

**Planning and Building Standards Services**



Proposed South Lanarkshire  
**Local Development Plan**

Call for Sites Assessment  
**Technical Report**

May 2013



**Community and Enterprise Resources**



# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## Contents:

1. Introduction
2. Assessment Criteria
3. Cambuslang/Rutherglen
4. Clydesdale
5. East Kilbride
6. Hamilton

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 As part of the pre Main Issues Report (MIR) consultation for the South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan (SLLDP) the Council invited developers, landowners or other interested parties to bring forward suggestions for sites that could be included in the MIR as potential development opportunities. Along with letters to developers and agents, the 'Call for Sites' consultation was advertised in the local papers and on the Council's website.
- 1.2 As a result a first tranch generated just over 200 sites for consideration. This included a number of sites owned by the Council as potential surplus assets. Following publication of the MIR a further 29 sites were brought forward for consideration and these were assessed using the same criteria as the first set of sites.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## 2.0 Assessment Criteria

2.1 An initial screening of the sites indicated that they fell into 3 categories:

- ◆ Category 1: Sites already included within the adopted local plan or with planning consent and therefore do not need to be reassessed under this plan.
- ◆ Category 2: Small scale sites (usually less than 4 units) or sites already within a settlement boundary that would be more appropriately considered through the submission and assessment of a planning application.
- ◆ Category 3: Sites that required to be considered against emerging spatial strategy, impact on infrastructure and environmental considerations.

### Category 1 and 2 Sites

2.2 The parties who submitted the category 1 and 2 sites were informed by letter of the decision regarding the status of their site and invited to submit a planning application, if appropriate. The list of sites falling under category 1 is shown on Table 1 and category 2 on table 2.

**Table 1 – Sites classified as Category 1  
(Already in the local plan or with planning consent)**

<b>Ref no</b>	<b>Address</b>
CR/66/001	Gilbertfield, Cambuslang
CR/66/003*	Langlea Avenue, Cambuslang
CL/04/001	North Back Road, Biggar
CL/04/002	North Back Road, Biggar
CL/04/003	North Back Road, Biggar
CL/10/005	Boghall Road, Carluke
CL/10/006	Mayfield Brickworks, Carluke
CL/10/008	Galahill Bing, Carluke
CL/10/011	Boghall Road, Carluke
CL/10/015*	Luggie Road, Carluke
CL/37/005	Stanmore Rd , Lanark
CL/65/007	Kerswell, near Carnwath
CL/65/008	Kerswell, near Carnwath
HM/81/004*	Ashgillhead Road
HM/82/004	Sunvic Uddingston
HM/85/005*	Buchan Street , Hamilton
HM/85/008*	Annsfield Farm, Hamilton
HM/85/009*	Wellcroft Road, Hamilton

\* Council owned sites

**Table 2 – Sites classified as Category 2  
(Sites of a scale or nature more suited to being subject to a planning application)**

<b>Ref no</b>	<b>Address</b>
CR/66/002*	Westburn Nursery, Cambuslang
EK/71/011*	Eden Drive, East Kilbride
EK/71/012*	Murray Primary School , East Kilbride
EK/71/013*	Maxwellton Primary School, East Kilbride
EK/71/014*	Canberra Primary School, East Kilbride
EK/71/015*	Hunter Primary School, East Kilbride
EK/71/016*	Recreation Ground, Jackton
EK/72/001	Gilmourton
EK/75/002	Crookedshields Road, Nerston
EK/77/011	Hills Road, Strathaven
EK/78/001	South Hill of Dripps, Thorntonhall
EK/78/004	Ballinluig, Thorntonhall
CL/01/001	Glengonnar, Abington
CL/10/014*	Sandy Road, Carluke
CL/10/016*	Carluke Primary School
CL/16/001	Richland Nursery, Cleghorn
CL/21/005	Oakbank Nursery, Crossford
CL/35/001	Byretown Road, Kirkfieldbank
CL/37/001	Glenclotha, Lanark
CL/37/006	Hollow Glen, Lanark
CL/37/010*	Former swimming pool, South Vennel, Lanark
CL/37/011	Ridgepark School Lanark
CL/37/012*	Caldwellside Plot 2B Lanark
CL/37/013*	Grazings, Caldwellside, Lanark
CL/39/001	Symington Street, Leadhills
CL/40/004*	Langdykeside, Lesmahagow
CL/53/001	Elmwood, Symington

## Call for Sites Technical Report

---

CL/53/003	Wyndales Farm, Symington
CL/65/004	Land at rear of Ponfeith Bungalow Sandilands
CL/65/005	Hyndford House
CL/65/006	Hyndford Gate
CL/65/009	Douglas View Terrace, Douglas West
HM/81/005*	Dalsarf Primary School, Ashgill
HM/82/005	Covenanters Field, Bothwell
HM/85/003*	Eddlewood Park, Hamilton
HM/85/004*	Broompark Road, Blantyre
HM/86/002*	Craigbank Primary school, Larkhall
HM/91/001	Udstonmill Rd, Stonehouse
HM/91/002	Sidehead Holdings, Stonehouse
HM/92/001	Muttonhole Road, Hamilton
HM/92/003	Newhousemill Road, Blantyre
HM/85/010*	Hillhouse Rd/Wellhall Rd, Hamilton
HM/85/012*	St Blanes Primary School, Blantyre
HM/82/009*	Hornal Rd, Uddingston

- 2.3 The sites left over were classed under Category 3. These had to be assessed on an individual basis against a variety of criteria. This is outlined in Table 3. The purpose of the assessment was to highlight the factors affecting each of the sites and how they fitted or otherwise with the emerging spatial strategy. The information collected for individual sites represented a general overview of the constraints and suitability of sites and is not an exhaustive assessment. More detailed assessment would be required with any future.
- 2.4 The appropriateness of a site has to be assessed against many factors including landscape, environmental impact, infrastructure, flood risk and accessibility. In addition the findings of the Strategic Environmental Assessment process have to be considered. The majority of sites assessed were greenfield locations outside established settlement boundaries. There were also sites within the urban area, for example on industrial land or on open space. An assessment of these sites was made and if deemed to be of continuing importance for industrial land or for open space purposes the sites were not considered to accord with the emerging development strategy for the LDP.



**Table 3 Site Assessment Criteria**

**Locational factors**

Location (within settlement/edge/isolated)	The location of the site in relation to existing settlements
Brownfield/greenfield	Is the site previously undeveloped, or has it had a previous development use. Is the site recorded on the Scottish vacant and derelict land survey
Settlement pattern/coalescence/ribbon development	The effect on settlement pattern, particularly if the site would create coalescence or ribbon development, or would be of excessive scale in relation to the existing settlement.

**Environmental factors**

Landscape	Landscape designations affecting the site for example: Landscape Character Type from the 2010 Landscape Character Assessment of South Lanarkshire and Special Landscape Areas (SLA).
Natural heritage	Natural Heritage designations affecting the site for example: European protected sites (SAC and SPA) SSSI, NNR, LNR, ancient woodlands, Local Biodiversity Action Plan priorities, watercourses, TPO's.
Built heritage	Built Heritage designations affecting the site for example: Conservation Area,

## Call for Sites Technical Report

---

	Listed Building, historic gardens/designed landscapes, Scheduled ancient monuments or archaeological trigger zones.
Open space	Urban sites only – is the site covered by a protected greenspace or green network designation (Policies ENV 1 or ENV2)?
Minerals	Is the site within a Coal Authority referral area?

### SEA

Does the site accord with SEA?	Summary of Strategic Environmental Assessment of site. The SEA Environmental report contains full details
--------------------------------	---

### Accessibility

Public Access	Does the site affect any core paths, cycle routes or rights of way?
Site access	Can a satisfactory vehicular access to the site be achieved?
Road network	Connectivity to the classified road network and potential capacity issues
Public transport	Distance to bus and rail services
Access to services	Distance to local services

### Infrastructure

Water and sewerage	Identification of any known constraints on water and sewerage supply
Flood risk	Is the site in the 1:200 flood plain or

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

	affected by local flooding issues?
Education	Existing constraints on school capacity

### Other Comments

Other comments	Other relevant factors pertaining to the site – for example, previous planning applications.
----------------	--

### Outcome

Site Accords with preferred LDP strategy	Council's initial view on whether site would accord with emerging development strategy based on above factors
Site would accord with strategy, with mitigation	
Site does not accord with strategy	

## Information Sources

2.5 The assessment drew on a number of information sources as follows:

- ◆ **Locational assessment:** This was carried out by planning officers based on desk survey and site visits.
- ◆ **Coalescence:** In order for settlements to maintain their identity some separation between them is required. Development can seek to close these gaps, this is coalescence. As well as physically removing the separation between settlements development it can give the appearance, from certain view points, of having done so – this is visual coalescence.
- ◆ **Ribbon development:** This refers to the stringing out of development along a road corridor and is most typified by being only one plot depth. Ribbon development has the effect of elongating settlements, stretching houses away from settlement centres and services.

## Call for Sites Technical Report

---

- ◆ **Settlement Pattern/Boundary:** A development proposal on the edge of a settlement may be acceptable where the land involved would fill in or round off a settlement edge. It may also represent a better, long term edge to a settlement.
  
- ◆ **Environmental Factors:** The assessment of environmental factors utilised a number of sources:
  - a. South Lanarkshire Landscape Character Assessment 2010 and Review of Local Landscape Designations 2010
  - b. Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data for designated nature conservation sites, and designed landscapes
  - c. Local planning GIS data on conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, protected open space and green network sites and Tree Preservation Orders
  - d. West of Scotland Archaeological Service data on archaeological trigger zones
  - e. Coal Authority GIS mapping of referral zones
  - f. South Lanarkshire Countryside and Greenspace assessment of local biodiversity impacts.
  
- ◆ **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)** - In accordance with Legislation a detailed SEA has been undertaken and subject to consultation. This includes a detailed assessment of each proposed development site against the nine SEA objectives.
  
- ◆ **Accessibility** - This assessment drew on the following information –
  - a. Public access information relates to proximity of the site to core paths, cycle routes and Rights of Way (RoW). This information was provided by South Lanarkshire Countryside and Greenspace.
  - b. Information on site access, impact on the road network and access to public transport and local services was provided by South Lanarkshire Roads and Transport Service.
  
- ◆ **Infrastructure** - The assessment of infrastructure constraints was based on the following data:
  - a. Water and Sewerage – information on water supply and sewerage capacity was provided by Scottish Water and SEPA. This was augmented by local SLC information where available.
  - b. Flood Risk – strategic level flood risk information was provided by SEPA. This was augmented by local SLC information which in some cases identified additional problems in certain localities.
  - c. Education – SLC Education provided information on schools with capacity issues.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## 3.0 Cambuslang/Rutherglen

3.1 Cambuslang/Rutherglen area has a number of large sites released through the South Lanarkshire Local Plan which have yet to be developed. This includes the Community Growth Area at Newton and a large site at Gilbertfield. Six sites, falling into category 3, were put forward for consideration. Of these CR/67/001 – Greenlees Farm Cambuslang and part of site CR/67/003 – Lightburn Road/Gilbertfield Road Cambuslang were considered appropriate for inclusion as proposals in the LDP. However both of these sites have issue that will need to be resolved. The Greenlees Farm site has flooding issues that will need to be addressed. The site at Lightburn Road/Gilbertfield Road has been reduced to avoid a high pressure gas pipeline and its buffer which runs through the centre of the site. In addition there are issues with a burn which runs parallel to the pipeline. For these reasons the developable area of the site has been reduced.

3.2 The remaining four sites CR/66/004, Gilbertfield, Cambuslang, CR/66/005, Duchess Road, Farme Cross, Rutherglen, CR/67/002, East Greenlees Road, Cambuslang and CR/67/004 Cathkin Grazings were not considered to accord with the strategy in the LDP.

3.3 CR/66/004 is a further extension into the Green Belt of a site already identified as a housing proposal in the SLLP. It is considered that release of this site would create an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. In addition it had various issues with SEA, accessibility and was not considered a sustainable location.

3.4 CR/66/005 is located within the urban area of Rutherglen. At present the site is an industrial use and this use bounds three sides of the proposed site. It is considered that this is an inappropriate site for residential development and for various reasons the site does not accord with the SEA mainly due to a major issue with air quality.

3.5 CR/67/002 is located in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambuslang. It is considered that development of this site would be inappropriate since it would be a breach in an existing well defined defensible settlement edge and result in pressure for release of fields on either side of the proposed site.

3.6 CR/67/004 is located south of the Cathkin Road breaching a well defined settlement edge. The site has issues relating to access and surface water which may be difficult to resolve. Development of this land could set an undesirable precedent and result in the erosion of the Green Belt between East Kilbride and Cambuslang.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## 4.0 Clydesdale

4.1 Given the area of Clydesdale, housing sites are scattered across its many settlements. A total of 91 sites were proposed for the Clydesdale area ranging from very small sites on the edge of villages to a proposal for a over 823 hectares of land for housing in the rural area. Of these sites some were considered more appropriately dealt with through planning application others rejected for a variety of reasons and others carried forward as proposals in the LDP. For convenience Clydesdale has been split into individual settlements.

### Auchenheath

4.2 Auchenheath is a small settlement which has been under pressure in previous local plans for development. Two sites CL/03/01 Auchenheath Farm and CL/03/002 Mckenzie's Yard East of Auchenheath have been submitted for consideration. CL/03/001 is split into two sites one to the west and one to the east of the village. Development of these sites would be a substantial expansion of the village into the rural area. There are also a number of issues that would be required to be addressed particularly relating to water and sewerage capacities. In addition it is considered that this is an unsustainable location where further expansion is not required. CL/03/002 is isolated from the village and is a site partly in operation and partly used for storage of disused scrap metals. At over 7 hectares this would be a substantial development in the countryside which is not sustainable or desirable.

### Biggar

4.3 Six sites have been put forward for consideration in Biggar. CL/04/005, CL/04/006 and CL/04/008 are for Market Road, an area close to the centre of the town. The site consists of a variety of unkempt, vacant land which is visually unattractive. However the site is not without issues particularly relating to access, ownership, flooding and mix of uses. For this reason the site is included in the LDP as a development framework site with an accompanying list of requirements were development proposals to come forward for the site. The remaining three sites in Biggar CL/04/004 Lindsaylands Road, CL/04/007, Gunns Meadow, CL/04/009 Biggar Park have been rejected as development proposals. CL/04/004 and CL/04/009 are adjoining sites. Development of these sites would extend the settlement into the rural area but would not constitute a defensible settlement boundary. In addition issues have been flagged up relating to soils and landscape plus access may be extremely problematic. The remaining site CL/04/007 would further extend the settlement into the rural area. The site also has no access to the public road network and is effectively landlocked.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## **Blackwood**

4.4 Only one site has been put forward for consideration CL/05/001 Carlisle Road. This site is designated as agricultural within the settlement but is effectively isolated from agricultural use by the M74 slipway. The site is not completely free of issues and any developer would need to achieve an access and address any noise issues associated with the adjacent motorway. However this site is considered as part of the settlement and can be redesignated as a general urban area.

## **Boghead**

4.5 One site has been put forward at Boghead, CL/06/001 Wetlea Park. It is considered that this very small site provides an opportunity to round off the settlement with a small development of 5 or so houses.

## **Braehead**

4.6 One site has been promoted at Braehead CL/07/001 Carnwath Road. This is a small site but would form ribbon development along Carnwath Road which is unacceptable. In addition there may be road issues given the proximity to the bend in the road and third party land may be required to achieve visibility splays. The site is not considered suitable for development.

## **Braidwood**

4.7 Braidwood has been under constant pressure since the SLLP for development. Four sites have been suggested as development opportunities CL/10/001, Woodhall Road, CL/10/003 Boghall Road, CL/10/019 Lanark Road and CL/42/001 Lower Braidwood. CL/10/001 is a large site to the south east of Braidwood on land used for urban fringe farmland. It is also within the Clyde Valley Special Landscape Area close to a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). In addition there are issues with access and possible sewerage constraints. This would be an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.

4.8 CL/10/003 is a small site which does not offer any opportunity to consolidate or round off the settlement boundary and is considered isolated from the existing settlement. CL/10/019 is outwith settlement within 200m of the Clyde Valley Woodlands SAC. The inclusion of this site would lead to substantial pressure for residential development along the northern side of the A73 within an SAC. CL/42/001 is a large site which would lead to the extension of built development into the Green Belt. In addition it would adversely impact on the Clyde Valley Special Landscape Area. It is not considered that any of the sites in Braidwood meet the spatial strategy of the LDP.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## **Carluke**

4.9 Carluke remains under pressure for development but also contains a number of large sites which were released through the SLLP, such as the Carluke Community Growth Area, which have yet to be developed. Nine sites have been brought forward for consideration. Of these only one site CL/10/017 Stonedyke Road offers an opportunity for consolidating and rounding off the settlement. However given its proximity to the undeveloped CGA and the issues that the site has with providing a playing field to replace the existing facility it is considered that this site should be incorporated as part of the redevelopment proposals at Carluke CGA. The remaining sites at Carluke CL/10/002 Hillhead Farm, CL/10/004/009 Kilncadzow Road, CL/10/007/013 Whiteshaw Farm, CL/10/010 Crawfordwalls Farm, CL/10/012 Samson Crescent, CL/10/018 Airdrie Road Carluke and CL/10/020 Castlehill Industrial Estate Extension are all considered inappropriate for inclusion in the LDP.

4.10 CL/10/002, CL/10/004/009, CL/10/007/013 are all considered to constitute significant encroachments into the Green Belt in an area where further housing release is not required. CL/10/010 is partly located on priority greenspace around the Jocks Burn and forms part of a wider network of linked sites important for their recreational and environmental value. In addition the site would be unlikely to achieve satisfactory access, does not accord with the SEA and lies partly within the 1:200 floodplain. CL/10/012 is an area of established amenity greenspace within a housing development. This is an integral part of previous planning consent requiring the then developer to construct amenity open space and provide pedestrian access. The site is actively used by local residents and the general public.

4.11 CL/10/018 is within settlement and is currently designated as a residential opportunity. The proposed use is for a Class 1 retail unit and associated works. This has already been subject of a planning application which was refused. The site will remain as residential in the LDP. A further site was brought forward for an extension to an existing industrial estate CL/10/020 however whilst this may be acceptable in terms of rounding off the settlement there did not seem to be a particular need for an extension of the industrial estate at this time. This can be reviewed in the next local development plan.

## **Carmichael**

4.12 Two sites have been promoted in Carmichael CL/11/001 Devonshire Road and CL/11/002 Harleyholm. Both of these sites would extend the built development into the adjoining rural area and both sites have issues which would need to be resolved. In addition there are other sites in Carmichael which have yet to be developed. It is not considered appropriate to include either of these sites as development opportunities.



# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## **Carnwath**

4.13 Two sites in Carnwath have been identified as potential development opportunities CL/12/001 Somerville Drive and CL/12/002 Head Inn Farm. Both of these sites have issues that would need resolved but there is scope for limited development at both of these sites on a reduced area. The northern part of CL/12/001 could be included since this forms a logical boundary to the settlement providing SEA issues relating to pink footed geese can be resolved. The southern part of CL/12/002 offers an opportunity for consolidation and rounding off of the settlement. It is proposed that the LDP will include parts of both of these sites as development opportunities.

## **Carstairs**

4.14 Four sites have been submitted for Carstairs, CL/13/001 West of Newhouse Crescent, CL/13/002, South of Lanark Road, CL/13/003 Manse Road and CL/13/004 West of A70 South east of Eastend Farm. The site identified as CL/13/003 is relatively small and offers an opportunity for rounding off of this part of the village. The remaining three sites would extend the village into the rural area and would not consolidate or round off the settlement boundary. None of these sites are appropriate for inclusion in the LDP.

## **Carstairs Junction**

4.15 Three sites have been brought forward for consideration, CL/13/005 and CL/13/006 both Lampits Road and CL/13/007 east of Carstairs Junction. All three sites are extensive and would extend the built development into the rural area. The sites are isolated and do not conform to the spatial strategy of the LDP.

## **Cleghorn**

4.16 One site has been promoted for Cleghorn CL/16/002 Haghholm Road for development. This site is unacceptable since it would constitute ribbon development along the northern side of Haghholm Road. In addition there are access and sewerage issues that would need to be resolved.

## **Crossford**

4.17 Crossford is under pressure for development and four sites have been brought forward CL/21/001, Blair Road, CL/21/002, Holmlea, CL/21/003 Holm Road and CL/21/004 Valley International Park. None of these sites are considered appropriate for inclusion in the LDP as a

## Call for Sites Technical Report

---

development opportunity. They fall within a Special Landscape Area, have significant issues with flooding and biodiversity and may find access difficult or unachievable.

### **Dolphinton**

4.18 Two sites have been brought forward for consideration. CL/23/001 Hillside Gardens and CL/23/002 Carmaben Brae. CL/23/002 is considered to be suitable for limited residential development since it is visually well contained by mature woodland to the north and west and by existing dwellings to the south and east. CL/23/001 is not acceptable since it would extend the built development into the rural area and does not represent a rounding off of the settlement boundary.

### **Elsrickle**

4.19 One site has been promoted at Carnwath Road CL/27/001. This site is unacceptable since it will be difficult to access safely onto the public road, the site would be visually prominent and the site is close to the feeding grounds of pink footed geese.

### **Elvanfoot**

4.20 Three sites were submitted for Elvanfoot, CL/28/001 West of Dumfries Road, CL/28/002 East of Dumfries Road and CL/28/003 Former Substation. CL/28/001 and CL/28/003 are both unacceptable since they would result in extending the built area into the rural area. In addition the sites are adjacent to the Ethylene Pipeline and it is unlikely they would be able to achieve sewerage and water facilities. CL/28/002 would have been appropriate for some limited scale development however this would not be possible without moving the septic tanks that serve the existing houses in Elvanfoot.

### **Hazelbank**

4.21 Two sites have been promoted at Hazelbank CL/32/001 Orchardville and CL/32/002 Lammas Knowe. Both of these are considered inappropriate for development since they would constitute a development which is out of character with the settlement and would have an adverse visual impact on the landscape setting of the surrounding area.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## Hyndfordbridge

4.22 CL/33/001 Hyndfordbridge has been promoted for a small development which would round off the settlement between existing residential development to the south and west. This site will be promoted in the LDP.

## Kirkfieldbank

4.23 Three sites were put forward for Kirkfieldbank, CL/35/001 Byretown Road, CL/35/002 Clyde Valley Caravan park, CL/35/003 Riverside Road. CL/35/001 was also subject to a planning application which has subsequently been granted. This site will now be monitored as part of the housing land audit. CL/35/002 is considered to be sporadic development not connected to the existing settlement and within the 1:200 floodplain. The site is not suitable for residential development. CL/35/003 is adjacent to the 1:200 floodplain. In addition the ground levels at this location would make development difficult. Resulting significant ground works that would be required would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the surrounding area. This site is not suitable for residential development.

## Lanark

4.24 Pressure for development around Lanark continues with nine sites being brought forward for consideration. CL/37/002 West of Bellefield Road, CL/37/003 Oakwood Nursery, CL/37/004 and CL/37/008 Jerviswood Farm (same site) CL/37/007 Land at Jerviswood south of A706, CL/37/009 East of Stanmore Farm, CL/37/011 Ridgepark School, CL/37/014 Smyllum Park, CL/37/015 Scarlet Muir and CL/37/016 Stanmore Road. CL/37/011 is an existing building which could be converted to residential use. The site is self contained and although there are issues regarding access it is considered that any proposals could be dealt with through a planning application.

4.25 CL/37/002 is a small strip of land which could accommodate 12 or so houses this site is being promoted through the LDP as a potential development opportunity. CL/37/014 is a large site being promoted for industrial uses. Part of the site is appropriate as an extension to the Caldwellside Industrial Estate and this will be promoted in the LDP.

4.26 The remaining sites are all being promoted for residential development with the exception of CL/37/016 which is mostly for retail. None of the sites are considered suitable for development since they are isolated or form an unacceptable expansion into the rural area. In addition the sites at Stanmore Farm and Jerviswood are of a considerable scale. Given the amount of residential land currently within the Lanark area that is yet to be developed, there is no need for further releases in this area.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## Law

4.27 Three sites have been promoted at Law CL/38/001 Stravenhouse Road, CL/38/002 Lawhill Road and CL/38/003 Birks Farm. CL/38/001 is a large site and it is considered that the settlement edge as it stands provides a robust and long term defensible edge of that part of Law. CL/38/002 is isolated from the settlement of Law and does not relate to the settlement boundary. The site at CL/38/003 is very large and could accommodate almost 1000 houses were the entire site to be released. The site as promoted is clearly excessive in scale in relation to the size of the existing settlement. However there is a small part of the site which would be suitable for rounding off the settlement boundary. This is the land bounded by Dobbies Court to the south, Ashfield Road to the west and open agricultural land to the north and the railway to the east. This part of the site will be promoted through the LDP.

## Lesmahagow

4.28 At Lesmahagow five sites have been submitted CL/40/001 Wellburn Farm, CL/40/002 Auchtykirnal, CL/40/003 South Garngour, CL/40/005 Clannochdyke and CL/40/006 Milton Farm. Part of site CL/40/001 already has planning consent but it is considered that only a small part of the proposed extended site should be included to reflect the consented area. It is not felt appropriate to further extend the area of this site since this is considered excessive development. In addition the site CL/40/006 partly rounds off a section of the settlement boundary but not the entire site as submitted. A reduced area of land is proposed for inclusion in the LDP.

4.29 CL/40/005 is completely inaccessible and is an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. CL/40/002 and CL/40/003 would extend development into the rural area which would be unacceptable.

## Nemphlar

4.30 One site has been promoted CL/43/001 Hall Road. This site is not considered a logical extension to the settlement since the development on the site would adversely affect the rural landscape setting of the village when viewed from the wider area.

## Newbigging

4.31 Four small extensions to Newbigging have been suggested under CL/46/001. Three of the suggestions offer an opportunity of rounding off parts of the settlement boundary. In total the three sites would produce less than 10 units. However one of the sites along the Main Street has a permanent water feature used by wild birds and appears to be undevelopable. This site should be retained as a water source for wildlife. The other three small sites will be included within the LDP as potential residential development opportunities.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## **New Trows**

4.32 CL/45/001 Coney Road is being promoted as an extension to the settlement. There are no particular issues with this and were proposals to come forward these could be dealt with as a planning application.

## **Quothquan**

4.33 CL/49/001 East of Loanhead is a small site which if developed would result in isolated built development within the rural area. In addition there may be localised flooding issues from the watercourse that passes through the site. The site is not considered suitable for development.

## **Ravenstruther**

4.34 Four sites have been promoted CL/50/001 Huntleybank Farm CL/50/002 Huntleybank Farm (reduced area), CL/50/003 Silvermuir Holdings and CL/50/004 Westbank Holdings. CL/50/002 could consolidate the existing building group and gap site to the south of the settlement with the boundary drawn tightly around the building plot to the south-west boundary.

4.35 CL/50/001 represents excessive settlement expansion along the south-west boundary to the detriment of the character of the village. CL/50/003 is inappropriate backland development with unclear access arrangements. In addition an area of woodland would require to be removed which, at present, bounds the settlement and enhances its character. CL/50/004 is landlocked with no access point to a public road. The proposed inclusion into settlement would lead to substantial residential expansion along the southern edge of the settlement which would not help provide a sustainable settlement boundary. These three sites are therefore no considered appropriate for inclusion in the LDP.

## **Symington**

4.36 Four sites are being promoted at Symington. CL/53/002 West of Main Street, CL/53/004 South of Kirk Bauk, CL/53/005 North of Biggar Road and CL/53/006 Biggar Road. CL/53/002 would represent a major expansion of the settlement into the adjoining rural area. CL/53/004 is a proposal to infill an area of ground bounded by development on 3 sides. Both of the site lie within the 1:10 year flood event and are not recommended for development. CL/53/005 is an area of agricultural land to the north of the village. CL/53/006 is also on the edge of settlement where provision of adequate access and sewerage infrastructure is of major concern. In addition neither of the sites consolidate or round off the settlement boundary and are not appropriate for development.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## Thankerton

4.37 CL/55/001 North of Boat Road, CL/55/002, South of Boat Road and CL/55/003 West of Mill Road have been suggested for Thankerton. CL/55/001 and CL/55/002 would extend built development into the adjoining rural area. Neither site consolidates or rounds off the settlement boundary. In addition there may be sewerage capacity issues and potential localised flooding. Neither of these sites is considered acceptable for inclusion in the LDP. CL/55/003 would represent an appropriate rounding off of the village. This site is included as an opportunity for residential and recreation development in the LDP.

## Rural Area

4.38 Five sites located within the rural area of Clydesdale have been submitted. CL/65/001 Aikmanhill Farm, Lintfieldbank, CL/65/002 Lower Throughburn, Forth, CL/65/003 Owenstown (near Rigside), CL/65/010 Kaimend Grazings, CL/65/011 Kypeside, west of Boghead.

4.39 CL/65/001, if developed, would lead to isolated small scale development in the rural area. The site is remote from settlements and affects the floodplain. CL/65/002 would be isolated development in the rural area which does not physically relate to the settlement boundary of Forth. In addition there are SEA issues due to the proximity to a poultry farm. These sites are not considered suitable for development.

4.40 CL/65/003 is a substantial new settlement in the rural area. It has major issues with biodiversity, soils, climate change and landscape impact. Development would also impact on the roads infrastructure and parts of the 1:200 floodplain. In addition 2 high pressure Ethylene Pipelines run through the sites and the entire site is underlain with coal deposits. This site is not suitable for development and will not be promoted in the LDP.

4.41 CL/65/010 gives an opportunity to consolidate existing development and to define a new settlement boundary including part of this proposed site. Part of the site is included within the LDP as a new settlement boundary at Kaimend.

4.42 CL/65/011 is for an eco village. This is in an isolated location with issues relating to provision of water and sewerage, biodiversity, soils, landscape and climate change. This is not considered an appropriate location for development.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## 5.0 East Kilbride

5.1 A total of 40 sites were proposed for the East Kilbride area ranging from very small sites on the edge of villages to larger proposals on the edge of East Kilbride. Of these sites some were considered more appropriately dealt with through planning application others rejected for a variety of reasons and others carried forward as proposals in the LDP. For convenience East Kilbride has been split into individual settlements.

### Chapelton

5.2 Three sites have been brought forward EK/69/001 Mounthilly Road, EK/69/002 Shawton and EK/69/003 Mounthilly Road. EK/69/001 would extend the built development into the adjoining countryside. The land also has serious flooding issues as it lies below the level of the adjacent A726. This site is not considered suitable for development.

5.3 EK/69/002 is a large site to the north west of the village which would significantly extend the village into the adjoining countryside. There are potential access issues with this site and parts of it are prone to serious flooding. This is not an acceptable development location. EK/69/003 is considered to be a rounding off of the settlement. However no defensible boundary exists so a suitable buffer would need to be created to form a suitable residential site. This site is included as a development proposal in the LDP.

### East Kilbride

5.4 Fourteen sites have been promoted for East Kilbride. EK/71/001, Atholl House, EK/71/002 North of Hayhill Road, EK/71/003 and EK/71/009 West Mains Road (same site) EK/71/004 Shields Road, EK/71/005 Queensway Retail Park, EK/71/007 Crutherland Farm, EK/71/008 Shields Road (larger site), EK/71/010 GSO Business Park, EK/71/017 Barbana Road, EK/71/018 Carmunock Road, EK/71/0120 Langlands West, EK/71/021 Westend Farm and EK/71/022 Redwood Drive.

5.5 EK/71/001 is a proposal to change Atholl House which is an office /class 4 use to town centre uses and include the site within the town centre boundary. The site has been under pressure for a foodstore which has been dismissed at a recent inquiry. There is insufficient retail expenditure capacity to support the development. The site will not be promoted as an extension to the town centre.

5.6 EK/71/003 and EK/71/009 are both for the same site and for is a proposed development of a retail foodstore. This has already been subject of an appeal and dismissed by the Report on the basis of retail impact and capacity. This site is inappropriate for development as a retail foodstore.

## Call for Sites Technical Report

---

5.7 EK/71/004 this is an area of Green belt between Lindsayfield and Langlands West. The site is predominantly flat and has a number of issues that would have to be resolved particularly relating to the hydrology of the adjacent peatland. There are no particular issues releasing this site for residential development. The site will be included in the LDP as a development proposal. A further site was proposed at EK/71/008 this included the site at Shields Road but extended it to the settlement of Auldhouse and would be capable of accommodating over 2500 units. There are significant SEA, coalescence, access and water and flooding issues with this site. For these reasons it is considered that the larger site should not be promoted for development.

5.8 EK/71/005 this is relating to a condition on a planning consent rather than a local plan land use issue. This has been dealt with by the development management team in the East Kilbride area office.

5.9 EK/71/007 this is an isolated site outwith the East Kilbride settlement boundary. There are issues with SEA and access to the site. It is not considered appropriate for development. EK/71/010 this is for an extension to the GSO Business Park. This has spare capacity at present and any potential development would impinge on the Green Belt buffer between East Kilbride and Thorntonhall. This site should remain in the Green Belt. EK/71/018 this site does not integrate satisfactorily with Kittochside and would affect the Green Belt between Kittochside and East Kilbride. There are also possible sewerage issues if the site were to be developed. This site will not be promoted in the LDP.

5.10 EK/71/020 this is an extremely exposed and open site which would create an unacceptable intrusion into the Green Belt. There are major biodiversity and landscape issues plus access and sewerage infrastructure constraints. This site is not considered suitable for development. EK/71/021 is a small site which is now part of a planning application which has been approved. The site will now be included in the housing land audit.

5.11 EK/71/022 this is an undeveloped industrial site within the East Kilbride settlement boundary. The site is currently identified as suitable for Class 4, 5 and 6 the proposal was to extend this to include commercial, leisure and retail. This is an inappropriate location for this type of development and it will remain as already designated in the South Lanarkshire Local plan as industrial.

### **Glassford**

5.12 Two sites were put forward EK/73/001 Glassford station and EK/73/003 Knowehead Farm. Both sites would extend the built development into the rural area. In addition there are climate change, local landscape and built heritage issues that would require to be resolved. Neither of the sites suitable for development.



# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## **Nerston**

5.13 EK/75/001 was submitted for consideration. This is a large site in two sections to the north east and north west of Nerston. This would result in a large scale increase in the size of the settlement. There are access and SEA issues that would require to be resolved. There are also power lines running through the western portion of the site and a strategic gas pipeline within the site which has an exclusion zone.

## **Sandford**

5.14 Three sites were put forward for Sandford EK/76/001 Sandford East Springside, EK/76/002 Strathaven Road and EK/76/003 Bonnahill. EK/76/001 includes Springside Farm steading which currently has planning consent. This extension to the approved site would consolidate the settlement to the east of Sandford. EK/76/002 would extend the boundary of Sandford into the Green Belt with no particular physical or natural boundary that would delineate the edge of settlement. In addition there are issues with access and drainage. EK/76/003 is an isolated development proposal in the Green Belt. The site is also adjacent to the 1:200 floodplain which is a SEAP high risk area. Sites EK/76/002 and EK/76/003 are not considered appropriate for development.

## **Strathaven**

5.15 Ten sites have been put forward around Strathaven for consideration, EK/77/001 South of Glassford Road, EK/77/002 Colinhill Farm, EK/77/003 South West of Strathaven south of A723, EK/77/004 Crofthead/Westpark Farm, EK/77/005 Goodsburn Farm, EK/77/006 Newtonside, EK/77/007 West Strathaven, EK/77/008 Over Lethame Farm, EK/77/009 Lethame Road and EK/77/010 Kibblestane Place. Sites EK/77/002, EK/77/007, and EK/77/009 are all located on the western edge of Strathaven. These sites have been considered individually and it is concluded that parts of the sites could be released for a masterplan development at Strathaven West. However there are issues that would need to be addressed particularly relating to access. This will be included as a proposal in the SLLDP.

5.16 Sites EK/77/003 and EK/77/004 are part of the same site. Development of these sites would extend the settlement into the Green Belt where there are potential issues with flooding from the Goods Burn. EK/77/001 is isolated and does not consolidate or round off the settlement. In addition there are issues with access. EK/77/005 and EK/77/006 are adjacent sites which would extend the settlement into the Green Belt. In addition there are potential issues with access and drainage. EK/77/008 is an isolated site in the Green Belt which has issues with access and visibility. EK/77/010 is a landlocked site to the west of Strathaven which has no visible means of access and no direct access to water main. None of these sites are thought suitable for development.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## Thorntonhall

5.17 Seven sites at Thorntonhall have been proposed for development EK/78/002 Braehead Road, EK/78/003 Peel Road, EK/78/005 South Hill of Dripps, EK/78/006 Peel Road, EK/78/007 North Dripps Farm, EK/78/008 Craigpark and EK/78/009 Braehead Road Grazings. Site EK/78/003 is an extension to an existing site at Peel Road which is currently being developed. Part of the site to the south west lies within the 1:200 floodplain and has mature trees. This area should be used for green network. This will be promoted as a residential masterplan site in the local development plan.

5.18 EK/78/002 is isolated from the main part of the village although it is located to the rear of some properties along Braehead Road. Whilst the whole site is not considered appropriate for development there may be an opportunity for a couple of units in the gap between houses along the road. EK/78/005 and EK/78/007 would result in a large scale expansion of Thorntonhall to the south and south west. The site does not round off the settlement boundary and would extend beyond the railway line which presently acts as a defensible settlement boundary. EK/78/006 would represent a breach in the well defined settlement edge to the north-west. Re-designation of the site would be likely to trigger further proposals for expansion in the future. EK/78/008 is a mature woodland on a site of biodiversity interest and therefore would not be suitable for large scale residential development. EK/78/009 would result in development of a large portion of the buffer area between Thorntonhall and East Kilbride. It would form an inappropriate expansion of the area at a location where the settlement edge is robust and defensible.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## 6.0 Hamilton

6.1 A total of 36 sites were proposed for the Hamilton area ranging in size and location. Some of the sites were considered more appropriately dealt with through planning application others rejected for a variety of reasons and others carried forward as proposals in the SLLDP. For convenience Hamilton has been split into individual settlements.

### Ashgill

6.2 Four sites have been proposed for Ashgill, HM/81/001 Over Dalsarf Farm, HM/81/002 Bogside, HM/81/003 Hills of Dalsarf Tinto View Road and HM/81/006 Millburn Road. HM/81/001 to the south and west of Ashgill is unscreened with the ground sloping up creating a natural ridge line. Development of the area would resulting large scale expansion into open fields and is inappropriate in this location. In addition there would be issues to be resolved relating to access, flooding and landscape.

6.3 HM/81/002 and HM/81/003 are adjacent sites on the western edge of the village. Both sites would expand Ashgill into open fields and would be an unacceptable expansion into the Green Belt. HM/81/006 is a section of former railway line with structural woodland landscape that screens properties along this part of the settlement edge. The site is not suitable for development and potential linear routes such as this should be protected from development.

### Bothwell/Uddingston

6.4 Nine proposals have been submitted for the Bothwell/Uddingston area. HM/82/001 Bothwellpark Road, HM/82/002 Uddingston medical rehabilitation centre Bellshill Road, HM/82/003, HM/82/011 and HM/82/012 all for the former gasworks at Bothwell Road, HM/82/006 Wilkie Road, HM/82/007 Laighlands Road, HM/82/008 Bothwellbank Farm, HM/82/013 Alexandra Workwear Bothwellpark Industrial Estate.

6.5 HM/003/011/012 have been submitted for the former gasworks. This site already has planning consent for residential development. These proposals relate to commercial development, business development and retail development on the site. It remains unclear what the end use proposed would be so in the meantime the site will be considered as a development framework site in the SLLDP.

6.6 Three adjacent sites HM/82/002/006/013 are being considered in the SLLDP as a residential masterplan sites. This is to consider the integration of housing with the health facilities on the site and to resolve access issues and the proximity to the nearby industrial units.

## Call for Sites Technical Report

---

6.7 HM/82/008 Bothwellbank Farm is being considered as a residential masterplan site. Any development proposals would have to meet the terms outlined in the masterplan requirements and address the issues that would need resolved relating to access and proximity to the sewerage treatment works and the nearby SSSI.

6.8 HM/82/001 and HM/82/007 are not considered appropriate for development since parts of both sites lies within the 1:200 floodplain. In addition there are access issues which may be unresolvable. The site also makes an important contribution to local biodiversity and separates the settlement from the motorway. Any development could affect the water table and the nearby SSSI.

### **Ferniegair**

6.9 Two sites have been proposed for Ferniegair HM/83/001 Hamilton Golf Club and HM/83/002 South east of Allanton. HM/83/001 is within the designed landscape of Chatelherault and any development in this location would harm the character and amenity of the Country Park. In addition there are access issues and the site is adjacent to a sensitive habitat. HM/83/002 is land between Ferniegair and Larkhall. Development of this land would have an adverse visual impact on the designed landscape of Chatelherault. In addition there are issues relating to noise, air quality, high value soils and landscape that would need to be addressed. Neither of these sites are appropriate for development.

### **Garrion**

6.10 Garrion North has four pressure sites HM/84/001 Skellyton, HM/84/002 North of Garrion village, HM/84/003 and HM/84/004 (same site) at north west Garrion. HM/84/001 is a SSSI and ancient woodland within the Clyde Valley woodland habitat network and is wholly inappropriate for development. HM/84/002 partly lies within the 1:200 floodplain; however the site may be capable of supporting development providing that the floodplain area is excluded from the development. HM/84/003 and 004 has the potential for some limited development along the road running through the village. This would also require substantial tree planting to screen the development from the A72.

### **High Blantyre/Blantyre**

6.11 Two sites HM/85/001 Shott Farm and HM/85/011 St Josephs Primary School have been submitted for consideration. HM/85/001 has a number of issues which would need to be resolved relating to access and its prominent location. It is proposed to identify the site as a residential masterplan site to access whether there is an opportunity for development at this location. HM/85/011 is within settlement and can be used for residential uses. There may be access issues to be resolved. This site will be identified in the SLLDP as a general urban site.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## **Hamilton**

6.12 HM/85/002 Muirmains and HM/85/013 and 014 Brackenhill (same site) were submitted for Hamilton. HM/85/002 is not suitable for rounding off, would require major road upgrading and is in a prominent location. HM/85/013/014 is an important area of open space forming the wider local network of greenspaces. This site is also a key link site in to the wider green network. Neither of these sites is suitable for residential development and will not be included in the SLLDP.

## **Larkhall**

6.13 One site HM/86/001 Broomelton Road was submitted for Larkhall. This is a site of high biodiversity value which is isolated from the settlement of Larkhall. In addition there are flooding and access issues and the site is not suitable for residential development.

## **Netherburn**

6.14 Two sites at Netherburn HM/87/001 East of Station Road and HM/87/002 Overton Road have been submitted for consideration for residential use. HM/87/001 includes the Threepwood Moss local nature conservation site and is a distinct landscape feature for the village. HM/87/002 is a site along Overton Road which would create a precedent for further ribbon development. The site is visibly prominent and development would be inappropriate. Neither of the sites are suitable for residential development.

## **Quarter**

6.15 HM/88/001 Carscallan Road and HM/88/002 Limekilnburn Road have been promoted for residential development. Both of these sites would be visually prominent if developed and would be an unacceptable expansion into the Green Belt. Neither of the sites is appropriate for development.

## **Rosebank**

6.16 One site HM/89/001 Lanark Road has been suggested for Rosebank. This site has no real capacity for development. Part of the site is within the 1:200 floodplain and junction spacing is not achievable. The site will not be promoted for residential development in the SLLDP.

# Call for Sites Technical Report

---

## **Shawsburn**

6.17 HM/90/001, HM/90/002 and HM/90/003 Ashgillhead Road, are all part of the same or adjoining site. These are not considered suitable for development due to a number of factors including difficult access, biodiversity issues associated with the loss of woodland habitat. None of these sites will be promoted in the SLLDP.

## **Stonehouse**

6.18 Two large sites HM/91/003 Udston Farm and HM/91/004 Manse Road have been suggested for Stonehouse. HM/91/003 is part of the Green Belt surrounding the village. Development of this scale in the proposed location would be out of character with the settlement and impair the landscape setting. HM/91/004 is an open exposed site rising towards the dismantled railway line. The site is within the Special Landscape Area and is highly visible across the Clyde Valley. This is a major intrusion into the countryside. Neither site is suitable for residential development.

## **Hamilton Greenbelt**

6.19 Three sites have been suggested for development in the Green Belt area. HM/92/002 Cornsilloch is for a golf course and associated housing. Development of this site would be inappropriate due to the visual and landscape impact of such a proposal. The land is also within the Special Landscape Area and wholly unsuitable for development. M/92/004 Millburn Larkhall is an isolated site with an unsuitable access. Development of this site would adversely affect the rural landscape character and setting of the area.

6.20 HM/92/005 Lanark Road Ferniegair is an area of sensitive landscape which may have an adverse visual impact on the setting of the designated landscape of Chatelherault. None of the sites proposed in the Green Belt are suitable for development.



**South Lanarkshire  
Local Development Plan**

South Lanarkshire Council  
Community and Enterprise Resources  
Planning and Building Standards Services  
Montrose House, Montrose Crescent  
Hamilton ML3 6LB  
[www.southlanarkshire.gov.uk](http://www.southlanarkshire.gov.uk)

For further information or to enquire about  
having this information supplied in an  
alternative format or language,  
please phone 01698 455934 or email:  
[localplan@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@southlanarkshire.gov.uk)