

Appendix 6 - Verbatim comments on the Buchanan Rural Development Framework and Responses

S Simmers (63)

The Policy resisting the sub-division of plots in the Draft South RDFA on page 11 should be re worded "The Sub-Division of Garden Grounds for New Development will require to meet the requirements of Design Guidance and maintain the character and density of development within the Estate". This statement is more positive and can cross refer to other guidance and policy. We object to the general resistance of the Park Authority to the sub-division of garden grounds as a blanket policy stance. Where plots are of insufficient size to be sub-divided and still maintain the low density appearance of the estate and they comply with the Sub-Division of Plots Guidance, they should be allowed. This is in line with the Supplementary Guidance on Housing on page 20, which allows for the Sub-Division of Plots through the Plan Area, subject to the Design Guidance set out on page 36 of the Draft Supplementary Guidance on Design Issues. As can be demonstrated on the attached plan, Mr and Mrs Simmers can achieve a second house on this plot, which is as large as the other plots on Castle Gardens. (Buchanan Castle Estate)

Response: *The statement about subdivision of garden grounds is not a blanket policy and the wording states 'generally' so allows some scope if appropriate.*

Montrose Estates (as owner of Buchanan Castle Golf Club) (0180)

On behalf of Montrose Estates (1993) Ltd, owners of Buchanan Castle Golf Club, can I offer the undernoted comments with regard to the Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance for Buchanan South that has been issued for public consultation by LLTNPA. Firstly, we greatly appreciate the efforts being made by LLTNPA to engage the local people and business community in the planning process and would acknowledge the success that has been achieved to date. There will undoubtedly be differences of opinion on what is appropriate and what should be resisted but to date LLTNPA appears to have encouraged discussion and thereafter correctly evaluated the numerous ideas and views that were expressed at the public meetings. As part of Montrose Estates (1993) Ltd, Buchanan Castle Golf Club welcome a new balance of sensitive areas and development opportunities and would stress the importance of the Golf Club being able to pursue development ideas aimed at:

- a) enhancing the facilities and financial viability of the Golf Club for its members and guests,
- b) securing the role of the Golf Club within the Montrose Estate portfolio and
- c) maintaining and enhancing the ancillary buildings and grounds.

To this end we welcome the new Draft Guidance and would emphasise our wish to continue dialogue with LLTNPA in respect of a few development opportunities (e.g. holiday lodges, small business offices etc.) that were highlighted during the public consultation exercises.

Response: *Noted and support welcomed, no modification proposed.*

Montrose Estates (Duke of Montrose) (709)

May I offer the undernoted comments in respect of the Draft Supplementary Guidance that has been issued for public consultation by Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park Authority (LLTNPA). Firstly can we compliment the LLTNPA on not only the various public meetings and consultations that have been hosted over the last few months, at which Montrose Estates was represented and was pleased to present some ideas on its needs and aspirations, but also on the extent to which the range of views expressed during these sessions appear to have been taken on board. From the estate's own point of view we are very pleased to note that the Guidance highlights the protection required for the sensitive areas around the River Endrick and the Loch Lomond shoreline. However, of equal

importance to the future of the estate is an acknowledgement that scope exists in other areas for the sympathetic redevelopment of existing traditional buildings along with some new development. As we have explained, continual investment is required in the on-going maintenance of the estate. In order to generate funds for re-investment works, the estate must identify suitable development opportunities. These must fall within a broad and forward-looking framework for the estate on a 5 and 10 year basis but it is appreciated they must also fall within the policies and expectations of LLTNPA and other statutory authorities. Our discussions over the last 18 months or so, and now formalised to some degree in the Draft Guidance, have been very positive and the estate welcomes this approach by LLTNPA. At the same time, the estate is also keen to co-operate with LLTNPA's own proposals and the possibility of an affordable housing development at Milton of Buchanan and a sympathetic redevelopment of the former Buchanan Castle are on our list of priorities for further discussion in the near future. We also look forwards to exploring new opportunities on the estate together with the LLTNPA as they may emerge. Overall the Estate greatly appreciates the opportunity for openness and co-operation with LLTNPA and warmly welcomes the terms of the Draft Guidance for Buchanan South.

Signed, By The Duke of Montrose on behalf of Montrose Estates (1993) Ltd

Response: *Noted and support welcomed, no modification proposed.*

David McCulloch (626)

Regarding Buchanan Castle Estate, I fully support the recognition in the guidance that the "quiet characteristic" and "infrastructure constraints" mean that there are "limited opportunities for further development". Regarding the specific opportunities mentioned in the guidance, I would comment as follows:

- Golf Club: I note the reference to self-catering lodges for golfers. Whilst I do not object to such development in principle, I would hope that such development is indeed "small scale" unlike the planning authority's approval for a holiday village in the former quarry comprising 13 x 6-bed chalets (i.e. 78 occupants). Any self-catering lodges for the golf club should be directly adjacent to the golf course, and should comprise no more than about six lodges so that the quiet residential characteristics of the estate are not degraded.
- Castle: I support any consolidation of the castle ruin, funded by small scale residential development, possibly on the land behind the castle walls. I would not support any attempt to restore the castle itself by turning it into a block of flats.
- Garden grounds: I support the aim to avoid development by sub-dividing garden grounds. I would however also like the guidance to refer to the need to avoid development on the various undeveloped plots dotted about the estate such as the small plots of woodland that separate the houses. These woodland plots help to hide many of the buildings, provide privacy by providing a buffer zone between houses, and support the wildlife that live in the estate e.g. roe deer, pine martens etc.
- Quarry site: The planning permission for the 78-person holiday village was very unpopular with most estate residents as it was a large scale development that would have changed the quiet residential character of the estate. In principle, I would therefore support any change in planning policy that would encourage a small scale residential development of perhaps six homes in the quarry, whether affordable or otherwise. The buildings should be located within the boundary of the former quarry floor to reduce their impact on the landscape, and there should be no building on the raised land within the site that surrounds the quarry floor.

Response: *Points above in relation to golf club, castle and quarry all noted and no modification proposed. In relation to development in garden grounds, guidance has been amended.*

James Graham (668)

There was strong sentiment at the November 2014 charrette held in the Buchanan Memorial Hall that the Milton should be strengthened and enhanced as the location of key community infrastructure. (Like many Scottish rural communities, this is already under threat.) This does not come across in the draft guidance and little consideration is given to the Milton despite its central role in the community. Another strong sentiment at the meeting was that the living environment in the area should not become suburbanised - this is a rural environment.

Response: *Guidance recognises this and supports affordable housing here over Buchanan Estate. No modification proposed.*

The Oak Tree Inn (698)

We refer to the recent charrettes for the Drymen to Balmaha corridor and the latest public presentation of the Draft Buchanan South Supplementary Guidance leaflet at Balmaha Visitor Centre earlier this month. Firstly, as local residents and business owners we welcome the focus that is being placed upon the Buchanan / Balmaha area. We appreciate our area, like Luss and Arden, experiences particular pressures and would agree with those comments which highlight the imbalance over the last decade or so whereby the majority of developments have been tourism-orientated rather than residential. As ones who has been responsible for quite a few recent developments in Balmaha we have to say that to a great extent, however, this has been as a result of the restrictive Local Plan policies that have been applied which effectively negated any new residential developments. On reading the new document and discussing its content with Susan Brooks and Kirsty Sweeney it is apparent that LLTNPA are seeking to redress this imbalance by encouraging a mix of open market and affordable housing in Balmaha, Montrose House, Milton of Buchanan and hopefully also at the former quarry site in Buchanan Castle Estate. There will always be opposing opinions from some quarters but in our view the LLTNPA efforts to encourage the residential development of these four sites with a varying range of house types ought to be applauded. With regard to public realm improvements in Balmaha these were also proposed by public comments and have duly been incorporated within the document. Again this should be applauded and hopefully suitable ideas and proposals will come forward.

Finally, in order to encourage non-car-based travel to the area, again we are pleased to see that the public suggestions relating to bike, walking and water-borne trips to Balmaha have been incorporated. Overall we believe the Draft Guidance has very successfully incorporated the public views expressed over the last few months and from a personal point of view we would applaud the positivity now being shown by LLTNPA.

Response: *Noted and support welcomed, no modification proposed.*

SEPA (713)

We would recommend that flood risk is referenced in the Buchanan South area as the consider there is a potential flood risk in the development area from fluvial, loch and surface water sources. Caveats & Additional Information the Indicative River & Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) has been produced following a consistent, nationally-applied methodology for catchment areas equal to or greater than 3km² using a Digital Terrain Model (DTM) to define river cross-sections and low-lying coastal land. The outlines do not account for flooding arising from sources such as surface water runoff, surcharged culverts or drainage systems. The methodology was not designed to quantify the impacts of factors such as flood alleviation measures, buildings and transport infrastructure on flood conveyance & storage. The Indicative River & Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) is designed to be used as a national

strategic assessment of flood risk to support planning policy in Scotland. For further information please visit <http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/water/flooding/flood-maps>.

Response: *Agreed, a description of the constraints within the area including flooding has now been included in the introduction to the guidance, referring both to the Local Development Plan policies and SEPA's flood maps.*