Council will publish supplementary planning guidance to clarify for all parties how the proposed DEAR will be delivered.</p> <p>(ii) That the 'comments' section for Opportunity H.B&B21 should be amended to state that contributions to the DEAR should be "proportionate".</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council's accepts the need for clarity on how developers will be expected to contribute to the DEAR.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 9.10</p> |

| 8. Falkirk | | |
|---|---|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| 8.1 Opportunity EN.FAL9 - Roughcastle <u>Objector:</u> TPS Planning Ltd (149/268) Callendar Estate (187/501) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Local Plan gives insufficient support for leisure, recreation and tourism facilities at Roughcastle. The Proposals Map should show EN.FAL9 covering a more extensive area. | That the text and proposals map be amended to indicate that the opportunity extends to both north and south of the main Glasgow-Edinburgh railway line. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The Council's acknowledges that a better representation of the potential extent of recreational opportunities at Roughcastle should be provided. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 10.4 |
| 8.2 Arnothill Conservation Area <u>Objector:</u> A Nimmo (117/210) J & A Green (127/226) D Cameron (128/227) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Local Plan text relating to Arnothill Conservation Area is not sufficiently robust. | That the Local Plan should be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation, and in addition recognise within the text that a character appraisal of Arnothill Conservation has been undertaken. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the text, as proposed within the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, provides a robust description of the Council's approach to the conservation. The text needs further updating to reflect the current conservation area review. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 10.3 |
| 8.3 Fox Covert/Kilbean Wood <u>Objector:</u> R Amos (11/23) | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <u>Summary of Objections:</u> There is no protection to the woodland at Fox Covert and Kilbean Wood. | | that existing designations will ensure that these areas are adequately protected from development. |
| 8.4 Green Belt at Westfield, Falkirk <u>Objector:</u> R Menzies (163/309) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Green Belt should be retained in the vicinity of the Falkirk Stadium at Westfield, Falkirk. | (i) That the Falkirk Stadium (Proposal RC.FAL3) should remain outwith the Green Belt. (ii) That the area to the east of the Falkirk Stadium, currently covered by Opportunity EN.FAL6, should be designated as Green Belt | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation with regard to the Falkirk Stadium site reflects the Council's view that it would be inappropriate to include it within the Green Belt. With regard to the land to the east, the Council accepts the Reporters' view that this land could make a meaningful contribution to the Green Belt. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 10.10 |
| 8.5 Green Belt at Camelon, Falkirk <u>Objector:</u> L Ramsay (183/349) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objection is made to the definition of the new Green Belt to the east of Camelon, since it precludes any further development of Camelon/Carmuir in the future. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the Green Belt boundary at Camelon is appropriately defined. |
| 8.6 Urban Limit at Slamannan Road, Falkirk <u>Objector:</u> Callendar Estate (187/368) | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the Urban Limit in this location is defined |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Falkirk Urban Limit should be redrawn to include a site at Slamannan Road. | | appropriately. |
| 8.7 Proposal H.FAL14 – Seaforth Road, Falkirk <u>Objector:</u> Mr & Mrs Valks (129/228) Mr & Mrs Sneddon (131/231) D Campbell (132/232) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Seaforth Road should not be allocated for housing, especially flats. A community use would be preferable. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the allocation of the site for housing is appropriate. |
| 8.8 Kingseat Place, Falkirk <u>Objector:</u> Garthill Developments Ltd (168/323) Callendar Estate (187/369) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Kingseat Place should be allocated for housing. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection, other than a minor change to the Urban Limit to include a new house that has been built on the western boundary of the objection site. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 10.9 |
| 8.9 Standalane, Falkirk <u>Objector:</u> Mactaggart & Mickel (176/333) Callendar Estate (187/367) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Standalane, Falkirk should be allocated for housing. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and the Urban Limit should not be amended. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>8.10 Glen Farm, Falkirk</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Persimmon Homes (180/341) Callendar Estate (187/370)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Land at Glen Farm, Falkirk should be identified as an opportunity site for residential development.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and the Urban Limit should not be amended.</p> |
| <p>8.11 Opportunity ED.FAL6 – Firs Park</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Ogilvie Homes (162/308)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Firs Park should be rezoned as a housing opportunity.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, with the retail proposal deleted and the site left unallocated.</p> | <p>To partially accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that not allocating the site for any specific purpose is the appropriate approach.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 10.6</p> |
| <p>8.12 Opportunity ED.FAL9 – Wester Newlands, Falkirk</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Bellair Property Investments Limited (158/301,302) Callendar Estate (187/364)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Opportunity ED.FAL9 should be extended to the east and the boundary of the Urban Limit and the Green Belt amended correspondingly.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the extent of the site, and the definition of the Urban Limit and Green Belt at Wester Newlands is appropriate.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>8.13 Opportunity ED.FAL12 – Glasgow Road 1 (Former Wrangler Works)</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Tesco Stores Limited (156/298)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Opportunity ED.FAL12 should be altered to include retail use as part of a mixed use development.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, but with the text of Policy EP2(2) adjusted to indicate that the food retail element allowed within the Glasgow Road Camelon Industrial Area is to meet local needs and should be less than 1,000 sq.m gross in line with the ceiling in Structure Plan Policy ECON5(3).</p> | <p>To not accept the Reporters' recommendation with regard to the inclusion of the 1,000 sq.m. restriction.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council considers that it is unnecessary to restate the Structure Plan ceiling of 1,000 sq.m. in the local Plan, as it is already set out clearly in the Structure Plan.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 5.2</p> |
| <p>8.14 Policy EP2 – Glasgow Road Industrial Area</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Co-operative Group Property Division (142/498) Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc (217/499) Scottish Power (218/500)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Co-op and Wm Morrison object to the Council's proposed modification allowing food retail within the Glasgow Road Industrial Area. Scottish Power is concerned that the allowance may only relate to the Wrangler site.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, but with the text of Policy EP2(2) adjusted to indicate that the food retail element allowed within the Glasgow Road Camelon Industrial Area is to meet local needs and should be less than 1,000 sq.m gross in line with the ceiling in Structure Plan Policy ECON5(3).</p> | <p>To partly accept the Reporters' recommendation, but not to include reference to the 1,000 sq.m. Structure Plan ceiling.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that provision of food retailing is appropriate within the Glasgow Road Industrial Area. However, the Council considers that it is unnecessary to restate the Structure Plan ceiling of 1,000 sq.m. in the Local Plan, as it is already set out clearly in the Structure Plan.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 5.2</p> |
| <p>8.15 Glasgow Road, Falkirk – Mixed Use Development</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Walker Group (Scotland Ltd) (172/3290) L Ramsay (183/351)</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that there is no justification or basis for allocating the area as a mixed use opportunity, or for further</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Walker Group state that the Glasgow Road Industrial Area should be allocated for mixed use development, rather than reserved for business and industry. Mr Ramsay states that more flexible range of uses should be allowed on Opportunities ED.FAL12 &13.</p> | | widening the range of uses on sites ED.FAL12 & 13. |
| <p>8.16 Lochlands, Larbert</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Stewart Homes (Property) Limited (166/318,319)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site adjacent to Lochlands Industrial Estate should be identified as a business opportunity, and removed from the Green Belt</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate this site for business purposes, or to amend the Green Belt in this location.</p> |
| <p>8.17 Lime Road, Falkirk</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Siboro Ltd (161/306)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Lime Road should be identified as a development opportunity for housing/hotel/leisure use.</p> | That the site should be identified as a housing opportunity, with the site area as 0.38 hectares, and the capacity as unknown. In the 'comments' section, it should be highlighted: that this is an opportunity to regenerate this small site; that the housing development requires to take account of proposals for the adjacent canal area insofar as they have been prepared; and that contamination is present on site, that remediation requires to be carried out, and that account requires to be taken of contamination in the surrounding area. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts that the site could beneficially be redeveloped for housing.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 10.5</p> |
| <p>8.18 Falkirk Town Centre Boundary – Municipal Buildings</p> <p><u>Objector:</u></p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>C Christie (15/30) A & M Smith (18/37) I Jockel (23/42) C Morris (21/40) Farr Properties (24/43) Mr & Mrs Easton (116/207) A Nimmo (117/209) Sister Gabriel (118/211) R Duffy (119/212) G Duncan (120/213) A Randle (121/214) Mr & Mrs Forsyth (122/215) R & C Downie (123/217) P Reid (125/219) M Stephen (138/245) R Menzies (163/310) G M Robb (200/412) G Simpson (202/414)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Municipal Buildings site should not be included within the Falkirk Town Centre boundary.</p> | | <p>that it is appropriate to include the Municipal Buildings site within the Falkirk Town Centre boundary.</p> |
| <p>8.19 Falkirk Town Centre Boundary – Bellsmeadow</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Aldi Stores Ltd (58/86)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Falkirk Town Centre boundary should be extended to include Bellsmeadow Park and the adjacent motor vehicle showroom.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that there is no justification for extending the Falkirk Town Centre boundary at Bellsmeadow.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>8.20 Camelon Local Centre Boundary</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Aldi Stores Ltd</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The local centre of Camelon should be extended to include the area round the Mariner Centre and the works adjacent to the former Wrangler factory.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that there is no justification for extending the Camelon Local Centre boundary.</p> |
| <p>8.21 Policy FAL5 – Local Centres in Falkirk</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Co-operative Group Property Division</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Policy FAL5 fails to offer the support required to protect local centres in Falkirk from competing development in other locations.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Policies EP6 and FAL5 provide an appropriate level of protection for local centres.</p> |
| <p>8.22 Glasgow Road/Camelon Road Congestion</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> L Ramsay (183/252) Mr & Mrs Easton (116/208) M Stephen (138/246) 142 Residents (211/485)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Council must make provision to resolve traffic congestion on the Glasgow Road/Camelon Road.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan, other than a minor change to indicate that the B820 Grahams Road corridor is not of greater priority than other arterial road corridors in terms of environmental issues caused by transport and traffic problems.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view generally fit for purpose, that the Council is promoting a variety of measures and improvements designed to improve the situation, and that the solutions proposed by the objector are not practical or appropriate.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 10.7</p> |

| 9. Grangemouth | | |
|---|--|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| 9.1 Green Belt, Grangemouth <u>Objector:</u> KemFine UK (205/425) Firmin Coates Ltd (206/440) Syngenta Limited (207/455) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/470) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Green Belt boundaries between Grangemouth and Falkirk should be reviewed to enable, if necessary, development away from existing chemical plants. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the Green Belt boundaries around Grangemouth are robust and do not need to be altered. |
| 9.2 Proposal H.GRA5 – Oxgang Road, Grangemouth <u>Objector:</u> Sport Scotland (186/407) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Oxgang Road, which is school playing fields, should not be allocated for development. | That the size of the site be reduced to 1 hectare and the capacity from 25 to 20, and that the 'comments' section be amended to refer to the fact that loss of the general sports area will require to be addressed either by replacing it with a new one, or upgrading an existing one, all in line with national planning policy guidance. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts that a reduction in the site size will reduce the impact on the open space and that the development of the site would have to address national planning policy in relation to the loss of playing fields. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 11.6 |
| 9.3 Proposal ED.GRA8 – Earls Road, Grangemouth <u>Objector:</u> | That proposal ED.GRA8 be extended to include the objection site, extending to 14.05 hectares, with the 'comments' section amended to read: <i>"Site would be suitable for use classes 4, 5, and 6,</i> | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that that |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>KemFine UK Ltd (205/421)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Proposal ED.GRA8 should be extended to cover all the land lying between Dalgrain/Glenburgh/ Earls Road and the existing chemical complex with the exception of land in the south west corner to be retained as open space.</p> | <p><i>with an opportunity to share spare capacity in power and effluent treatment. Development of the site should retain the woodland area and important trees. The loss of sports facilities requires to be addressed either by replacing them with new ones, or upgrading existing ones, all in line with national planning policy guidance. Other matters which potentially have to be addressed include flooding, access, and European protected species. Any proposals for hazardous substance consent will require to be assessed under Policy EP19".</i></p> | <p>the allocation of the site for business purposes could be justified, subject to the caveats outlined regarding safeguarding of woodland and addressing the loss of sports facilities.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 11.15</p> |
| <p>9.4 Opportunity ED.GRA9 – Wood Street, Grangemouth</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Carronvale Homes (84/139)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Wood street, Grangemouth should be allocated as a housing opportunity site rather than for business/industrial development.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it would not be appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and that it should be retained for business/industrial use.</p> |
| <p>9.5 Existing Chemical/Petrochemical Sites, Grangemouth</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> KemFine UK (205/434,435) Firmin Coates Ltd (206/449,450) Syngenta Limited (207/464,465) Fujifilm Imaging Colorants Ltd (208/479,480)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The existing chemical and petrochemical sites including redevelopment proposals on these sites</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, and that two additional minor textual changes be made.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it would be inappropriate to include the existing chemical and petrochemical sites as proposals. The minor textual changes are considered acceptable.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 1.1, 2.4, 11.9, 11.13</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| should be listed as proposals/ opportunities. A range of other minor changes are requested. | | |
| 9.6 Little Kerse, Grangemouth <u>Objector:</u> The Mariner Group (126/221,225) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Little Kerse, Grangemouth should be designated for leisure, recreation and tourism uses and removed from the Green Belt. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the site should be retained as Green Belt and that it would be inappropriate to allocate it as a specific recreational opportunity. |
| 9.7 Grangemouth Docks <u>Objector:</u> Forth Ports plc (184/355,357,523) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Land identified as ED.GRA2-3 should be identified for port-related distribution rather than mixed use. Requirements in relation to retention of the old docks should not be included. Concern is expressed about requirements for contributions to off-site motorway upgrading. | (i) That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, subject to the removal of references to the acceptability of a more flexible range of uses in ED.GRA2 and 3. (ii) That the 'comments' section of opportunities TR.GRA 6 and TR.GRA8 be amended to state that all developer contributions to these projects will be raised in accordance with national planning policy guidance. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation but to further modify the 'comments' section of ED.GRA2 and 3 to remove references to seasonal restrictions on construction activities. <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts that the emphasis on these sites is now exclusively on port-related industry and warehousing, in line with the development of the Grangemouth Freight Hub. The retention of references to the importance of the old Docks reflects the Council's view that their value should be taken into account in assessing development proposals. The retention of references to developer contributions in relation to TR.GRA 6 and 8, suitably qualified, reflects the Council's view that it is appropriate to seek such contributions to these major junction upgrades. The removal of the references to seasonal restrictions on construction activities is based on the advice of SNH that the identification of only one type of mitigation may be misleading. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <u>Modification Ref:</u> 11.11, 11.19 |
| 9.8 Inchyra Grange, Grangemouth <u>Objector:</u> MacDonald Hotels Ltd (155/295-297) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Land adjacent to the Inchyra Grange Hotel should be allocated for business/tourism purposes and removed from the Green Belt. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for business purposes, or to remove it from the Green Belt. |
| 9.9 Trunk Road Impacts & Improvements <u>Objector:</u> Transport Scotland (81/128) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Local Plan allocations and policy statements with regards to the strategic improvements to the M9 are considered premature. | That the Local Plan be modified in line with the wording agreed between Falkirk Council and Transport Scotland prior to the inquiry, which identifies within the 'comments' section of TR.GRA6 and TR.GRA8 specific interim mitigation measures which would resolve capacity issues over the term of the Local Plan, and states that developer contributions to the upgrades will be required. Additionally, reference should be made to the raising of such contributions being in accordance with national planning policy guidance. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's agreed position with Transport Scotland on the wording of these proposals, indicating the scope of interim solutions as well as the need to examine longer term solutions through the designation of the Grangemouth Freight Hub as a national development in NPF2. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 11.19 |

| 10. Larbert & Stenhousemuir | | |
|---|--|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| 10.1 Bensfield Farm, Stenhousemuir <u>Objector:</u> Hallam Land Management & R Johnston (135/242,244) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Bensfield Farm should be allocated for housing and removed from the Green Belt. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to these objections. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and that the site should remain outwith the Urban Limit and within the Green Belt. |
| 10.2 Roughlands Farm, Stenhousemuir <u>Objector:</u> Redrow Homes (175/332,335) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Land at Roughlands Farm, Stenhousemuir should be allocated as a long-term housing opportunity and removed from the Green Belt. | That the site should be removed from the Green Belt but left outwith the Stenhousemuir Urban Limit and within the countryside. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes or to alter the Urban Limit. However, the Council accepts the Reporters' view that Webster Avenue can form a robust alternative boundary for the Green Belt in this location. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 12.2 |
| 10.3 Carron Dams, Stenhousemuir <u>Objector:</u> AOC Oakfield (133/233) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The business and industry retention area at Carron Dams should be extended westwards to | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the allocation of the site for business and industry purposes is not appropriate. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| the boundary of the SSSI. | | |
| 10.4 Stenhousemuir Town Centre Boundary <u>Objector:</u> Aldi Stores Ltd (58/87) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Stenhousemuir Town Centre boundary should be extended to include the McCowan's factory site. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that there is no justification for extending the Stenhousemuir Town Centre boundary as suggested by the objector. |

| 11. Polmont Area | | |
|---|--|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| 11.1 Opportunity EN.POL5 - Lathallan House <u>Objector:</u> TPS Planning (149/270) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Opportunity EN.POL.5 offers insufficient support for enabling development as part of the restoration of the listed house and grounds. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Opportunity EN.POL5 is defined appropriately and should not be altered. |
| 11. 2 Green Belt at Beancross Road, Polmont <u>Objector:</u> Klondyke Group Limited (197/405) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Klondyke Garden Centre site should not be included in the Green Belt. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the site should remain within the Green Belt. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>11.3 Toravon Farm 2</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Ecosse Homes (41/65)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Toravon Farm should be allocated for residential development and included within the Urban Limit.</p> | <p>That the site should be allocated for housing purposes, with a capacity of 100-120 units. In the 'comments' section, it should be highlighted that an appropriate landscape treatment should be provided along the eastern boundary; and that the developer has indicated that 50% of the units to be provided on site would be affordable.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation with regard to the allocation of the site, but to augment the Reporters' recommended comment on affordable housing with a statement that a minimum of 25% of the housing on the site should be affordable, in line with Policy SC4, and to indicate that contributions to educational provision may be required, in line with Policy SC14.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that the site should be allocated for housing. However, the affordable housing requirement should to be consistent with Policy SC4. Reference to education contributions are a necessary safeguard, given capacity constraints at Maddiston Primary School.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 13.3</p> |
| <p>11.4 Parkhall South, Maddiston</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Maghera Developments (56/80)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Parkhall South, Maddiston should be allocated as a housing site.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it within the Urban Limit.</p> |
| <p>11.5 Parkhall North, Maddiston</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Manor Forrest (86/137)</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Parkhall North, Maddiston should be allocated as a housing site. | | housing purposes, or to include it within the Urban Limit. |
| 11.6 Vellore Road, Maddiston <u>Objector:</u> Central Scotland Housing Group (83/132) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Vellore Road, Maddiston should be included within the Urban Limit and allocated for housing. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for mainstream private housing. |
| 11.7 Greenwells Farm, Maddiston <u>Objector:</u> Sovereign House Developments (33/54) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Greenwells Farm, Maddiston should be allocated for housing, and included within the Urban Limit. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it within the Urban Limit. |
| 11.8 Hollandbush, Maddiston <u>Objector:</u> David Angus Limited (63/95) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Hollandbush, South Brae, Maddiston should be allocated for residential development. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it within the Urban Limit. |
| 11.9 Standrigg Road, Wallacestone | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p><u>Objector:</u> Wallacestone Community Expansion Limited (70/113,114) Wallacestone Regeneration Group (94/163)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> WCEL state that a site at Standrigg Road should be allocated for a 'care complex'. WRG state that the site should be released for housing.</p> | | <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it within the Urban Limit.</p> |
| <p>11.10 Polmont Burn, Reddingmuirhead</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> MacTaggart & Mickel (103/199) David Angus Limited (63/95)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Land at Middlerigg Farm, Reddingmuirhead should be allocated for housing.</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it within the Urban Limit.</p> |
| <p>11.11 Polmont Park, Polmont</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Mr Wilson (61/88-90)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Polmont Park should be allocated as a housing opportunity and removed from the Green Belt.</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it within the Urban Limit.</p> |
| <p>11.12 Whyteside Farm, Polmont</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Major Developments Ltd (88/143,144,146)</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Whyteside should be allocated for housing. Its designation as open space and as a SINC should be removed. | | housing purposes, and that its designation as open space and a SINC should remain. |
| 11.13 Proposal H.POL20 – Station Road, Polmont <u>Objector:</u> Major Developments Ltd (88/145) S Simpson (34/55) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Station Road should not be allocated for housing development. | That this housing allocation be deleted from the Local Plan and the site designated as open space under Policy SC12. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that the site has an important local role as open space. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 13.2 |
| 11.14 Opportunity ED.POL1 – Gilston, Polmont <u>Objector:</u> Hansteen Land Limited (93/502) Polmont Community Council (69/112) Land Options West (100/173) Persimmon Homes (136/243) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Hansteen object to the Council's proposed modification to require a review of Opportunity ED.POL1 in the next development plan. Polmont CC object to the allocation of ED.POL1. Land Options West and Persimmon Homes object to the failure to include a residential element within the mix of uses. | That the Council's pre-inquiry modification setting out a requirement to review ED.POL1 should not be incorporated in the Local Plan, and that the supporting text to ED.POL1 be amended so that it reflects the up to date factual planning position relating to the appeal decisions for the site. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that the reference to a requirement to review the Gilston allocation in the next development plan should not be included in the Local Plan, and that the text should be updated to reflect the current planning position. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 13.4 |
| 11.15 Opportunity ED.POL4 – Main Street, Maddiston | That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p><u>Objector:</u> Maddiston Community Council</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Main Street, Maddiston should not be identified for use as a neighbourhood shop.</p> | | <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that is appropriate to allocate this site for local service or community uses.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 13.5</p> |
| <p>11.16 Beancross Farm, Polmont</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Midland Electrical Winding & Contracting (Scotland) Ltd (91/149)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Beancross, Polmont should be allocated for business and industry purposes.</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for business and industry purposes.</p> |
| <p>11.17 Reddingmuirhead</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Redding Park Development Co Ltd (44/68)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Reddingmuirhead should be allocated for business and industry development.</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate this site for business and industry purposes.</p> |
| <p>11.18 Redding Road, Polmont</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Ogilvie Homes (102/178)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Redding Road, Polmont should be allocated for housing development.</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes.</p> |

PART 3: RURAL NORTH

| 12. Airth | | |
|--|---|--|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>12.1 Opportunity H.AIR7 – Castle View, Airth</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Ogilvie Homes Ltd (182/347) Airth Castle Limited (222/533)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Ogilvie Homes object to the allocation of Opportunity H.AIR7 for housing. Airth Castle Limited object to the Council's proposed modification to reduce the capacity of the H.AIR7 site.</p> | <p>That the site be retained for housing in the Local Plan, with a capacity of 115 units, and the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, subject to the inclusion of additional text in the 'comments' section as follows: <i>"A development brief and masterplan will be required to minimise potential adverse impacts on the landscape. This should include a detailed landscape and visual assessment, with appropriate mitigation measures"</i>.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the site is suitable for housing expansion in Airth, and that the reduction in capacity is also appropriate. The Council acknowledges the need for a development brief and masterplan, informed by landscape/visual assessment, and suitable landscape mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 15.2</p> |
| <p>12.2 Eastfield, Airth</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Ogilvie Homes Ltd (182/348,354)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Eastfield, Airth should be allocated for residential development.</p> | <p>That the southwest corner of the site be allocated for housing, extending to 1.8 hectares immediately south of existing housing at Kennedy Way, with a capacity of 40 units. In the 'comments' section, it should be highlighted that the site is in a prominent location at the entrance to the village and requires a high standard of design, which respects the historic interest to the west and provides an appropriate southern edge to the village and an appropriate treatment along the site's eastern boundary.</p> | <p>Not to accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council considers that the significant southward extension to the village recommended by the Reporters constitutes ribbon development along the east side of Main Street which would be unsympathetic to the character of the village, and the maintenance of a compact village form. It would also make it difficult to resist development on the other side of Main Street (the Airth Castle South site) which, as the Reporters' have</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | concluded, would have an adverse impact on the setting of Airth Castle and Old Airth Parish Church (see Section 12.4 below). |
| 12.3 Banks View, Airth <u>Objector:</u> Carronvale Homes (84/136) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Banks View, Airth should be allocated for residential development. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it would not be appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it within the Village Limit. |
| 12.4 Airth Castle South, Airth <u>Objector:</u> Murdoch Smith (80/550) Airth Parish Community Council (147/531) Ogilvie Homes Ltd (182/528) Airth Castle Limited (222/532) D & J Nairn (229/540) Historic Scotland (64/530) AWG Property (151/504) J Maciocia (223/534) Ms Sutherland et al (224/535) B Twiddle (225/536) L Cooper (226/537) Douglas Avenue Airth Homeowners Association (227/538) G Hannah (228/539) E Martin (230/542) C Mitchell (231/543) D Nicolson (232/544) S & M Williamson (233/545) A & D Stubbs (234/546) | That this housing allocation, as proposed in the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, should be deleted from the Local Plan, with the site placed outwith the settlement boundary and covered by countryside and TPO designations. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporter's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes due to likely adverse impacts on the setting of on the adjacent category A listed buildings and scheduled ancient monument. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>C & S Raine (235/547)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objection is made to the Council's proposed modification to allocate a site at Airth Castle South for residential development</p> | | |
| <p>12.5 Proposal H.AIR6 – South Green Drive</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> 88 Residents (212/486)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Site H.AIR6 should be retained as open space and not allocated for housing.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, which have deleted the housing proposal and designated it as open space.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the area should be safeguarded as open space.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 15.1</p> |

| 13. Letham | | |
|--|---|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>13.1 East Letham</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Murdoch Smith (80/127)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site to the east of Letham should be allocated for residential development.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it within the Village Limit.</p> |
| <p>13.2 West Letham</p> | <p>That only the southern part of the site identified within the Council's pre-inquiry modifications be</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p><u>Objector:</u> Murdoch Smith (80/548) Ogilvie Homes Ltd (182/529) AWG Property (151/505)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objection is made to the Council's proposed modification to allocate a site at Letham West for housing.</p> | <p>allocated for housing and included within the Village Limit. The site should be no more than 2.5 hectares, with a capacity of 30-40 units. In the 'comments' section and supporting text, adjustments should be made to indicate that a planning brief will required to set out design requirements.</p> | <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that this is the most appropriate location for the expansion of Letham. The Council accepts the Reporters' view that the site should be reduced in size.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 20.1</p> |
|--|---|--|

14. Skinflats

| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporter's Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
|---|---|---|
| <p>14.1 Skinflats East</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Messrs Flett</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Skinflats East should be allocated for residential development.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, and that it should remain within the Green Belt.</p> |

15. South Alloa

| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
|--|---|---|
| <p>15.1 South Alloa Village Limit</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p><u>Objector:</u> Hanson Ltd (170/327)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The South Alloa Village Limit should be extended to the south, and the whole of the objector's storage and distribution depot be allocated as a housing site.</p> | | <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it would not be appropriate to extend the Village Limit or to allocate the depot site for housing purposes.</p> |
|---|--|---|

| 16. Torwood | | |
|---|---|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>16.1 McLaren Park, Torwood</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> SM Developments (137/257)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at McLaren Park should be allocated for residential development.</p> | <p>That the site be allocated for housing, with a capacity of 10 houses, subject to the objector demonstrating capacity can be made available at the waste water treatment works to accommodate the development, and that the site should be included within the Village Limit. In the 'comments' section, it should be highlighted that a low density, high quality, housing development is required on the objection site, which must be controlled by a planning/design brief; that appropriate provision should be made for open space on site; that the trees around the site should be protected and reinforced by further planting; and that all infrastructure constraints have to be overcome.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation, and in addition, to make consequential changes to the Village Limit, extending it on the north east side of Glen Road.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council's accepts the Reporters' view that would form a suitable housing allocation. The inclusion of the site within the Village Limit means that the Village Limit would logically have to be extended to encompass some further existing properties along Glen Road.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 26.1</p> |
| <p>16.2 Torwood Village Limit</p> <p><u>Objector:</u></p> | <p>That the Village Limit be amended to include Greenacres and its garden ground.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u></p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>N Stevenson (59/84)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Village Limit of Torwood should be extended to include the property, and garden ground, at Greenacres, Torwood.</p> | | <p>The Council accepts the Reporters' view that, in conjunction with the allocation of McLaren Park for housing, the further inclusion of Greenacres within the Village Limit would be logical.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 26.1</p> |
| <p>16.3 Torwood Minerals, Torwood</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> J McCaig (143/409)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Torwood Minerals site should be identified for low density residential development.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes.</p> |
| <p>16.4 Glenbervie House</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> SM Developments (137/247)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Glenbervie House site should be identified as a gateway development opportunity, incorporating a mixed use leisure, tourism and housing development.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that Glenbervie House is not an appropriate site for housing development and that, while some elements of the hotel proposals may be acceptable in principle in terms of the Local Plan policies, there is no requirement to make a special allocation for them within the Local Plan.</p> |

PART 4: RURAL SOUTH

| 17. Allandale | | |
|--|---|--|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>17.1 Stein's Brickworks, Allandale</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Allandale Properties Ltd (210/484) I & H Brown (25/494)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Allandale Properties state that the Stein's Brickworks site should be allocated for residential development. I&H Brown object to the Council's proposed modification to include the site within the Allandale Village Limit.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, with the site being included within the Village Limit but without a specific allocation.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that whilst it is appropriate to include the site within the Village Limit, as outlined in the Council's pre-inquiry modification, it should not be identified for housing purposes.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 16.1</p> |

| 18. Avonbridge | | |
|---|---|---|
| Issue/Objections | Reporter's Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>18.1 Proposal H.AVN1 – Main Street, Avonbridge</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> L Tanner (192/383)</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that these sites are appropriate housing</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Sites H.AVN1 & 2 should be deleted from the Local Plan.</p> | | allocations which are capable of becoming effective. |
| <p>18.2 Proposal H.AVN5 – Slamannan Road 2, Avonbridge</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Drumbow Homes (90/161)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The capacity of Proposal H.AVN5 should be higher. Requirements to contribute to community infrastructure are questioned.</p> | That the site be reduced in size to include just the eastern part of the site (outwith the pipeline consultation zone), amounting to approximately 2.8 hectares, but that the capacity remain the same, giving an increased density. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that a reduction in the scale of the site, whilst maintaining the capacity, would be appropriate.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 17.1</p> |
| <p>18.3 Slamannan Road, Avonbridge</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> R & W Waugh (46/70)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Slamannan Road, Avonbridge should be allocated as a housing opportunity.</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporter's recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council' view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it in the Village Limit.</p> |
| <p>18.4 Bridgend Road, Avonbridge</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Balmuir Homes (78/125)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Bridgend Road should be allocated as a housing proposal.</p> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes, or to include it in the Village Limit.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>18.5 Proposal H.AVN4 – Bridgehill, Avonbridge</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> T Wilson (45/69)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Sites H.AVN4 should be deleted from the Local Plan.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the site is an appropriate housing allocation, which is capable of becoming effective.</p> |
|---|---|--|

| 19. California | | |
|--|---|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporter's Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>19.1 Proposal H.CAL4 – Church Road 2, California</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Ogilvie Homes Ltd (102/179)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objection was originally made to the stated capacity of the Proposal H.CAL4, but is now focussed on the Council's proposed modification to remove the site from the Local Plan</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modification, by removing H.CAL4 as a housing allocation.</p> | <p>Not to accept the Reporter's recommendation and to reinstate H.CAL4 as a housing allocation, with a capacity of 50 units.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Reporters considered that it was not appropriate to allocate the site because it was ineffective. However, the issues with sub-standard road access through site H.CAL1 have now been resolved and the roads brought up to adoptable standard. It should also be possible for the objector to negotiate access over the area of land outwith their control. Accordingly, circumstances have changed since the inquiry in a manner which suggests that the site is capable of becoming effective, and could make a useful contribution to the housing land supply in Rural South.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>19.2 Proposal H.CAL5 – Church Road 3, California</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> B Robertson (6/12) Hamilton & Kinneil Estates (8/18) B Gregors (36/60)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> The objectors seek various extensions to site H.CAL5.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate these sites for housing purposes.</p> |
| <p>19.3 Cliftonhill Farm, California</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> V Young (38/62)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Cliftonhill Farm should be allocated for housing and included within the California Village Limit.</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes.</p> |

| 20. Greenhill | | |
|---|---|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>20.1 Greenhill Road, Greenhill</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Mr Devlin (3/5-7) Allandale Properties (210/512)</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications by including the site within the Greenhill Village Limit.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the site should be included in the Village Limit, given its location and brownfield character, but that</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Mr Devlin seeks the allocation of a site at Greenhill Road for housing. Allandale Properties object to the Council's proposed modification to include the site within the Greenhill Village Limit. | | it would not be appropriate to allocate it specifically for housing purposes. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 19.1 |
|---|--|---|

21. Limerigg

| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
|---|---|--|
| 21.1 Slamannan Road, Limerigg <u>Objector:</u> AWG Property (151/506) Allandale Properties (210/512) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objection is made to the Council's proposed modification to allocate a site at Slamannan Road, Limerigg for housing. | That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications by including the site as a housing allocation, but with an amended site boundary corresponding to that of planning application P/08/0617/OUT, giving a site area of 1.94 hectares. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes. The Council considers that the revised site boundary is acceptable. <u>Modification Ref:</u> 21.1 |

22. Shieldhill

| Issue/Objections | Reporter's Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
|---|--|--|
| 22.1 Opportunity RC.SHIE1 – Belmont Avenue, Shieldhill <u>Objector:</u> | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Carronvale Homes (84/140)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Belmont Avenue, Shieldhill should be included within the Village Limit and allocated for housing purposes rather than open space.</p> | | <p>that the site should be retained as open space and should not be allocated for housing purposes.</p> |
| <p>22.2 Reddingmuirhead Road, Shieldhill</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> G Johnston (216/497) M Oliver (220/525) T Nimmo (221/527)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objection is made to the Council's proposed modification to allocate a site at Reddingmuirhead Road, Shieldhill for housing.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications by allocating the site for housing purposes, with the addition of text highlighting the constraint which former mining activity may present.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 23.1</p> |

| 23. Slamannan | | |
|---|--|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>23.1 Proposal H.SLA2 – Avonbridge Road, Slamannan</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> S McArthur (1/74) I Burden (12/28) J McArthur (35/59) J Smith (51/75) D Robertson (52/76)</p> | <p>That the capacity of the site be reduced from approximately 30 to approximately 10, and that reference is made to the need for a flood risk assessment.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes. The Council accepts that flooding is an issue affecting part of the site and that this is likely to restrict the capacity of the site as indicated.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>M Given (67/110) M&M Consultancy (106/192) Slamannan Regeneration Group (43/67)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Proposal H.SLA2 should not be allocated for housing development, or should be considered ineffective as a housing site due to constraints.</p> | | <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 24.2</p> |
| <p>23.2 Proposals H.SLA4/H.SLA7 – Blinkbonnie Terrace/Southfield Farm, Slamannan</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> S Hall (7/13,14,16) W Black (68/111) J Reminch (215/496) Drumbow Homes (90/162) AWG Property (151/507) M & M Consultancy (106/192) Slamannan Regeneration Group (43/67)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> S Hall objects to the allocation of sites H.SLA4 & 7 for housing. W Black seeks the extension of site H.SLA7. Drumbow Homes express concerns about requirements for developer contributions. J Reminch and AWG Property object to the Council's proposed modification to extend site H.SLA7. M & M Consultancy and Slamannan Regeneration Group consider that the sites are ineffective due to constraints.</p> | <p>(i) That housing allocation H.SLA7, as extended by the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, should be deleted from the Local Plan, with the site placed outwith the Village Limit and the SIRR boundary, and designated as countryside and part of the AGLV.</p> <p>(ii) That the 'comments' section to H.SLA4, as modified by the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, be amended to delete reference to the site being masterplanned in conjunction with H.SLA7, and to include the following text: <i>"While it should be possible to access the site from the B803, further investigations will be required. A footpath link should be provided to Balquhatstone Crescent at the north east corner of the site and the link from there to Bank Street retained and improved if necessary. Culloch Burn lies to the south of the site, and a flood risk assessment will be required, which will inform the development framework, the masterplan, and the layout of any development on site"</i>.</p> <p>(ii) That additional text be added to the Slamannan village statement stating that all development contributions will be raised in accordance with the texts contained in national planning policy guidance.</p> | <p>To partly accept the Reporters' recommendation, by deleting site H.SLA7 but retaining its north east corner as a housing allocation, as part of H.SLA4 .</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that there has been an overallocation of housing land in Slamannan as part of the SIRR, and that H.SLA7 should be deleted. A small part of H.SLA7 represents a natural rounding off of the Village Limit and can logically be developed as part of H.SLA4.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 24.3, 24.6</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>23.3 Proposal H.SLA5 – Blinkbonnie Terrace South, Slamannan</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> S Hall (7/17) M & M Consultancy (106/192) Slamannan Regeneration Group (43/67)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> S Hall objects to the allocation of site H.SLA5 for housing. M & M Consultancy and Slamannan Regeneration Group consider that the site is ineffective due to constraints.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications by deleting site H.SLA5 as a housing allocation.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the site is ineffective due to an ownership constraint and it is therefore not appropriate to allocate it for housing purposes.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 24.4</p> |
| <p>23.4 Hillend Farm Slamannan</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> M & M Consultancy (106/560) Slamannan Regeneration Group (43/559) SEPA (196/558) M Grant (237/555)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Objection is made to the Council's proposed modification to include land at Hillend Farm as a housing opportunity as part of the Slamannan SIRR. SEPA highlight that part of the Hillend Farm site is in an area at risk of flooding.</p> | <p>That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications by including the enlarged Hillend Farm site, and a new economic development opportunity ED.SLA1 at Hillend Farm. Additional information in the 'comments' section should be provided on the various sources of flood risk affecting the site and the need for flood risk assessment.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes as the principal focus of the Slamannan SIRR.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 24.1</p> |
| <p>23.5 Wester Jaw, Slamannan</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> M & M Consultancy (106/192)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u></p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for housing purposes as part of the Slamannan SIRR.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| A site at Wester Jaw should be allocated for housing as part of the Slamannan SIRR. | | |
| 23.6 St Lawrence Cottage, Slamannan <u>Objector:</u> S McArthur (1/1) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The Slamannan Village Limit for should be extended to the east to include St Laurence Cottage and adjacent ground. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that the site should not be included within the Village Limit. |

| 24. Standburn | | |
|--|--|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| 24.1 Standburn South <u>Objector:</u> Carronvale Homes (84/141) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site to the south of Standburn should be allocated for housing. | That the Council review all potential housing opportunities in Standburn, taking into account the objection site, and that, based on the review, they make a housing allocation of an appropriate size in the village. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation, and to modify the Local Plan to indicate that a further modest allocation up to 30 units will be made in Standburn, but with the precise location and boundaries of the site, or sites, to be identified through the preparation of Supplementary Planning Guidance, which will follow on after the adoption of the Local Plan. <u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that a modest allocation should be made in Standburn to ensure that the Local Plan is in accordance with Structure Plan Policy COM.4. However, the carrying out of such a review requires further |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>investigation and consultation, and in order to avoid further delay to the Local Plan, it is considered to appropriate to define the detailed location and boundaries of the new site, or sites, through Supplementary Planning Guidance, which would follow on from the adoption of the Plan.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 25.1</p> |
| <p>24.2 Standburn East</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> I McGillivray & J Pattinson (formerly Drumbow Homes) (239/561)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site to the east of Standburn should be allocated for housing.</p> | <p>That the Council review all potential housing opportunities in Standburn, taking into account the objection site, and that, based on the review, they make a housing allocation of an appropriate size in the village.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporters' recommendation, and to modify the Local Plan to indicate that a further modest allocation of 10-20 units will be made in Standburn, but with the precise location and boundaries of the site, or sites, to be identified through the preparation of Supplementary Planning Guidance, which will follow on after the adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The Council accepts the Reporters' view that a modest allocation should be made in Standburn to ensure that the Local Plan is in accordance with Structure Plan Policy COM.4. However, the carrying out of such a review requires further investigation and consultation, and in order to avoid further delay to the Local Plan, it is considered to appropriate to define the detailed location and boundaries of the new site, or sites, through Supplementary Planning Guidance, which would follow on from the adoption of the Plan.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 25.1</p> |

| 25. The Loan, Muiravonside | | |
|--|--|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| 25.1 The Loan, Muiravonside <u>Objector:</u> Select Developments (40/64) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> Two sites on the south side of the Loan should be allocated for housing. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate these sites for housing purposes, or include them within the Village Limit. |
| 25.2 Gillandersland Farm, The Loan <u>Objector:</u> David Angus Limited (63/94) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> A site at Gillandersland Farm should be allocated for housing. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate this site for housing purposes, or include it within the Village Limit. |

| 26. Other Rural South | | |
|--|--|--|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporters' Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| 26.1 Myrehead Steading, Whitecross <u>Objector:</u> Oneaxis (139/251) | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site for |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The steading at Myrehead Farm should be allocated for housing purposes. | | housing purposes. |
| 26.2 Woodhead Farm, by Bo'ness <u>Objector:</u> J Wood (110/201) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The steading at Woodhead Farm should be identified as a rural development opportunity. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site as a rural development opportunity. |
| 26.3 Boagstown Farm Steading, by Avonbridge <u>Objector:</u> W Waugh (111/202) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> The steading at Boagstown Farm should be identified as a rural development opportunity. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site as a rural development opportunity. |
| 26.4 Various Rural Brownfield Sites <u>Objector:</u> J McCaig (143/256,410,490) <u>Summary of Objections:</u> An additional policy should be introduced promoting redevelopment of various rural brownfield sites. | That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection. | To accept the Reporters' recommendation. <u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that there is no need for an additional policy as proposed by the objector. |

| 27. Landfill Sites | | |
|--|---|---|
| Issue/Objections | Summary of Reporter's Recommendation | Proposed Falkirk Council Decision and Reasons |
| <p>27.1 Inveravon, Polmont</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Marathi Ltd (150/272 -274)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> Inadequate provision has been made for meeting landfill requirements. A site at Inveravon should be allocated as for landfill purposes</p> | <p>That no modifications be made to the Local Plan in response to this objection.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporter's recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate the site at Inveravon for landfill purposes.</p> |
| <p>27.2 Proposal TR.RUR6 – Avondale, Polmont</p> <p><u>Objector:</u> Avondale Environmental Ltd (185/361-363) Callendar Estate (187/375)</p> <p><u>Summary of Objections:</u> A further extension to the existing Avondale landfill site should be identified. The boundary of the facility on the proposals map does not reflect the planning permission. The site should be removed from the Antonine Wall WHS buffer zone.</p> | <p>(i) That the Local Plan be modified in line with the Council's pre-inquiry modifications, with the boundary of TR.RUR6 extended to reflect the site granted planning permission, but Avondale House excluded.</p> <p>(ii) That the text relating to Avondale be updated to refer to the approval of reserved matters granted for the Material Recycling Facility in 2008, and that the facility be shown on the Proposals Map.</p> | <p>To accept the Reporter's recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The recommendation reflects the Council's view that it is not appropriate to allocate a further site for expansion of Avondale, but that the site boundary of the existing landfill site (TR.RUR6) should be amended to better reflect the planning application boundary. It is considered appropriate to show the proposed Materials Recycling Facility on the Proposals Map as it has planning permission.</p> <p><u>Modification Ref:</u> 6.11, 14.3, 14.4</p> |