



**Clackmannanshire  
Council**

[www.clacksweb.org.uk](http://www.clacksweb.org.uk)

**Greenfield, Alloa, Scotland, FK10 2AD (Tel.01259-450000)**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Thursday 19 January 2012 at 9.30 am**

**Venue: Council Chamber, Greenfield, Alloa, FK10 2AD**

---

For further information contact Finance and Corporate Services, Clackmannanshire Council, Greenfield, Alloa, FK10 2AD  
Phone: 01259 452106/2004 Fax: 01259 452230 E-mail: [customerservice@clacks.gov.uk](mailto:customerservice@clacks.gov.uk) [www.clacksweb.org.uk](http://www.clacksweb.org.uk)

Date	Time
------	------

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

---

The Planning Committee is responsible for taking decisions on planning applications and enforcement, dealing with regulatory issues arising in the fields of Building Control, Trading Standards, Environmental Health and non liquor licensing, all in line with Council policy.

**12 January 2012**

**A MEETING of the PLANNING COMMITTEE will be held within the Council Chamber, Greenfield, Alloa, FK10 2AD, on THURSDAY 19 JANUARY 2012 at 9.30 am.**

**DAVID THOMSON  
Legal Services Manager**

**B U S I N E S S**

	<b>Page No</b>
1. Apologies	--
2. Declaration of Interests	--
Members should declare any financial or non-financial interests they have in any item on this agenda, identifying the relevant agenda item and the nature of their interest in accordance with the Councillors' Code of Conduct. A Declaration of Interest form should be completed and passed to the Committee Officer.	
3. Confirm Minute of Planning Committee Meeting held on Thursday 22 December 2011 (Copy herewith)	01
4. Planning Application: Residential Development of Land - Former Forth Valley College Site, Branshill Road, Sauchie Clackmannanshire (Ref. No. 11/00219/PPP) - report by the Principal Planner (Copy herewith)	05

## COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP – PLANNING COMMITTEE

---

### Councillors

### Wards

Councillor Alastair Campbell (Convener)	5	Clackmannanshire East	CON
Councillor Tina Murphy (Vice Convener)	1	Clackmannanshire West	SNP
Councillor Kenneth Earle	4	Clackmannanshire South	LAB
Councillor Mark English	4	Clackmannanshire South	SNP
Councillor George Matchett	1	Clackmannanshire West	LAB
Councillor Walter McAdam	2	Clackmannanshire North	SNP
Councillor Bobby McGill	2	Clackmannanshire North	LAB
Councillor Harry McLaren	5	Clackmannanshire East	LAB
Councillor Derek Stewart	3	Clackmannanshire Central	LAB
Councillor Gary Womersley	3	Clackmannanshire Central	SNP



**Clackmannanshire  
Council**

www.clacksweb.org.uk

**THIS PAPER RELATES TO  
ITEM 3  
ON THE AGENDA**

**MINUTE OF MEETING of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held within the Council Chamber,  
Greenfield, Alloa, FK10 2AD, on THURSDAY 22 December 2011 at 9.30 am.**

**PRESENT**

Councillor Alastair Campbell (Convener)  
Councillor Tina Murphy (Vice Convener)  
Councillor Kenneth Earle  
Councillor Mark English  
Councillor George Matchett, QPM  
Councillor Walter McAdam, MBE  
Councillor Bobby McGill  
Councillor Harry McLaren  
Provost Derek Stewart  
Councillor Gary Womersley

**IN ATTENDANCE**

John Gillespie, Head of Community and Regulatory Services  
Ian Duguid, Development Quality Team Leader  
Andrew Wyse, Solicitor (Clerk to the Committee)

**PLA(11)26      APOLOGIES**

None

**PLA(11)27      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor George Matchett declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6 (Ref. No. 11/00298/FULL). As local member for Ward 1, Councillor Matchett had raised a constituent matter on behalf of the applicant.

**PLA(11)28      MINUTES OF MEETING: PLANNING COMMITTEE 24 NOVEMBER 2011**

The minute of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 24 November 2011 was submitted for approval.

**Decision**

The minute of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 24 November 2011 was approved as a correct record of the proceedings and signed by the Convener.

## **PLA(11)29      REPORT OF HANDLING ON PLANNING APPLICATION**

### **Report of Handling on Planning Application: Erection of 1 No. House and Domestic Garage and formation of access road at land to the south of Carsebridge Row, Sauchie, Clackmannanshire (Ref. 11/0142/FULL)**

A report submitted by the Principal Planner summarised a planning application for the above noted development and made a recommendation to Committee on the application. The application requires to be determined by the Planning Committee as it includes a small area of land owned by the Council.

#### **Motion**

That Committee approves the application subject to the terms and conditions set out in the report.

Moved by Councillor Alastair Campbell. Seconded by Councillor Gary Womersley.

#### **Decision**

The Committee agreed unanimously to APPROVE the application subject to the terms and conditions set out in the report.

#### **Action**

Service Manager (Development)

## **PLA(11)30      REPORT OF HANDLING ON PLANNING APPLICATION**

### **Report of Handling on Planning Application: Erection of 1 No. House, land north of Armour Place at Bard's Way, Tillicoultry (Ref. 11/00296/FULL)**

A report submitted by the Development Quality Team Leader examined the nature of the proposals, location of the proposed development and the site history of the surrounding development. The examination took account of relevant development plan policies and allocations and other material considerations, including representations from interested parties. The report recommended that the application be approved subject to the terms and conditions identified in the report

The Council is currently responsible for maintaining the land within the application site and for this reason, the application cannot be determined by the Council's Appointed Officer under the Scheme of Delegation.

The Development Quality Team Leader introduced his report and advised the Committee that one representation had been omitted in error from the list of representations at paragraph 5.1 of the report:

- Mrs Walsh, 14 Heathwood Crescent, Tillicoultry.

A late representation had been received from Mr McAulay, 15 Bard's Way, Tillicoultry. The Development Quality Team Leader advised the Committee that the report of handling covers the issues raised by this representation.

The Committee then heard representations from:  
Mr Peter Tait, representing AMCA Architects (Applicant/Agent)  
Ms Claire Walsh, Objector  
Mr Peter F Griffin, Objector  
Mrs Johanna M Griffin, Objector  
Mr Alan Munro, Objector

## **Motion**

That the application be deferred to allow officers opportunity to see and consider the document circulated by Mr Alan Munro, Objector, to Committee Members.

Moved by Provost Derek Stewart. Seconded by Councillor Kenneth Earle.

## **Vote**

The motion was defeated by 8 votes to 2.

The Committee heard legal advice from the Clerk that the document submitted by Mr Alan Munro, Objector, and circulated to members on a confidential basis forms no part of the agenda papers and has no official status. In setting the document in context, members must consider it in that light as a single sided presentation and whether the document presents any new information which could potentially place the Council in a difficult position in relation to any appeal if it seeks to rely on the information it contains, on the relevance of the section 75 Agreement regulating the original development, and that in determining the application the Committee were required by the statutory process to approve the application unless there were sound planning reasons to do otherwise.

## **Motion**

Having considered all of the information set out in the report and all of the representations made, that the Committee approves the application subject to the terms and conditions set out in the report.

Moved by Councillor Alastair Campbell. Seconded by Councillor George Matchett, QPM.

## **Voting**

The motion was defeated by 8 votes to 2.

## **Decision**

Accordingly, on a division of 8 votes to 2, the Committee, having considered all of the information set out in the report and the representations made, refused the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is contrary to Policy EN11 of the Clackmannanshire Local Plan, as it will not make a positive contribution to the surrounding environment, and is not a high quality of architectural design that will integrate with its surroundings. The form, scale and layout will not reflect or enhance the character of the area. The loss of this area of established open space will detract from, rather than protect or enhance, the local landscape, woodland, and habitat. The proposed development as submitted will not ensure that established landscape quality within the overall development is maintained.
2. The proposed development is contrary to Policy RES 4 of the Clackmannanshire Local Plan, as it comprises infill development which will result in the loss of open space that is of value to the community. The proposed development will result in a significant loss in the standard of amenity presently enjoyed by existing residential properties in close proximity to the site.

## **Action**

Service Manager (Development)

- Councillor Mark English withdrew from the meeting on conclusion of this item.

## **PLA(11)31      REPORT OF HANDLING ON PLANNING APPLICATION**

### **Report of Handling on Planning Application: Erection of Garden Shed (Retrospective) at 6 Newbiggin Crescent, Tullibody, FK10 2RT (Ref. No. 11/00298/FULL)**

A report of handling on the above application for planning permission submitted by the Planning Officer considered the relevant planning policies in the Development Plan, consultation responses and any other material considerations.

As the Council has an interest in the application for planning permission, the Council's Appointed Officer is prohibited from making a determination. Accordingly, the application is reported to the Planning Committee for decision.

Councillor George Matchett declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item and took no part in the debate or the vote on the application. As local member for Ward 1, Councillor Matchett had raised the matter on behalf of his constituent, the applicant.

#### **Motion**

That Committee approves the application subject to the terms and condition set out in the report.

Moved by Councillor Alastair Campbell. Seconded by Councillor Tina Murphy.

#### **Decision**

The Committee agreed to APPROVE the application subject to the terms and condition set out in the report.

#### **Action**

Service Manager (Development)

## **PLA(11)32      STREET NAMING REPORT**

A report submitted by the Head of Community and Regulatory Services asked the Committee to decide the name of a new street. The report set out the results of a consultation exercise seeking a suggested name for a street in Sauchie.

#### **Motion**

That Committee agrees the recommendation set out in the report.

Moved by Councillor Alastair Campbell. Seconded by Councillor Gary Womersley.

#### **Decision**

The Committee agreed unanimously that the development at the former workshops at Greygoran, Sauchie, be known as:

"Kippen Place"

#### **Action**

Head of Community and Regulatory Services

ENDS 10.50 am



---

**Report to Planning Committee of 19th January 2012**

---

---

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Planning application ref: 11/00219/PPP - Residential Development of Land - Former Forth Valley College Site, Branshill Road, Sauchie, Clackmannanshire</b>
-----------------	---

---

---

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Forth Valley College</b>
-------------------	-----------------------------

---

---

<b>Agent:</b>	<b>GVA, Quayside House, 127 Fountainbridge, Edinburgh, EH3 9QG</b>
---------------	--

---

---

<b>Prepared by:</b>	<b>Grant Baxter, Principal Planner</b>
---------------------	--

---

---

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Clackmannanshire Central</b>
-------------	---------------------------------

---

**1.0 Purpose**

- 1.1. This report summarises a planning application for the above noted proposed development and makes a recommendation on the application to Members. The application is being reported to the Planning Committee for a decision as the proposal constitute a Major development.

**2.0 Recommendations**

- 2.1. The application for Planning Permission in Principle is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions and reasons.

2.2. Conditions and Reasons

1. a) Before any construction works commence on site, the written approval of the Council as Planning Authority shall be obtained for the details of the siting design and external appearance of all buildings, the means of access and landscaping, including future maintenance (Matters Specified in Conditions (MSC).
- b) Particulars of the MSC referred to in item (a) above shall be submitted for consideration by the Planning Authority, and no work shall begin until written approval has been given.
- c) Application for approval of all MSC shall be made to the Council as Planning Authority within 3 years of the date of this permission.

- d) The development hereby permitted shall begin within 5 years from the date of this permission, or within 2 years from the date of approval by the Planning Authority of the last of the MSC to be approved.
2. Further to Condition 1, any subsequent applications for the approval of MSC shall be accompanied by:
- a) A detailed assessment of the site's overland flow paths that demonstrates the site has been designed to ensure no flooding to any existing or proposed properties from a 1 in 200 yr (0.5%) return period storm event.
  - b) A Drainage Impact Assessment prepared in accordance with the advice contained in "Drainage Assessment - A Guide for Scotland" and proposals prepared in accordance with "Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems - Design Manual for Scotland and Northern Ireland". These will include connections to existing infrastructure and upgrading thereof, the provision of on-site filtration and attenuation facilities, design for biodiversity, incorporating a series of ponds, swales and appropriate planting, timescales for implementation and arrangements for future maintenance.
  - c) A full tree survey of all trees within and adjacent to the site, recording the species, position, height, crown spread and condition of all trees, to be carried out by a qualified arboriculturalist.
  - d) A Ground Investigation to assess the nature, extent and type of contaminated material within the site, the assessment to be carried out in accordance with BS 10175 and CLR 11; and a remediation scheme to ensure that the site is fit for its proposed use in accordance with the foregoing standard, in consultation with the Council's Environmental Services.
  - e) A Site Waste Management Plan for the development, construction and post development phases of the proposed development, produced with reference to the Council's Supplementary Advice Note - Managing Waste in Housing and Commercial Developments. The plan shall detail measures for waste minimisation, separation, re-use and recycling, identifying storage and collection requirements/facilities.

The development shall thereafter proceed in accordance with the requirements of any approval of MSC issued by the Council unless subsequently otherwise agreed in writing by the Council, as Planning Authority.

3. The application or applications for the approval of MSC described in Condition 1 above shall include:
- a) A Site Layout Plan at a minimum scale of 1:500 showing the position of all buildings, public utility and energy infrastructure, roads, footpaths, parking areas, public and private spaces, walls, fences, open space and children's play facilities and landscaping.

- b) Plans and elevations of all buildings, showing the dimensions and type and colour of external materials.
  - c) Details of existing and finished ground levels and finished floor levels, in relation to a fixed datum (preferably Ordnance Survey) and including levels immediately adjacent to the site.
  - d) A Construction Method Plan or plans that contain the arrangements to minimise the environmental and road safety impact of construction activity and all vehicle movements on the adjacent public road network, during the construction phase or phases of the development. The plan will include community liaison arrangements.
4. Further to Condition 1, the first application for approval of MSC shall include the following proposals:
- a) A specification and plan(s) of transport infrastructure improvements including:-
    - (i) A new Zebra Crossing off Fairfield Road, close to its junction with Park Crescent, to improve linkages to Craigbank Primary School as generally shown on the applicant's Indicative Site Layout.
    - (ii) An improved pedestrian route compliant with the Equalities Act 2010 to link the site to Pompee Road.
    - (iii) Enhancement of existing pedestrian routes linking the site with Branshill Park and Woodlea Park.
    - (iv) Traffic calming measures on Branshill Road along the frontage of the site.
  - b) Details of the provision of a Travel Pack to be provided to all new residents of the proposed development, prepared in consultation with the Council's Roads and Transportation Section.
  - c) A Phasing Plan, identifying in plan and written form the components of the proposed development, including demolition, ground preparation and remediation, all houses including affordable housing provision, structures, roads and footpaths, landscaping, SUDs and public utility works.
  - d) Details of public art provision in the form of a student-led project run by Forth Valley College, to produce a new piece of public art to be installed in the locality of the site.
  - (e) Details of the provision of affordable housing amounting to no less than 7% of the proposed number of houses within the site or a commuted sum of no less than £300,000 towards the provision of affordable housing in the locality.

5. Further to Conditions 1 and 3, the Scheme of Landscaping shall include:-
- (a) Existing trees and hedges to be retained.
  - (b) The type, number and location of proposed native trees and shrubs.
  - (c) The creation of a centrally located level area of open space of no less than 5000m<sup>2</sup>, including an area for ball games and a play area containing between 6No. and 8No. items of play equipment, enclosed and under-surfaced with an appropriate and approved safety surfacing, with seating and litter bins. The area of open space should have houses facing onto it on at least two sides, and houses should be at least 20m from the play area boundary.
  - (d) Details of the location, design, landscaping and boundary treatment of proposed SUDs infrastructure.
  - (e) Timescales for implementation and arrangements for future maintenance.
  - (f) Arrangements for lodging of a Landscape Bond or other form of security to cover provision and maintenance of all areas of communal open space including all areas of planting, trees, SUDs, ball games area and play area.
6. The Illustrative Site Layout Option drawing submitted with the application is NOT hereby approved. The detailed site layout required by Condition 3, above, shall be designed fully in accordance with the Government Policy Statement, Designing Streets, and should meet the six qualities of successful places, set out therein. In particular the layout should incorporate the following elements:
- (i) A strong built and landscaped frontage to Branshill Road, utilising key feature house types, boundary walls and railings, and high quality hard and soft landscaping including native shrubs and trees.
  - (ii) Consideration of the scope to incorporate the large verge area on the south side of Branshill Road along the site frontage into the development, including realignment of Branshill Road and the creation of a positive built frontage in accordance with point (i) above.
  - (iii) Consideration of the need for more than one vehicular access onto Branshill Road, based on optimising the potential to enhance the entrance to the site and the character of this section of Branshill Road.
  - (iv) Creation of a clearly defined and articulated linked hierarchy of streets and spaces within the development based on the principles of inclusive design and place making as set out in Designing Streets.
  - (v) The use of building types, positioning, orientation and articulation to create a sense of place within the public realm of the site.

7. Before any works start on each respective phase of development, protective fencing if required by the Council shall have been erected around all trees to be retained as part of the development, in accordance with BS 5837(2005). The fencing shall be inspected by a representative of the Council, and shall remain in place for the duration of the construction work within each respective phase.
8. No construction work shall take place and no construction vehicle or equipment shall operate outwith the hours of 0800-1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800- 1300 hours on Saturday, and at no time on Sundays or local Bank Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council.

#### Reasons

1. In order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.
2. In order to ensure that the Reserved Matters comply with the development that has been approved as part of this planning permission.
3. In order to ensure that the Reserved Matters comply with the development that has been approved as part of this planning permission.
4. In order to ensure that the Reserved Matters comply with the development that has been approved as part of this planning permission.
5. In order to ensure provision of high quality open space, play provision and landscaping.
6. In order to ensure the proposed development incorporates the principles of good street design as set out in the Government Policy Statement, Designing Streets
7. In order to ensure that trees are properly protected during the construction phase of the development.
8. In order to safeguard the amenity of nearby residents during the construction phase of the development.

#### 2.3. Reasons for Decision

The site is identified in the Clackmannanshire Local Plan as a preferred site for residential development once the college use ceased. The Clackmannanshire Local Plan First Alteration (Housing Land), Adopted October 2011 identifies the site as Housing Policy H23. In addition, the proposal would redevelop brownfield land for residential use, in accordance with Policy RES 2 of the Local Plan. The principle of the development is therefore acceptable in policy terms and there are no other material considerations that indicate the development should otherwise not be approved.

The proposals are in principle only, and if approved will be subject to detailed consent stages, where the houses types, street layout, and all other detailed aspects of the proposals shall be presented. The above noted planning conditions set a framework for the detailed proposals to follow.

## 2.4 Plans in Relation to the Decision

1. General Level Survey, FVC\_1
2. Promap Location Plan

## 3.0 Background to the Proposals

3.1. The site is the former campus for Forth Valley College (previously Clackmannan College), located on Branshill Road, Sauchie. The site extends to 5.5Ha and occupies an elevated position in the town, and generally rises from east to west. It is broadly rectangular in shape with a frontage of approximately 125m onto Branshill Road to the north east, and largely abutting residential properties on all other sides. The site contains a complex of mainly two storey former college buildings which are now vacant. The remainder of the land is made up of areas of hardstanding, parking and roads, large grassed areas, including sports pitches, and an enclosed horticultural area in the north west part of the site. This area contains some mature trees, and smaller trees are also located along the site's frontage to Branshill Road and next to the main access road.

3.2. The application is for Planning Permission in Principle for residential development of the site, which would assume demolition of all existing buildings, consent for which is already in place. Whilst, only seeking permission in principle, the application indicates a development of 140No. houses and is supported by:

- Supporting Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Transport Assessment
- Environmental Report
- Illustrative Site Layout Option Drawing

## 3.3 Summary of Supporting Documents:

### 3.3.1 Supporting Planning Statement

This gives an overview of the site and its context, details of the proposals, and of the planning status of the site, including the Development Plan and other material considerations. The statement emphasises the support in principle from the development plan for residential development of the site, and also its brownfield status. The statement also indicates that residential use of the site is compatible with its surroundings, and can enhance the site and its

surroundings. It also gives an overview and summary of the other detailed reports submitted with the application.

### 3.3.2 Design and Access Statement (DAS)

As is required by current planning legislation relating to major developments, the applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement (DAS) with the application.

The DAS identifies the constraints and opportunities of the site. The existing buildings, site levels, terracing and lack of features worthy of retention were identified as constraints, whilst the site also presented opportunities for better pedestrian links to its surroundings, new recreation space and enhanced landscaping and planting, including along the Branshill Road frontage.

The design ethos proposed involves development of 140 houses of 2,3 and 4 bedroomed detached, semi-detached and terraced types. Key design principles include a strong build and landscaped frontage to Branshill Road and a main central area of open space, taking advantage of views into and out of the site. The DAS indicates that the site's shape dictates building orientation and street layout, and proposes generally linear streets in a grid pattern, and incorporating design principles from the Government's Designing Streets Policy.

Access for vehicles is proposed only from Branshill Road, but with enhanced pedestrian links to integrate with adjoining street networks and public transport routes.

### 3.3.3 Transport Assessment (TA)

This document was prepared on behalf of the applicant by SIAS Consultants, and assesses the traffic situation around the site, during its use as a college, and how this would change as a result of the proposed development. The report considers traffic impact, including pedestrian, cycle and public transport and makes a set of recommendations for transport infrastructure upgrades where necessary.

The TA has assessed the traffic generation from the proposed development as being comparable with that associated with the previous college use, albeit the patterns of travel will be different. On this basis, the TA proposes the following roads infrastructure improvements:

- A zebra crossing at Fairfield Road/Park Crescent to improve links to Craigbank Primary School.
- A pedestrian route to link Branshill Road with Pompee Road.
- Traffic measures on Branshill Road along the site frontage.

### 3.3.4 Environmental Report

This report was prepared on behalf of the applicant by Halcrow Ltd. It concludes that:

- Given the low environmental sensitivity of the site, it is considered that the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impact on the environment.
- The site was not identified as representing a significant ongoing source of contamination, based on its previous uses. Some investigative and risk assessment work, including gas monitoring will nevertheless be required before development commences.
- Consultation with the Regional Archaeologist should take place before development commences.

3.4 Due to the site's size (over 2Ha), the planning application constitutes a Major Development and as such, the applicant was required to carry out a pre-application consultation process in the local community, prior to submission of the application, and submit a Pre-application Consultation (PAC) Report with the planning application, which they have done, and is summarised in Section 5 of the report, below.

## 4.0 Consultations

4.1 Roads: No objections. The detailed layout should be informed by Designing Streets Policy, although the indicative layout submitted does not fully reflect this approach. Transport infrastructure upgrades referred to in the TA are accepted. The assertion in the TA that the development will generate less traffic than the previous college use and that therefore, no improvements are required at the Branshill Road/Parkhead Road junction, is not accepted, due to the different spread of traffic a residential development will generate, compared to the previous college use. As such a low cost junction improvement, such as a mini-roundabout should be considered. A number of other detailed comments are made on the proposals and TA, including consideration of pedestrian links, requirement for an assessment of overland flow flood risk and SUDs scheme. *Comment: Issues regarding internal road layout, pedestrian links and SUDs can be addressed in suitable planning conditions. It should be noted that the site lies in an area of low flood risk, and an FRA is not considered necessary before PPP can be granted. A condition that considers the issue of overland flows within the development, rather than the flood risk to the site from a watercourse would therefore be suitable. Issues in relation to the Parkhead Road/Branshill Road junction are considered in more detail in **Section 6.0 Planning Considerations** of the report.*

4.2 Environmental Health: No objections. Details required of control of noise, dust etc during demolition/construction and also a limit on hours of activity. Environmental Health agree with the findings of the Environmental Report submitted with the application, and any outstanding issues can be dealt with by condition. *Comment: Demolition Consent for the existing buildings is already in place, and includes a demolition management plan.*

4.3 Education: The site lies in the catchment of Craigbank Primary School. Taking account of current and projected rolls, and the proposal to incorporate Sauchie Nursery into Craigbank PS, there is spare capacity at Craigbank PS for 57No. Pupils. Based on this assessment, Craigbank can accommodate up



to 228 additional houses within its catchment before any additional accommodation is required. Education Service will have to consider how any development of over 80No. houses is managed in Lornshill Academy. *Comment: The assumed capacity of the proposed site is 140No. houses, and therefore there is adequate capacity at Craigbank PS to accommodate this size of development.*

- 4.4 Land Services: A detailed tree survey is required. Tree protection measures in accordance with BS 5837 should be applied to all trees to be retained. The indicatively proposed area of open space is slightly too small and should be at least 5000sqm, with provision for ball games and an equipped play area with 6 to 8 items of play equipment. A detailed landscape plan should be submitted with the detailed layout and showing high quality treatment along Branshill Road.
- 4.5 Housing: The Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) indicates a requirement for 2601No.houses over the next 10 years in the Alloa housing market sub area within which the site lies. Housing would therefore look for the maximum of 25% (35 units) affordable housing to be provided on the site, 75% of which should be social rented type, although direct discussions between the developer and Housing on how the requirement could be met would be welcomed. Such discussions could include consideration of a reduced number of social rented houses being provided without public subsidy, and consideration of off-site provision and commuted sums as alternatives to on-site provision. There is a particular need for four and one bedroomed social rented houses. The site shows a good range of house types. Provision of a small number of wheelchair units should be considered for the site. *Comment: The issue of affordable housing is discussed in detail in **Section 6.0 Planning Considerations** of the report.*
- 4.6 Scottish Water: No objections, however water/drainage capacity cannot be reserved at this stage. Due to the size of the development, a Drainage Impact Assessment will be required. A separate SUDs scheme for surface water will be required.
- 4.7 SEPA: No objections subject to a planning condition being attached requiring details of a SUDs scheme.
- 4.8 Sauchie Community and Residents Group: No objections to proposed housing development, subject to there being a green belt running to the rear of the hedge bordering Branshill Park; there being no flats in the site; a children's play area being provided; a roundabout being created at the junction of Branshill Road and Parkhead Road. *Comment: This is an application for planning permission in principle (PPP) and it is noted that the Sauchie Community Group have no objections to the principle of residential development. A number of the comments raised are matters that are reserved for the more detailed stages of consent, should PPP be granted, and which the group would be consulted on. The Design and Access Statement indicates that the development will consist of houses only, and the TA indicates that traffic generation from the proposed development will be comparable with that generated by the previous use of the site.*

- 4.9 Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society: No objections. A path through the site from Branshill Road to Branshill Park is a useful local link, although not recorded as a Right of Way. It is noted that this route is shown as an opportunity to enhance pedestrian links in the Design and Access Statement.

## **5.0 Publicity and Representations**

- 5.1 Under new planning legislation, all applications for Major and National Developments require to carry out a pre-application consultation exercise, in order to seek communities' views on the proposals at least 3 months before a planning application is submitted. As this application falls into the "Major" category, by virtue of the size of the site development, these procedures apply.
- 5.2 To this end, the applicant submitted a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN) to the Council on 21 April 2011. This set out the applicant's proposals for public consultation, including direct consultation with the Sauchie Community Group and Alloa Centre Community Council, notification of neighbours of the site (535 properties in total), and hosting of a public drop-in event, which took place on 1st June within the former college. This event was also advertised in the local press on 25 May 2011, and posters were displayed at local shops. The event was attended by 157 people, many of whom provided feedback on comments cards.
- 5.3 As required by legislation, this planning application is submitted with a pre-application consultation (PAC) report which summarises the public consultation exercise, provides analysis on feedback and how this has been taken into account in the application submission. The report summarises the key elements of the consultation as follows:
- Eighty six feedback forms were received from the 157 attendees at the public event, giving a 55% questionnaire response rate.
  - Of these 86 responses, 57 (67%) were generally not in favour of the proposed residential development.
  - In respect of a question asking what were the good features of the development, 59% of respondents could not see any good features. Of the 41% who could see benefits, 11% welcomed the mix of house types; 10% welcomed a proposed play area; and several others welcomed the redevelopment of a derelict site and new planting.
  - In respect of what changes to the proposals respondents would wish to see, 26% were unhappy about the prospect of flats on the site. Other popular response requested inclusion of refuse collection points, and low building heights to protect views.
  - A range of additional comments were also made, and included concern about increased traffic, a request for more consultation, and a desire for private rather than social housing.
- 5.4 The applicant has set out in the PAC report how they have responded to the feedback, although acknowledge that this is an application for PPP only, and

many of the issues raised are detailed and would be addressed at the detailed Matters Specified in Conditions (MSC) stage, however the following responses have been given by the applicant to key issues raised through the consultation:

- The 3 proposed blocks of flats have been removed, and the indicative layout shows 140No. houses.
- The indicative open space area has been enlarged and located centrally.
- A Transport Assessment (TA) has been undertaken which demonstrates that the number of car trips from the proposed development is comparable with the previous college use.
- Proposed landscaping has been extended along the northern boundary.

5.5 The planning application, when submitted, was advertised in the local press and a total of 117No. neighbouring properties were notified of the application. In response a total of three representations were received from the following parties:

- R Alexander, 72 Woodlea Park, Sauchie
- Mrs V Wardrope, 1 Parkhead Road, Sauchie
- Mrs M McGrorty, 7 Fairfield, Sauchie

and are summarised below:

- Concern as to whether the proposed development is for Council housing: *Comment: The application is made by FVC, and not the Council, although there may be a requirement for a proportion of the site to consist of affordable housing.*
- A question raised as to whether new boundary treatment will be erected between existing and proposed houses. *Comment: This is likely to be a matter that would be addressed following the grant of PPP at the MSC stage, where detailed plans are submitted.*
- Concern regarding increased traffic generation, particularly at the junction of Fairfield Road and Parkhead Road, making crossing more difficult for pedestrians. Concern regarding HGV movements during demolition/construction. *Comment: The TA proposes a new zebra crossing on Fairfield Road, and a construction traffic management plan will also be required, which would address these concerns.*

## **6.0 Planning Considerations**

6.1 The application requires to be determined in accordance with the Council's Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.2 The site is identified in the Clackmannanshire Local Plan adopted 2004 is one which is preferred for housing development if the existing use ceases. The relevant policies from the Clackmannanshire Local Plan relating to the application are as follows:

- Policy RES 2 Brownfield Development: Supports residential development on previously developed sites including vacant and underused land and property. This policy supports the application which would redevelop the site of the former college, which is currently lying vacant.
- Policy RES 3 Clackmannan College Site: This is a site specific policy that supports the redevelopment of the site for residential use, subject to the requirements of a brief. This policy also supports the development, and a draft brief has been prepared, which is referred to below.
- Policy RES 5 Affordable and Particular Needs Housing: This policy sets out a requirement for developments of 30 or more houses to provide for affordable and particular needs housing, up to a target of 25%, dependant on an assessment of local needs and circumstances, and taking account of all other material considerations. The response of the Housing Service on local need is set out in Section 4 above. The issue of proposed affordable and particular needs contribution arising from the development is discussed under the Developer Contributions heading, below. Ultimately it is for the Council to determine the required contribution towards affordable housing and therefore the development will require to comply with this policy, based on the Council's assessment of local needs in the context of all other material considerations.
- Policy RES 7 The Layout and Form of Development, Policy RES 8 Amenity Standards and Policy RES 11 Development Principles for Large Housing Developments: These policies sets out design criteria for all housing developments, including larger developments such as this, and seek to provide high standards of residential design, layout and amenity. It should be noted that this is a PPP application and detailed design issues will be addressed in subsequent MSC stages, nevertheless, important design parameters can be set out at this stage, and indeed, the applicant has submitted an indicative layout as part of the Design and Access Statement. This is considered in more detail below. It is also worth noting that some of the provisions of Policies RES 7 and RES 11 are perhaps somewhat outdated and have been superseded by the provisions of the Government Policy, Designing Streets, which is a significant material consideration, and has guided some of the developer's thinking on the indicative layout. In considering this application, the Council will seek to ensure the development meets high standards of design and residential amenity in accordance with the intentions of these policies.
- Policy RES 9 Open Space Principles and Policy RES 10 Open Space Standards: These policies seek to ensure provision of adequate open

space and recreation to serve new developments. As with Policies RES 7, 8 and 11, compliance with these policies will depend greatly on the details of subsequent MSC applications, however, in the indicative layout and supporting documents, the applicant has indicated an intention to provide open space and play provision in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Land Services Section, as set out in their consultation response in Section 4 of this report. This level of provision would constitute compliance with these policies.

- Policy INF 2 Integration of Transport and Development Proposals: The proposals are considered to comply with this policy which seeks to locate new developments where they are conveniently served by public transport, and can be easily accessed on foot or by bicycle. Bus routes and stops lie in very close proximity to the site on Parkhead Road and Pompee Road. In addition, the site lies within walking distance to the Mixed Leisure Route and Alloa Rail Station. The Service is keen to promote new and enhanced active travel routes associated with the development. To this end, the applicant has indicated an intention to enhance pedestrian links to the north east and north west, as well as improve the route to Craigbank Primary school, through installation of a new zebra crossing at Fairfield Road.
- Policy INF 4 Development Standards: This policy requires new developments to comply with the Council's Roads Development Guidelines, and indicates that Transport Assessments will be required in relation to larger development proposals. The Council's Roads and Transportation Section have indicated that the Government Policy Designing Streets provides an overarching ethos to their approach to roads and street design. The applicant intends to adopt Designing Streets approach in the detailed layout of the development, and a TA has been submitted, the recommendations of which this Service largely concurs with. The issue of a possible roundabout at the junction of Branshill Road and Parkhead Road is discussed under the Developer Contributions heading below.
- Policy INF 13 Public Art: The Service will expect major private sector developments to provide a contribution to public art through the proposed development. The applicant has indicated a willingness in principle to this, and the details of any such contribution are discussed under the Developer Contributions heading below.
- Policy INF 14 Existing Public Parks, Amenity Open Spaces, Allotment Gardens, Playing Fields and Sports Pitches: This policy seeks to resist the loss of such facilities to development unless particular circumstances apply. The site contains open space including pitch provision. In this case, the site is identified for residential development in the Clackmannanshire Local Plan, and in this respect, the Council has already taken a decision to develop the site, including pitches, for housing. Nonetheless, the proposals involve the provision of a new park with provision for ball games and an equipped play area, which will serve both the new development and existing adjacent communities. The application does not therefore conflict with this policy as there will be a re-provision of suitable open space and play

facilities within the redeveloped site, that will also serve the adjoining existing communities.

- Policy EN11 Enhancing Environmental Quality: This policy sets out criteria which new developments should address in order to positively contribute to their immediate environment. As with a number of other policies referred to above, compliance with Policy EN11 will largely depend on the detailed submissions following the grant of PPP. The details of the applicant's design and access statement and opportunity to redevelop this brownfield site in an appropriate manner indicate that the proposals are likely to result in a development that enhances its surroundings and complies with this policy.

6.3 In light of this summary, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the adopted Clackmannanshire Local Plan.

6.4 The Clackmannanshire Local Plan 1<sup>st</sup> Alteration (Housing Land) adopted November 2011 identifies the site as housing Policy H23, for speculative new build and affordable housing. A draft Development Brief has been prepared for the site, the key elements of which are considered to be reflected in the application submission.

6.5 The planning application is therefore considered to be in accordance with the Alteration to the Local Plan and the draft brief.

6.6 Developer Contributions

Policy H23 of the Local Plan Alteration indicates that the site should be developed for speculative and affordable homes, and indicates a requirement for a public art contribution. A draft development brief prepared by the Service for the site makes reference to both affordable housing and public art contributions but also the possible requirement for an education contribution to the school estate, pending a review of school capacity and further consultation. The brief currently remains in draft form, pending this review.

6.7 The consultation response of both Education and Housing Services are summarised in Section 4, above, and set out the position in respect of both these areas of potential developer contribution. In addition, the Roads response has raised the issue of a possible requirement for a mini roundabout at the junction of Branshill Road and Parkhead Road.

6.8 The applicant's agent has submitted, along with the planning application, a set of confidential documents setting out the applicant's position in relation to possible developer contributions arising from the proposed development. These set out development viability appraisals, and also factor in specific issues for Forth Valley College (FVC) as applicant and site owner, such as the costs associated with demolition of the existing buildings on the site, the reduction in value of the site during the current recession and the need for the college to pay for the newly completed college campus at Hawkhill. The Scottish Government has advised local Planning Authorities to give due consideration to the current state of the housing market in considering the scale and delivery of community infrastructure requirements on new developments.

- 6.9 These documents make reference to the College's role in providing education services and state that the development of this site for housing will bring significant benefits for education in Clackmannanshire. The Service acknowledges the status and role of FVC as applicant in this case, and also the consultation response from Education indicating that the primary school estate has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development. The Service is therefore satisfied that there is no requirement for the developer to contribute to education provision through this proposed development.
- 6.10 The Housing Service has set out their expectation in respect of the provision of affordable and particular needs housing from the development, taking account of the HNDA and Policy RES 5 of the Local Plan. Both this policy and response of the Housing Service to the application indicate that, whilst local needs indicate a requirement for 25% affordable housing, a degree of flexibility will be required both in this figure and how it is delivered, taking account of local circumstances and other material considerations.
- 6.11 In alluding to the financial constraints that it is already under, the applicant has indicated that, in the circumstances, it would be in a position to deliver an affordable housing contribution of 7% or £300,000 (equivalent to 10 affordable homes) as part of this development. Taking account of the Housing response, the statements from the applicant and the Service's consideration of all these and all relevant factors in the context of the Local Plan policy, the Service is satisfied this represents an appropriate contribution in this case.
- 6.12 In respect of public art, the applicant has argued that as a further education college, they are not a private sector developer, and should not be subject to this policy. They have also highlighted the public art contribution from the development of the new college, in the form of the new sculpture installation at Shillinghill Roundabout. The Service does, nonetheless, consider that an appropriate public art contribution is required in connection with this proposal, in accordance with the Local Plan. To this end, the applicant has now indicated a willingness to undertake a student-led project with the aim of providing suitable public artwork provision at a location considered acceptable by the Council. On balance, this is deemed to be an acceptable approach to addressing public art as part of this planning proposal, taking account of the above circumstances.
- 6.13 The TA submitted with the application proposes a package of transport infrastructure improvements, including a new zebra crossing at Fairfield Road, and traffic calming along the site frontage. The findings of the TA are that the development will generate a comparable level of traffic to the previous college use, however, Roads and Transportation consider that there may be an overall increase in traffic arising from the proposed development, and spread through the year, rather than only during term times and opening hours of the former college. As such they have indicated that a junction improvement, in the form of a mini-roundabout at the Parkhead Road/Branshill Road junction should be considered. Construction of such a mini-roundabout is likely to cost upwards of £80,000, notwithstanding any requirement to move utilities, which could significantly increase costs. In addition, there is land, currently open space, on the northwest side of the junction that would be required to form any such roundabout. Initial investigations of Title to this land by the Council's Law and Administration indicate that the ownership situation is far from clear,

and this may be a significant constraint on the ability to provide any roundabout.

6.14 Notwithstanding this, it is therefore clear, that not only would any roundabout be a significant and currently unknown cost to the development, the case for the roundabout is not clear based solely on the traffic generated from this redevelopment of the former college. There may also be legal issues around land ownership that could prevent the installation of a roundabout of the required radius. Taking account of the findings of the TA, and Roads and Transportation's comments, it is considered that any additional traffic generated by the proposed development, compared to the site's previous use, would be outwith term and college opening times, rather than generating higher peaks of traffic at specific times. Finally, the area of land in question contains attractive trees and hedging, and is an piece of amenity open space of some value at the junction of Branshill Road and Parkhead Road. although this is not a requirement of the draft brief for the site, nor the development plan. For these reasons, the Service concur with the findings of the TA, that the transport infrastructure improvements associated with the development need not include a new mini-roundabout at the junction of Branshill Road and Parkhead Road.

6.15 In summary, the Service has considered the infrastructure requirements for this proposed development, in the context of the Development Plan, consultation responses, representations from the applicant, and also bearing in mind the desire of the Council and the Scottish Government to see effective housing sites allowed to commence without being overburdened by infrastructure demands, particularly where such demands may prevent the redevelopment of a brownfield site for much needed new housing in the area.

6.16 As such, the anticipated developer funded infrastructure requirements arising from this development, not including the on site open space and play provision, can be summarised as follows:

- A zebra crossing at Fairfield Road/Park Crescent to improve links to Craigbank Primary School.
- A pedestrian route to link Branshill Road with Pompee Road.
- Traffic measures on Branshill Road along the site frontage.
- Provision of 7% affordable housing.
- Provision of a public art project resulting in production of a new public artwork.

6.17 Layout and Design Issues

Whilst the illustrative site layout submitted with the application makes reference to design principles set out by the draft Development Brief for the site and the Designing Streets policy, it may not represent the optimum approach to developing the site layout. At this stage however, it is considered that the site layout should be developed on the basis of a set of key development principles, which the applicant has largely identified, and



also build on current Government design policy, as set out below:

- A strong built and landscaped frontage to Branshill Road, utilising key feature house types, boundary walls and railings, and high quality hard and soft landscaping including native shrubs and trees, incorporating part of the southern road verge into the development in a positive manner.
- Consideration of the scope to incorporate the wide verge on the south side of Branshill Road, as it passes the site, into the development in a positive manner.
- Consideration of the need for more than one vehicular access onto Branshill Road, based on optimising the potential to enhance the entrance to the site, the character of this section of Branshill Road and the hierarchy of streets within the development in accordance with the principles set out in Designing Streets.
- Provision of a park located centrally within the development with a minimum area of 5000sqm, including a fully equipped play area (with a minimum of 6 to eight items of play equipment), space for ball games and with high quality boundary treatment and planting, and houses with positive frontage facing onto the open space.
- The overall ethos of street layout and the relationship of buildings to the street and of public to private space guided by the six key principles of Designing Streets: **Distinctive; Easy to Get to and Move Around; Welcoming; Adaptable; Resource Efficient; Safe and Pleasant.**
- The development should consist of a range of housing of no more than two storey design, including detached, semi-detached and terraced houses, to provide a mix of house types and create a variety of buildings types, designed and laid out to visually enhance and articulate the development.
- Incorporation of SUDs to address surface water drainage of the site, in accordance with SEPA guidance.

## 6.18 Summary

The application complies with the Council's Development Plan, and will allow for the positive redevelopment of a brownfield site with vacant buildings for much needed new housing in the area. There are no other material considerations that indicate the application should not be supported

- 6.19 A set of planning conditions will be required in order to ensure that the detailed proposals, beyond this "in principle" stage are also in accordance with the Development Plan, Government policy and advice, and the Council's expectations for high quality new residential development in Clackmannanshire. These conditions are set out in **Section 2** of this report.

## 7.0 Sustainability Implications

- 7.1 The proposed development would re-use a brownfield site for residential development, in accordance with the Development Plan.

## 8.0 Resource Implications

### 8.1 Financial Details

- 8.2 The full financial implications of the recommendations are set out in the report. This includes a reference to full life cycle costs where appropriate.

Yes ☒

## 9.0 Exempt Reports - Reasons for Exemption

- 9.1 This is not an exempt report.

## 10.0 Declarations

The recommendations contained within this report support or implement our Corporate Priorities and Council Policies.

- (1) **Our Priorities 2008 - 2011** (Please double click on the check box ☒)

The area has a positive image and attracts people and businesses	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our communities are more cohesive and inclusive	<input type="checkbox"/>
People are better skilled, trained and ready for learning and employment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our communities are safer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vulnerable people and families are supported	<input type="checkbox"/>
Substance misuse and its effects are reduced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health is improving and health inequalities are reducing	<input type="checkbox"/>
The environment is protected and enhanced for all	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Council is effective, efficient and recognised for excellence	<input type="checkbox"/>

- (2) **Council Policies** (Please detail)

Clackmannanshire Local Plan

## 11.0 Equalities Impact

- 11.1 Have you undertaken the required equalities impact assessment to ensure that no groups are adversely affected by the recommendations?

Yes ☐

No ☒

## 12.0 Legality

- 12.1 It has been confirmed that in adopting the recommendations contained in this report, the Council is acting within its legal powers. Yes ☒

## 13.0 Appendices

- 13.1 Please list any appendices attached to this report. If there are no appendices, please state "none".

None

## 14.0 Background Papers

- 14.1 Have you used other documents to compile your report? (All documents must be kept available by the author for public inspection for four years from the date of meeting at which the report is considered)

Yes ☐ (please list the documents below) No ☒

### Author(s)

NAME	DESIGNATION	TEL NO / EXTENSION
Grant Baxter	Principal Planner	01259 452615

### Approved by

NAME	DESIGNATION	SIGNATURE
Julie Hamilton	Development Service Manager	
John Gillespie	Head of Community and Regulatory	

