

The background of the slide is a large, light blue watermark of the City of Vancouver's coat of arms. It features a crown at the top with four maple leaves. The shield is divided into four quadrants: top-left shows a city skyline with a diagonal beam of light; top-right shows a stag's head with a cross above its antlers; bottom-left shows a three-masted sailing ship on wavy water; bottom-right shows an eagle with spread wings perched on a branch. A banner at the bottom contains the motto 'A NE FOR A' in a stylized font.

Agenda Item 7

Minutes

Draft

FALKIRK COUNCIL

**Minute of Meeting of the Planning Committee held in Bo'ness Academy,
Gauze Road, Bo'ness on Monday 21 October 2019 commencing at 7.00 p.m.**

The purpose of the meeting was to hold a pre-determination hearing in terms of the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006. When sitting in this capacity, the Planning Committee comprises all members of the Council.

Councillors:

David Aitchison	David Grant
David Alexander (Convener)	Gordon Hughes
Robert Bissett	Adanna McCue
Allyson Black	Lynn Munro
Jim Blackwood	Alan Nimmo
Gary Bouse	Depute Provost Ann Ritchie
Joan Coombes	

Officers:

Kevin Brown, Planning Officer
Ian Dryden, Development & Building Standards Manager
Arlene Fraser, Committee Services Officer
Jack Frawley, Committee Services Officer
Iain Henderson, Legal Services Manager
Alistair Shaw, Development Plan Co-ordinator
Russell Steedman, Network Co-ordinator

Also

Attending:

Charles Church, Mactaggart & Mickel
Christine Dalziel, Barton Wilmore
Colin Lavety, Barton Willmore
Alex Orr, Orbit
Nigel Pacey, AWG

PDH9. Apologies

Apologies were intimated on behalf of Provost Buchanan; and Councillors Balfour, Collie, Kerr, McLuckie, Meiklejohn, Murtagh, Reid and Spears.

PDH10. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

PDH11. Pre-Determination Hearing Procedures

The Convener formally welcomed those present and outlined the procedures relating to the meeting.

PDH12. Development of Land for Residential Use (Including Affordable Housing), Community Facilities & Associated Development at Land to the South of Bo'ness Fire Station, Crawfield Lane, Bo'ness for MacTaggart & Mickel and AWG - P/19/0409/PPP

The Committee considered a report by the Director of Development Services on an application for planning permission in principle for the development of land for residential use, including affordable housing, community facilities and associated development at land to the south of Bo'ness Fire Station, Crawfield Lane, Bo'ness.

1. Kevin Brown, Planning Officer outlined the nature of the application and the consultations carried out. Consultation responses were outstanding from both NHS Forth Valley and The Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society. He advised that a letter of representation had been received from West Lothian Council in respect of the application. A number of concerns had been raised by the Council's Transport Planning Unit in respect of the methodology used to produce the original Transport Assessment. A revised Transport Assessment containing additional information had been submitted by the applicant.
2. On behalf of the applicant, Colin Lavety, Barton Willmore was heard in relation to the application. He advised that the site had previously been promoted through the emerging Local Development Plan (LDP) process as part of a larger site. The site had been identified by the Council's Planning Officers, as a Strategic Growth Area (Bo'ness South West) in both the LDP Main Issues Report and proposed LDP2 committee draft (Site HO7-450 houses). However, the site had been removed by members at the Full Council meeting on 27 August 2018 and was no longer identified for development in the emerging LDP.

Mr Lavety referred to the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) which required Councils to maintain a minimum 5 year supply of effective housing land at all times, and the Council's mechanism for addressing any shortfall through Policy HSG01. As the Council's most recent audit showed a shortfall of 599 units, failure to meet housing targets could have an influence on the Reporters examination of the Council's LDP2, and that the site could be reinstated in the forthcoming LDP. It was the applicant's opinion that there were no other desirable sites in Bo'ness.

He detailed the application for planning permission in principle, which related to one half of the original site and which proposed a residential development of up to 225 houses, 75 of which would be affordable housing. The site also identified land for future development for community facilities, significant areas of open space for recreational use and planting and landscaping. The proposed development also had enhanced drainage provision as well as new and improved roads.

Mr Lavety set out the benefits of the proposed development which included:-

- delivery of 225 new homes, 75 of which will be affordable homes
- significant areas of landscaping and open space
- support local population growth
- traffic calming measures to improve road safety
- variety of new recreational routes
- £40m investment into the local economy

He advised that community exhibitions had taken place both prior to and following submission of the application. The applicant's view was that there was significant support for the development, with 57% of returned questionnaires showing a demand for local housing. The number of objections received were at a relatively low level and this reflected the effectiveness of the pre-application engagement, the applicant's efforts to address local opposition and to make improvements to the proposed development. He concluded that the submitted Response to Objections report showed that there were no insurmountable constraints to the development of the site.

He recognised that the proposed development lay within the green belt, but he considered that it complied with the Council's LDP with the shortfall in the housing land supply supporting development. He commented that development was supported by officers of the Planning authority.

He stated that no objections had been received from statutory consultees; all relevant assessments had been undertaken; the development proposed a number of improvements in terms of traffic calming, flooding & drainage, and to the landscape.

Mr Lavety concluded that this was the most logical site for new housing in Bo'ness. There were no technical constraints and on balance the proposal complied with the local development plan.

3. Questions were then asked by Members of the Committee as follows:-

- Q(a) What were the proposals for traffic calming?
- Q(b) Had any regard been made to closure of Bo'ness Road which would generate additional traffic on Wholeflats Road?
- Q(c) What was the objection submitted by West Lothian Council?
- Q(d) Would there be an impact to infill development within greenbelt land and whether this application could "open" things up?
- Q(e) Did the proposed development fulfil the Council's obligation for effective housing land supply?
- Q(f) What was the potential impact on Bo'mains Meadow Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?
- Q(g) Would locals be "outpriced" from purchasing properties on the site?
- Q(h) What impact would the proposed development have on local schools and health centres?

Responses:-

- (a) Mr Lavety advised that there were indicative proposals for traffic calming on Crawfield Road set out in the application but that specific detail would follow at the detailed design stage of the process.
- (b) Mr Lavety stated that the scope of the submitted traffic assessment had been agreed with the Roads Unit and that this had not been included. No formal objection had been received from the Roads Unit. Kevin Brown advised that, at this stage, no objection had been received from the Transport Planning Unit on this matter and that this would be covered in the report to Council.
- (c) Kevin Brown advised that West Lothian Council are working on draft supplementary guidance for developer contributions towards transport infrastructure and sought contributions from the developer towards junction 3 of the M9.

- (d) Kevin Brown stated that this was a standalone proposal and at this time, there was currently no consideration at this stage on other sites. Ian Dryden advised that ineffective housing land supply would engage HSG01 Policy and that this matter would be covered in the report to Council.
- (e) Ian Dryden advised that there was an ineffective land supply in the Council's LDP and emerging LDP and as previously stated, would be covered in the report to Council.

Mr Lavety stated that there was a 599 shortfall and the number can change quickly. The site had been identified to accommodate housing growth which was needed for strategic growth in Bo'ness.

- (f) Kevin Brown stated that the SSSI lay to the west and is some distance away from the proposed development. No objection had been received from Scottish National Heritage.
- (g) Kevin Brown advised that this came in the representations section. He stated that this was not the view of the Development Management Unit at this stage.
- (h) Kevin Brown advised that NHS Forth Valley had yet to comment. Children's Services had responded advising that no contributions would be sought for schools but that they would seek contributions for nursery provision.

- 4. Section 38A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 together with Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 give those persons who have submitted representations on relevant planning applications the right to be heard before Committee of the Council before the application is determined. On this occasion, in addition to those persons who had submitted representations, some other members of the public in attendance at the meeting were permitted to address the Committee.

- (a) Madeline Hunt advised that she thought the Community Council had submitted representations. She indicated that she had concerns in relation to potential flooding; that no affordable housing might be available within the site of the development; the proposed development lay within the greenbelt and was not identified in the Local Development Plan; the land was the only remaining landscaped area between Linlithgow and Bo'ness; two additional roads would be constructed; there would be additional road traffic on the existing already busy roads; and

that planning permission in principle did not always give a clear indication of the final development.

- (b) Mr Davidson requested information on what the plans were for the existing roads coming off Crawfield Road as he had concerns about the additional traffic and also the current condition of the existing roads. He also raised concern at the amount of traffic on the road, especially at the start and end of the school day.

Mr Lavety stated that the Traffic Assessment undertaken had not identified the need to upgrade any surrounding roads. It was proposed that 2 new access points and traffic calming on Crawfield Road would be developed and that these were detailed in the application.

- (c) Marion Stewart raised concerns on road implications, especially Borrowstoun Road; she acknowledged the overall need for housing, but that this was not the location; that the residents would shop in Linlithgow and not in Bo'ness; there was not adequate infrastructure; and there was no other benefits for Bo'ness apart from housing. She also sought clarification on where members of the public could access reports.

Mr Lavety confirmed that traffic counts had been taken; that all junctions operated within capacity and that a full Transport Assessment had been lodged with Falkirk Council. The development would offer affordable housing and bring new families into the area which could enhance the sustainability of current resources.

Ian Dryden advised that all public documents were accessible on Falkirk Council's website. Officers could also be contacted to assist, if required.

- (d) Duncan McIntosh raised concern that the development would break the greenbelt with further development to the south and west being a possibility.

Ian Dryden advised that members were only obliged to determine the application lodged and could not comment beyond that.

- (e) Pauline Purves, objector, referred to the shortfall in housing supply across the Falkirk Council area and commented that it could be made up over the whole district, without impacting on greenbelt. She also referred to the lack of information on the community use of the site at this stage.

Mr Lavety advised that community use on the site was included after the developer had listened to locals. However, no clear consensus of what the community wanted had been identified at this stage so matters have been left open for development.

PDH13. Close of Meeting

The Convener concluded by thanking the parties for their attendance and advising that the matter would be determined by Falkirk Council on a date yet to be determined.