

**Planning and Building Standards Services**



# Proposed South Lanarkshire **Local Development Plan**

Comments and Main Issues

May 2013



**Community and Enterprise Resources**



No	ID	Title		Consultee	Consultee	Agent	Summary	Council's Response
1	MIR1	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	To ensure that the Plan meets the future needs of all towns and villages across the plan area, it is suggested that the words " all settlements and villages within " be added immediately before the words " South Lanarkshire".	The vision addresses the whole of South Lanarkshire and is not specific to all villages and settlements - it can include areas outwith villages and settlements. No amendment proposed to Plan Vision.
1	MIR934	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1		Ashfield Land	Barton Wilmore	The vision of the plan should be reworded to reflect current economic position	The current economic position is dealt with elsewhere in the plan. It is not necessary to have it in the plan vision therefore no amendment proposed to Plan Vision.
1	MIR1081	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1		Hamilton Golf Club	Barton Wilmore	The vision should seek to kick start the economy and increase levels of growth over and above that experienced during and since the recession. By planning for growth and increased economic activity those industries most affected by the financial crisis can be given the opportunity to recover and flourish in a growing economy. The vision as presently set out in the MIR should therefore be reworded	The proposed plan takes a realistic view of the current economic position. The vision is clear in this respect and no amendment is proposed to Plan Vision.

							accordingly	
1	MIR273	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Taylor Wimpey		GL Hearn	Supports the LDP Vision to promote growth and regeneration of South Lanarkshire. Residential development at West Strathaven would help to deliver these objectives	Noted
1	MIR711	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Muse Developments		GVA Grimley	Supports the vision for the LDP	Noted
1	MIR950	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Yes this is the right vision for the plan.	Noted
1	MIR195	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	The vision is broadly correct as it highlights the benefits derived from redeveloping the former Gasworks site. However the priority of the LDP must be to promote the economic recovery and this should be identified as the overriding imperative at least for the next first five years of the LDP.	The current economic position is dealt with elsewhere in the plan. It is not necessary to have it in the plan vision therefore no amendment proposed to Plan Vision.
1	MIR149	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	Fully supports vision for SLLDP	Noted
1	MIR43	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan	Question 1	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	Fully supports vision for SLLDP	Noted

		vision						
1	MIR899	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	Yes, however cognisance will require to be taken from the recently approved CVSDP, with particular reference to housing of a strategic/masterplan nature.	The GCVSDP will be fully considered when producing the LDP. In addition a Housing Technical Report will be produced to deal with specific housing issues.
1	MIR175	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	The vision should have more emphasis on rural area investment	The rural area is fully considered in the plan and the vision applies to all of South Lanarkshire
1	MIR14	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes continued growth and regeneration is an appropriate vision.	Noted
1	MIR486	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes, continued growth and regeneration is an appropriate vision	Noted
1	MIR317	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	The Vision must recognise the need to meet the housing and employment needs of the area in full. There are no serious local environmental or infrastructure constraints which cannot be resolved to allow such development within the life of this Plan. If the Council is committed to a low carbon economy then the LDP must support all appropriate opportunities for	The vision recognises the role of housing and employment in meeting the needs of an area but at the same time it aims to address climate change. The LDP therefore will represent the most realistic view of how to achieve these aims in the current economic climate.

							renewable energy development in its Proposed Plan Policy framework.	
1	MIR65	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	The Vision must recognise the need to meet the housing development needs of the area in full, as per SPP. There are no serious local environmental or infrastructure constraints which cannot be resolved to allow such development within the life of this Plan.	The LDP will consider fully the implications of both SPP and SDP but will endeavour to be as realistic as possible in the current economic climate.
1	MIR375	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	The Vision must recognise the need to meet the housing and employment needs of the area in full. There are no serious local environmental or infrastructure constraints which cannot be resolved to allow such development within the life of this Plan. If the Council is committed to a low carbon economy then the LDP must support all appropriate opportunities for renewable energy development in its Proposed Plan Policy framework.	The vision recognises the role of housing and employment in meeting the needs of an area but at the same time it aims to address climate change. The LDP therefore will represent the most realistic view of how to achieve these aims in the current economic climate.

1	MIR795	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1		Stonehouse Ahead	Turley Associates	The overall vision is supported but there should be an acknowledgement that the regeneration of less economically successful settlements will be an objective allowing all areas to share in the outputs of sustainable economic growth.	The LDP will consider development opportunities across South Lanarkshire but this will be based on a realistic assessment of what can be achieved and what can be considered to be truly effective in the current economic climate.
1	MIR769	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Mike	Andrews		The SLLDP should accord with the GCVSDP key aims and this is the right vision for the plan. Given current economic circumstances, the emphasis should be on growth, as a means to stimulate investment, provide additional employment and improve consumer confidence	The LDP will focus on the economy as one of the key drivers to development in South Lanarkshire and be as realistic as possible reflecting the SPP and SDP
1	MIR263	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Donna	Brooks		The vision for the plan should incorporate a reference to the role of the communities of SLC as partners in shaping the area , and the intention of the plan to be inclusive as it stands the vision appears to be an officials vision. Whilst fully supporting the need for on-going regeneration would question the	The vision of the plan reflects that of the SDP and the adopted South Lanarkshire local plan.

							promotion of continued growth throughout South Lanarkshire.	
1	MIR644	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1		Cala Homes West		Agree with main themes of the proposed Vision. However, the Vision could be improved by tailoring it to South Lanarkshire, rather than being a generic statement which could be applicable to any place.	The vision of the plan reflects that of the SDP and the adopted South Lanarkshire local plan.
1	MIR413	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	David	Crawford		No further residential land release in the Green Belt around Strathaven	Noted
1	MIR417	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Agnieszka	Devine		The west Strathaven proposals seem to be unnecessary as there is not significant employment in this area.	Noted
1	MIR218	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Avril	Dobson		Development planning for communities should focus on discussion with those communities as partners and stakeholders, determining how the needs of each community should be incorporated in an inclusive manner.	Extensive consultation took place before the MIR was produced to allow input from communities and individuals as to which direction the Council should be taking future development. The results of this exercise and subsequent consultation following publication of the MIR have been taken into account when producing the LDP.



1	MIR1021	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Robert	Freel		Plan needs to also take account of the Recycling and the zero waste strategy agenda, renewable energy and wind farm sites. The MIR should have set out and detailed the sites currently with consent (but not yet developed) and not requiring to be assessed as well as the sites with commitment.	The LDP will fully consider all aspects of climate change and additional Supplementary Guidance will be produced to deal with Climate Change. In addition a Housing Technical Paper will be produced outlining all the sites included in the plan and the annual housing land audit will be available.
1	MIR318	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	To accord with Scottish Government focus on localism and community-led regeneration, the vision for the plan should incorporate a reference to the role of the communities of SLC as partners in shaping the area , and the intention of the plan to be inclusive - as it stands the vision appears to be an officials' vision. Whilst the CC fully supports the need for on-going regeneration it would question the promotion of continued growth throughout South Lanarkshire.	Extensive consultation took place before the MIR was produced to allow input from communities and individuals as to which direction the Council should be taking future development. The results of this exercise and subsequent consultation following publication of the MIR have been taken into account when producing the LDP.

1	MIR439	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Wendy	Gilmour		Does not agree with the Vision. It does not take into account that growth in rural areas is limited by poor quality access roads, lack of public transport, and pressure on existing rural services. The local community should have more input to development plan.	The vision fully takes account of growth across South Lanarkshire and has directed development to the most appropriate locations.
1	MIR665	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Ian	Gilmour		Add phrase about "within economic resources" to Vision.	The current economic position is dealt with elsewhere in the plan. It is not necessary to have it in the plan vision therefore no amendment proposed to Plan Vision.
1	MIR1070	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Ged	Hailey		The vision for South Lanarkshire allows for strategic housing sites whilst also allowing organic, sustainable growth of existing settlements, for example Blackwood / Kirkmuirhill, and this is supported.	Noted
1	MIR1000	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Stuart	Hunter		Agrees with vision	Noted
1	MIR802	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1		James Barr		agreed	Noted

1	MIR923	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Grant	Kirkhope		LDP Vision is sufficient to ensure that current and national level objectives are being met within the plan period.	Noted
1	MIR784	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1		Lidl UK GmbH		The very highest priority must be given to supporting development that is able to provide both increased local employment and reduces the need to travel. This should be stated clearly in the overall Vision of the LDP. One example of this type of development is the provision of new retail floorspace in smaller towns that serves a local market, reducing the need to travel to larger centres (and thereby reducing carbon emissions) but also provides significant new local employment.	Noted but retail development must be directed to appropriate centres and locations
1	MIR1007	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Stuart	MacGarvie		Yes	Noted
1	MIR712	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Rachael	Macleod		Agrees with vision for LDP	Noted

1	MIR1058	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		The vision is good but incomplete, SLC requires the involvement of others - particularly with more limited resources. It also needs to encourage local self help through Supplementary Guidance on relations with the voluntary sector. Suggest an extra sentence: 'This can only be achieved with the help of other public bodies, private enterprise and the voluntary sector'.	Extensive consultation took place before the MIR was produced to allow input from communities and individuals as to which direction the Council should be taking future development. The results of this exercise and subsequent consultation following publication of the MIR have been taken into account when producing the LDP. There would be no merit in altering the vision as suggested.
1	MIR370	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Claire	Marr		With a significant decline in employment over the past 5 years, it seems over-optimistic to forecast for growth over the next 10 years. Additional housing sites are not required. The Community Growth Area policy from the current SLLP could be reduced in geographical area. Any new housing development should be in East Kilbride not Thorntonhall.	The Housing Technical Report outlines the Councils position regarding development over the short medium and longer term and the choices made in directing new development to certain locations across South Lanarkshire.
1	MIR888	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Allan	McCulloch		Agreed	Noted

1	MIR833	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	John	McMorran		Yes	Noted
1	MIR546	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	William W	Park		yes	Noted
1	MIR528	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Isobel	Paterson		Strathaven is a small town in the country which should have green belts interspersed between housing development otherwise it would no longer be a country town. Take new housing development to Chapelton towards East Kilbride area and leave green belt between housing developments.	Noted but there will still be a green belt between Strathaven, Chapelton and East Kilbride.
1	MIR670	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Malcolm	Phillips		Agrees with the vision for the LDP	Noted
1	MIR616	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Jim	Ravey		SRG is content, in principle, with the overall direction of the Vision as stated in the MIR but suggest that, in the absence of a definition for low carbon economy, the phrase within a low carbon economy is amended to ...striving toward a low	Noted

							carbon economy.....	
1	MIR133	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	George	Ross		The continued growth of South Lanarkshire is not a priority, particularly the East Kilbride and surrounding area and villages. The priority should be the regeneration of the inner and central part of East Kilbride which has been neglected by the Council.	Economic growth is a priority for the Council and this is invariably linked to residential development. Regeneration is also a priority and this will continue to be one of the Councils main focuses.
1	MIR479	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Roy	Scott		No, the priority should be regeneration and improvement of existing developments rather than continued growth	Noted
1	MIR595	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Mark	Stephens		The Falls of Clyde should be given more prominence in the MIR.	This will be covered in Supplementary Guidance
1	MIR234	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Toby	Wilson		Agree with LDP vision and welcome the desire for a 'low carbon economy and improved urban and rural environment'.	Noted
1	MIR514	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	John	Wright		Does not agree with LDP vision	Noted
1	MIR862	South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan vision	Question 1	Ryden			Yes generally acceptable, although should focus development on sites within settlement envelopes.	Noted

1.1	MIR118	Paragraph	1.11	Ian	Craig		Objects to the potential Residential Masterplan site at Strathaven West due to impact on traffic and capacity of local services. The area should remain within the Green Belt and not be developed.	Noted
1.1	MIR121	Paragraph	1.12	William	Cochrane		The timescale allowed for consultation is not realistic --received in post on 8th June leaving only 21 days to study and submit observations.	The MIR was available for consultation for longer than statutorily required.
1.4	MIR261	Paragraph	1.4	Avril	Dobson		Objects to the potential Residential Masterplan site at Strathaven West due to impact on traffic and capacity of local services.	Noted
1.6	MIR113	Paragraph	1.6	Alastair	Dickie	James Barr Ltd	Have significant concerns over the Site Assessment as they relate to Atholl House. See separate submission for details	Noted but site assessments were all carried out in the same way for each individual site
1.6	MIR147	Paragraph	1.6	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	EK/71/004 Shields Rd East Kilbride capacity minimum 350 not 300 as stated.	Noted
2	MIR2	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Support is given for the general terms of the Spatial Strategy, with specific support being given to the creation of regeneration and	Noted

							development opportunities through the appropriate adjustment and revision of existing settlement boundaries.	
2	MIR935	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2		Ashfield Land	Barton Wilmore	The spatial strategy of the LDP should be amended to take account of changes to SDP	The spatial strategy will take account of any changes required with approval of the SDP
2	MIR1082	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2		Hamilton Golf Club	Barton Wilmore	While we have some reservations regarding the effectiveness of some of the historical legacy sites, particularly those that have been in the housing land supply for many years, the continued support for CGAs is in line with the terms of SPP and the recently approved SDP and is duly supported.	Noted
2	MIR274	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Taylor Wimpey		GL Hearn	Supports the proposed Spatial Strategy of the LDP relative to West Strathaven.	Noted
2	MIR725	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Muse Developments		GVA Grimley	Agrees with preferred option and highlights support for retail proposals at Cherryhill Larkhall and the Larkhall CGA's	Noted
2	MIR951	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Yes this option is the correct basis. All decisions by all departments in the Council should be made to	Noted



							ensure the natural environment is not harmed. Economic development should not overrule the protection of the environment.	
2	MIR196	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	This Planning scenario is very much welcomed.	Noted
2	MIR150	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	Agree with the spatial strategy. In particular identifying where there are opportunities for settlement boundaries to be revised and where this can allow for suitable development opportunities.	Noted
2	MIR44	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	There are opportunities for settlement boundaries to be revised where they allow a balance to be struck between sustainable economic development and environmental issues. The preferred spatial strategy appears to allow for this.	Noted
2	MIR900	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	The recently approved strategic development plan provides up to date evidence on spatial strategy	Noted

2	MIR176	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	The Rural Area should be a single designation with flexible policies on investment, leisure and tourism, including housing	Noted
2	MIR117	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	James	Frame	John Duff Planning	The statement in the Spatial Strategy "Providing Regeneration and Development opportunities through the revision of settlement boundaries" is entirely the correct approach as many large sites with high upfront costs are not proceeding for economic reasons. .	Noted
2	MIR601	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2		Scottish and Southern Energy	Jones Lang LaSalle	It is generally supported that the spatial strategy recognises that the LDP requires to take steps to move towards a low carbon economy. However, the bullet points set out as the preferred option do not touch upon measures to achieve a low carbon economy or measures to address climate change impacts. Owing to the significant development interests for onshore wind energy development within the SLC area, it is recommended that the	Noted - further details on this will be included in Supplementary Guidance on Climate Change

							spatial strategy also sets out the approach to planning for onshore wind energy development.	
2	MIR127	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	Largely agree with preferred Option 1 however recommend that in addition to development being directed to the most sustainable locations or to areas where it tackles regeneration issues, the effectiveness of development sites should also be taken into consideration	Effectiveness of each site has been fully considered and is included in the Housing Technical Report.
2	MIR15	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Agree that the spatial strategy needs adjustment to account for the non-delivery of Strategic Growth Areas. There is a need to balance the land supply in terms of size, location and characteristic.	This has been considered fully in the Housing Technical Report
2	MIR493	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Agree that the spatial strategy needs adjustment to account for the non-delivery of Strategic Growth Areas. There is a need to balance the land supply in terms of size, location and characteristic.	This has been considered fully in the Housing Technical Report

2	MIR1093	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Stephen	Partington	Muir Smith Evans	Spatial strategy within the MIR is broadly welcomed including the move towards a low-carbon economy. However, it should be recognised that the housebuilding industry has already made major progress towards energy efficiency in the construction and use of new housing. The LDP should recognise that the main priority now should be measures to increase the energy efficiency and overall sustainability of the established housing stock.	Noted
2	MIR857	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Ashfield Land (Glasgow) Ltd		Muir Smith Evans	This preferred option for the spatial strategy is broadly welcomed including the identification of the Clyde Gateway area as a regeneration priority. Given prevailing economic conditions it is important that the LDP gives due weight to this aspect of policy. In the short to medium term the move towards a low-carbon economy requires to be balanced with the immediate priority of stimulating sustainable economic growth and	Noted

							tackling areas in need of regeneration. This requires to be reflected in the wording of the forthcoming LDP Proposed Plan.	
2	MIR319	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	The spatial strategy must recognise the need to meet the housing development needs of the area in full. This should include the promotion of appropriate rural land release and brownfield regeneration opportunities. The MIR recognises that brownfield redevelopment opportunities exist in rural areas and this is welcomed. It must also recognise that rural greenfield land release will be necessary to accommodate housing land requirements in full and provide a range and choice of housing sites across the Council area.	Noted

2	MIR66	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	<p>The spatial strategy must recognise the need to meet the housing development needs of the area in full, as per SPP Alternative Options 1 and 2 are unacceptable. However, Alternative Option 3 is supported subject to it being amended to promote development requirements that also meets the requirements of sustainable economic growth. This should include the promotion of regeneration opportunities. The MIR recognises that the Council area has an increasing population and this, combined with other demographic factors e.g. ageing population, requires additional housing of all tenures. The MIR notes the effects of the recent economic downturn on economic activity. This should not be used as an excuse to avoid allocating land for development.</p>	<p>The LDP contains sites that are consider as effective or being able to be made effective in the short to medium term in locations that are sustainable and meet the tests set out in the site assessment criteria.</p>
---	-------	--	---------------	--	----------------------------------	----------	---	---

2	MIR387	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	The spatial strategy must recognise the need to meet the housing development needs of the area in full. This should include the promotion of appropriate rural land release and brownfield regeneration opportunities. The MIR recognises that brownfield redevelopment opportunities exist in rural areas and this is welcomed. It must also recognise that rural greenfield land release will be necessary to accommodate housing land requirements in full and provide a range and choice of housing sites across the Council area.	The Council has fully considered all of the sites put forward and identified areas where release on edge of settlements would be most appropriate,
2	MIR796	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2		Stonehouse Ahead	Turley Associates	Agree with sustainable economic growth and highlights that this would be a particular issue for the Stonehouse area	Each of the sites submitted has been assessed in terms of effectiveness and deliverability and released if they meet certain criteria in the site assessment process.

2	MIR770	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Mike	Andrews		Preferred spatial strategy is largely correct. However, in the context of funding constraints and the general reluctance of banks to grant finance for development projects that require significant investment in infrastructure, the effectiveness of housing land within the CGAs, the development framework sites and masterplan sites requires careful scrutiny. Flexibility is an important element of the spatial strategy and the housing land supply should be bolstered by additional land release which accords with directing major developments to the main urban settlements.	This has been considered fully in the Housing Technical Report
2	MIR278	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Donna	Brooks		Bullet point 1 - Agree the focus for major development should be on East Kilbride and other main settlements best served by public transport and infrastructure. Bullet point 2 - Agree. Bullet point 3 - Disagree with the generalist approach to settlement boundary changes, i.e., that a	Noted



							<p>'preferred option' should be identified for every settlement. Some rural settlements are much better served by public transport than others, they cannot all be held equally suitable for extension.</p> <p>Bullet point 4/5/6 - Agree.</p> <p>Bullet point 7 - Agree but should include 'heritage' and should add 'enhancing through guiding investment and encouraging good management'</p> <p>Bullet point 8 - Strategic legacy items should only be retained where they continue to be feasible and appropriate.</p> <p>The wording regarding the balance between sustainable economic development and environmental issues should include an undertaking to demonstrate, how the plan performs in terms of the stated low-carbon economy aims with the emphasis more firmly on 'sustainable' development.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

2	MIR645	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2		Cala Homes West		<p>The Spatial Strategy need to be converted into SMART objectives and outcomes otherwise it will not be possible to monitor the LDP's implementation. Focusing on the future provision of new homes as an example, the following comments are offered: 1. No mention is made of the scale of housing needs and demand which the Council is seeking to provide for over its LDP period; 2. No mention is made of the need to promote new housing development which is known to be effective in addition to being in sustainable locations; 3. No mention is made about the need to balance future development on greenfield as well as brownfield sites to ensure help ensure that sites in the Proposed Plan are effective; The Council also needs to acknowledge the need to review Green Belt boundaries to accord with the requirements of SPP.</p>	<p>This is covered in the housing technical report. In addition the LDP will be accompanied by an action programme which will outline how the plan will be implemented and monitored.</p>
---	--------	--	---------------	--	--------------------	--	---	---

2	MIR219	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Avril	Dobson		Agrees with preferred spatial strategy however major development should be directed to areas where there is already good public transport links and good infrastructure and settlement boundary changes should not be done as a matter of course, but each suggested change for each community should be examined individually.	Noted
2	MIR1022	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Robert	Freel		No this is not the correct spatial strategy. No hierarchy of how major developments are directed to sustainable locations or indeed rural locations are detailed. How does the council direct to one area as opposed to another. Whilst support and safeguarding town and neighbourhood village centres is a noble cause, nothing in the existing local plan has succeeded in preventing this erosion. More detail on the supporting rural and countryside business opportunities is required as is the development of existing brownfield sites	The Housing Technical Report outlines the Councils position regarding development over the short medium and longer term and the choices made in directing new development to certain locations across South Lanarkshire. Dovesdale is a separate issue dealt with elsewhere

							and how these sites can be made appropriate. What are the strategic legacy items, they should be easily identifiable or listed within the plan. Is the balance between economic development and environmental issues correct.	
2	MIR128	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Neil	Gainford		The spatial strategy should reconsider what is meant by the term 'sustainable locations' and recognise that rural areas are not necessarily less sustainable than their urban counterparts. This term should be defined in the Glossary of Terms.	Noted
2	MIR167	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Neil	Gainford		The spatial strategy should not rely on CGAs/masterplans to deliver housing development as the circumstances in which the SLLDP is being prepared (and which are likely to apply throughout the Plan's lifetime) are completely different from the previous Local Plan.	Whilst these are doubtless important to ensure appropriate development in appropriate locations the LDP also considered development outwith these area around smaller rural settlements and on brownfield sites within urban areas.

2	MIR320	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	<p>Bullet point 1 - Agree the focus for major development should be on East Kilbride and other main settlements best served by public transport and infrastructure. Bullet point 2 - Agree. Bullet point 3 - Disagree with the generalist approach to settlement boundary changes, i.e., that a 'preferred option' should be identified for every settlement. Some rural settlements are much better served by public transport than others, they cannot all be held equally suitable for extension. Bullet point 4/5/6 - Agree. Bullet point 7 - Agree but should include 'heritage' and should add 'enhancing through guiding investment and encouraging good management' Bullet point 8 - Strategic legacy items should only be retained where they continue to be feasible and appropriate. The wording regarding the balance between sustainable economic development and</p>	Noted
---	--------	--	---------------	---	---------	------------------------------------	--	-------

							environmental issues should include an undertaking to demonstrate, how the plan performs in terms of the stated low-carbon economy aims with the emphasis more firmly on 'sustainable' development.	
2	MIR440	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Wendy	Gilmour		Partly agree with preferred option - support development in main urban settlements, which already have the infrastructure but without expanding the boundaries too far. Support redevelopment of brownfield sites, safeguarding Town Centres and supporting rural and countryside business opportunities. Concerned that expansion of settlement boundaries changes the natural environment. Developments should be in appropriate locations and existing consents should be completed before new sites are released.	Noted - this is discussed more in the Housing Technical Paper
2	MIR666	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Ian	Gilmour		If revision of settlement boundaries means changing the Green Belt	Noted

							boundaries, would prefer no change to occur.	
2	MIR1071	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Ged	Hainey		The spatial strategy option is generally well considered.	Noted
2	MIR1001	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Stuart	Hunter		support the preferred spatial strategy.	Noted
2	MIR803	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2		James Barr		Agreed Settlements outside the main conurbations should be subject to flexible policies permitting mixed uses, particularly in rural areas. This can be achieved by "rounding off" settlements in the first instance - at an appropriate scale	Noted - but it must be appropriate rounding off.
2	MIR924	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Grant	Kirkhope		preferred strategy states that development will be directed towards sustainable locations this is not being reflected in the suggested residential land releases. According to the sites which are classified as 'sites that accord with the preferred LDP strategy' the majority are not within the main urban settlements. CGAs are to remain effective sites within the LDP, these sites should be subjected to the same test of viability and marketability as the	All sites have been reassessed and this work is included in the Housing Technical Report

							proposed sites.	
2	MIR785	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2		Lidl UK GmbH		The preferred spatial strategy is expressed in a way that gives no meaningful guidance as to the preferred locations for development. Appropriate development opportunities should be consistent with the proposed Vision - i.e. the ability to provide and support the local economy while, at the same time, reducing the need to travel. This could, in certain situations, result in the support for retail and commercial development located outwith defined town centres. The spatial strategy should expressly build in this requirement to be flexible.	Noted - but retail development must be redirected to appropriate locations
2	MIR1008	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Stuart	MacGarvie		yes; but it should also look towards sustainable economic growth/land adjacent to the smaller settlements and rural areas.	Noted- sites in the rural villages and adjacent to them have been considered in this plan.
2	MIR713	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Rachael	Macleod		Broadly agree with the spatial strategy The preferred option most appropriate. There needs to be a balance between economic and sustainable	Noted



							development. Blanket zero carbon or full economic growth will have detrimental impacts.	
2	MIR1059	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		This understates the need to protect the environment.	Noted but protection of the environment has been given the same weight as the other strands of the spatial strategy
2	MIR371	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Claire	Marr		No. The balance between sustainable economic development and environmental issues does not accord with the SDP spatial strategy. This can be addressed by re-ordering the priorities shown as follows: 1. Protecting and safeguarding the natural environmental. 2. Supporting regeneration priorities at Clyde gateway, priority areas. 3. Providing regeneration and development opportunities through the revision of settlement boundaries. 4. Continuing support and safeguarding of town and neighbour/village centres. 5. ensuring that the existing supply of land available for industrial and	The LDP accords and is based on the SDP spatial strategy

							housing purposes is used as efficiently as possible and returning surplus CGA to the green belt	
2	MIR889	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Allan	McCulloch		Spatial Strategy is acceptable in principle. Reference must be made to the recommendations made by the Reporter to the previous SLLP inquiry. This is a fundamental point where guidelines for planning development have already been assessed and commented upon	The LDP accords and is based on the SDP spatial strategy
2	MIR835	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
2	MIR988	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Blair	Melville		As a broad strategy, there seems little to comment on in the preferred strategy. However, the implication of the text is that there are some variations from the existing strategy of the adopted Local Plan to deal with new legislative and policy issues. These changes are not clear to the reader, and are not evident from the wording of the preferred strategy, which appears to describe the current strategic and local planning approach.	This is covered in the housing technical report and will be subject to further discussion with housebuilders whilst producing the LDP

							<p>The preferred strategy also needs to be subject to the same tests of viability and marketability as individual sites. For instance, is the focus on brownfield and regeneration sites actually deliverable in the current climate? Are some of the legacy elements such as CGAs likely to proceed at all, or at least in timescales close to previous assumptions? If major components of the strategy are uncertain or no longer deliverable, then the MIR should have discussed the alternatives.</p>	
2	MIR600	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Marjory	Munro		<p>The CGA around Larkhall should continue to be a development priority in the LDP</p>	Noted
2	MIR101	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Peter	Murray		<p>The preferred option is preferable. Table 1.3 refers to protecting locally designated sites and areas of natural heritage importance, strongly support this intention.</p>	Noted
2	MIR548	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	William W	Park		<p>yes</p>	Noted

2	MIR530	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Isobel	Paterson		Take any new housing development to Chapelton or Chapelton area to keep Strathaven a country town. Leave green belt alone. The town would be all squashed together with no green belt area between developments. The character of the town would change.	Noted but it would be inappropriate to put all development to a small settlement such as Chapelton.
2	MIR618	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Jim	Ravey		SRG is content with the Preferred Spatial Strategy (Option 1) as set out in the MIR. Clarification is sought on the reference to major scale of developments referred to Bullet Point 1 and whether it equates to major as set out in T&CP (Hierarchy of Development) (Scotland) Regulations 2009. If this is the case, then it may constrain further investment in the rural areas on a scale similar to the Dewar Bonded Warehousing Complex at Poniel.	Noted - but Poniel is covered under SDP as a SEIL
2	MIR145	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	George	Ross		East Kilbride should be included in the areas in need of regeneration. Continuing to support and safeguard town and	Noted

							neighbouring villages, together with the natural environment, is correct. No further development should be considered around Strathaven, Thorntonhall and Jackton.	
2	MIR236	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Toby	Wilson		Generally agree with preferred Option 1 but wish to see "Protecting and safeguarding the natural and built environment" amended to read 'Protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment', which we believe fits with the positive statement in the proposed vision. This should also apply to Table 3.1.	Noted
2	MIR886	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Bruce	Wilson		No mention of locally designated Local Nature Conservation Sites (LNCS). This means that there is very little safeguard for sites that are not designated as SSSIs or Natura 2000 sites. Inappropriately located and badly designed developments can have significant, detrimental impacts on Scotland's biodiversity and on	LNCS are not covered in the MIR - the MIR only includes areas of change. This will be dealt with in Supplementary Guidance

							<p>people's quality of life planning and design of new places could and should in the future enhance biodiversity, particularly if new developments are designed to improve habitat connectivity and avoid the destruction of valuable biodiversity hotspots. SWT recommends the application of an ecosystem-based approach to at least the natural heritage aspects of the planning system. Scottish Wildlife Trust would like to see the inclusion of locally designated sites within the plan</p>	
2	MIR825	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Capefleet Limited			<p>Support the Preferred Option 1 - Spatial Strategy, and welcome the Council's preference to retain strategic legacy items from the SLLP including community growth areas, development framework and masterplan sites.</p>	Noted
2	MIR863	Preferred option 1 - spatial strategy	Question 2	Ryden			<p>Yes generally acceptable.</p>	Noted

2.2	MIR915	Paragraph	2.16		Essar Oil (UK)	Bell Ingram Design	Requests that the LDP takes account of the pipeline running through SLC area when assessing and releasing sites for development and respects the exclusion zones	Noted
2.2	MIR209	Paragraph	2.16	John	McMorran		Has some concerns about the pre MIR consultation process.	Pre MIR consultation was extensive and is outlined in the Consultation and Engagement report produced alongside the MIR
2.2	MIR986	Paragraph	2.16	Blair	Melville		Paragraph 2.16 bullet point 1 requires reconsideration. The onus placed on the LDP by Scottish Planning Policy is now to identify land for 10 years from the date of adoption which is effective or capable of becoming effective, and to identify a generous land supply which will ensure a minimum 5-year supply of effective land at all times. Given the dramatic changes in the economic context, which have affected the viability and deliverability of so many sites, it is wrong to assume that sites already in the Local Plan are effective without further	Sites have all been reassessed and this is included in the revised figures in the housing technical report

							assessment. The Council is aware how many sites in the housing land audit have been reclassified as non-effective for marketability reasons; it is inevitable that some of these reclassified sites will be allocated in the existing Plan.	
2.2	MIR123	Paragraph	2.17	William	Cochrane		It is unclear how the individual site assessments and the comments received on these will be incorporated into the emerging spatial strategy for the LDP.	Each of the sites submitted has been assessed in terms of effectiveness and deliverability and released if they meet certain criteria in the site assessment process. The sites have then been accepted or rejected in the LDP
2.2	MIR987	Paragraph	2.17	Blair	Melville		in paragraph 2.17 site assessment of existing or potential new sites has to include considerations of marketability, viability and deliverability from a builders perspective.	This has been considered fully in the Housing Technical Report and in separate discussions with Homes for Scotland
2.2	MIR939	Paragraph	2.19		Ashfield Land	Barton Wilmore	in relation to site CL/37/007 we submit that the SEA is flawed	Noted but each site was assessed in the same way.
2.2	MIR148	Paragraph	2.19	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	Objects to some of the comments included in the assessment criteria for Shields Road EK71004	Noted but each site was assessed in the same way.



							particularly relating to biodiversity and landscape.	
2.2	MIR910	Paragraph	2.19	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	There are conflicting assessments between the SEA and MIR. This is also reflected in previous Reporter's recommendations to the SLLP.	The SEA has been updated in view of assessments and comments made by the gateway regarding the MIR and pressure for change sites.
2.2	MIR664	Paragraph	2.19		Cala Homes West		An assessment of the SEA for sites at Braehead Road and Peel Road, Thorntonhall, site west of Strathaven and site at Bothwellbank, confirms that the Council has been unduly negative regarding the potential impacts of residential development on the environment:	Disagree - each site was assessed using the same criteria and parameters
2.2	MIR897	Paragraph	2.19	Allan	McCulloch		There are conflicting comments on the same site in the SEA and the planning assessment. This also applies to traffic comments.	The SEA has been updated in view of assessments and comments made by the gateway regarding the MIR and pressure for change sites.
2.4	MIR287	Paragraph	2.4		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	The LDP must reflect the approved GCVSDP. This fundamentally amends the strategic direction of growth, especially in relation to new housing requirements.	The LDP will fully reflect the SDP

2.4	MIR64	Paragraph	2.4		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	Concern is raised in relation to various comments made in the MIR relating to the content of the GCVSDP. The findings of the Reporter are binding on the SLC and must be reflected in the LDP.	The LDP will fully reflect the SDP
2.4	MIR372	Paragraph	2.4	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	The LDP must reflect the approved GCVSDP. This fundamentally amends the strategic direction of growth, especially in relation to new housing requirements.	The LDP will fully reflect the SDP
2.4	MIR122	Paragraph	2.4	William	Cochrane		It is not clear what positive proposals are being considered and /or adopted to " maintain and enhance the built and natural environment" in a rural context.	Noted
2.6	MIR80	Paragraph	2.6	David	Berry		The Coal Authority considers that there is still a requirement for the LDP to take account of minerals issues and outline appropriate general policies to ensure that these issues are addressed within future development decisions.	Noted the LDP will cross refer to the Councils Minerals Local Development Plan adopted in 2012

3	MIR952	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	None of the alternative options are appropriate	Noted
3	MIR151	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	None of the alternative options for the spatial strategy allow for a balanced perspective to be taken. The strategy for fulfilling housing demand through the release of large CGAs has not been effective and requires to be addressed through the new LDP through the release of appropriate additional housing sites to meet the current need and the gap which has been created by the delay in the CGAs not performing to the required timescale.	Noted but this has been fully considered in the housing technical report
3	MIR45	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	It is considered that none of the alternative options for the spatial strategy allow for a balanced perspective to be taken.	Noted
3	MIR901	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	Guidance needs to be taken from the Clyde Valley SDP as well as the MIR housing need statistics.	Noted but this has been fully considered in the housing technical report

3	MIR602	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3		Scottish and Southern Energy	Jones Lang LaSalle	<p>In terms of Alternative Option 1, it is agreed that the option of progressing with the current SLLP strategy would not be consistent with current government guidelines. The draft LDP should set out those aspects of the strategy that have been updated from the Local Plan in order to meet Scottish Government requirements. In terms of Alternative Option 2, it is recognised that a zero carbon approach may be detrimental to development delivery within the SLC area as a whole. However, a zero carbon approach could be achieved by off-setting the carbon impacts of development with developing a more positive planning framework for on-shore wind energy development. In terms of Alternative Option 3, it is recognised that this approach is likely to result in sporadic development and could well be detrimental to both the</p>	Noted - there will be separate Supplementary Guidance produced on climate change and renewable energy
---	--------	---	---------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------------------	--	---

							environment and pressures on infrastructure within the council area. Table 3.1 does not give sufficient recognition to the benefits of renewable energy development	
3	MIR16	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	No - the Council have the right balance	Noted
3	MIR498	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	No, the Council have the right general balance although further housing land is required in Blantyre	Noted - however any land release must be appropriately located
3	MIR1094	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Stephen	Partington	Muir Smith Evans	None of the alternative options for the spatial strategy are realistic	Noted
3	MIR324	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	The spatial strategy must recognise the need to meet the housing development needs of the area in full. Alternative Options 1 and 2 are unacceptable. However, Alternative Option 3 is supported subject to it being amended to promote development requirements in full but in a manner that meets the requirements of sustainable economic growth. This should include the promotion of appropriate rural land	Noted sites within the rural area have been included as development opportunities in the LDP

							release and brownfield regeneration opportunities. The MIR recognises that brownfield redevelopment opportunities exist in rural areas and this is welcomed. It must also recognise that rural greenfield land release will be necessary to accommodate housing land requirements in full and provide a range and choice of housing sites across the Council area.	
3	MIR67	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	Alternative Option 3 is supported subject to it being amended to promote development requirements in full but in a manner that meets the requirements of sustainable economic growth.	Noted
3	MIR771	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Mike	Andrews		The LDP requires to take account of the drive towards a low carbon economy, but it should be recognised that ongoing improvements to the Building Regulations will satisfy a large part of this aim. A further key government aim is economic development	Noted

							and the planning system is tasked with providing a positive framework for delivering development. In the context of the current economic position, it is difficult to support a strategy that does not exploit the economic potential of the area.	
3	MIR279	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Donna	Brooks		No change is not feasible since the LDP has to meet needs as well as demands. Zero carbon is not feasible within the lifespan of a LDP Full economic development is equally unfeasible within the existing SDP/national /European planning/environmental policy and regulatory context. The reality lies within the spectrum between 2. and 3. - the SLLDP should aim towards the Zero carbon end of the spectrum, focusing economic development to the settlements best served by transport and infrastructure and restricting development in settlements less well served.	Noted but the LDP needs to be realistic

3	MIR220	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Avril	Dobson		Does not agree with Spatial Strategy Alternative Options 1 and 2	Noted
3	MIR1023	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Robert	Freel		Support the full economic development by encouraging different types of developments in all locations. Do not support the No change option.	Noted
3	MIR321	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	1. No change' is not feasible since the LDP has to meet needs as well as demands. 2. Zero carbon' is not feasible within the lifespan of a LDP 3. Full economic development' is equally unfeasible within the existing SDP/national /European planning/environmental policy and regulatory context. The reality lies within the spectrum between 2. and 3. - the SLLDP should aim towards the Zero carbon' end of the spectrum, focusing economic development to the settlements best served by transport and infrastructure and restricting development in	Noted but the LDP needs to be realistic



							settlements less well served.	
3	MIR441	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Wendy	Gilmour		Zero carbon economy is unrealistic. Development in rural areas and extension of large conurbations will also increase car usage. The climate itself is so unpredictable that wind and solar power alone cannot guarantee to supply power. Use should be made of energy from waste and ground source heat for new development sites . Free car parking in town centres would reduce travel to "out of town" sites.	Noted - however parking comes under the remit of roads not the LDP
3	MIR667	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Ian	Gilmour		Number 2 and 3 required but if no.1 means not meeting Government guidelines it is not feasible	Noted
3	MIR804	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3		James Barr		Development should be at an appropriate scale	Noted

3	MIR714	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Rachael	Macleod		Due to the nature and size of the Wellburn Farm site, it should be included in the list of defined sites presented in table 3.1 of the MIR in relation to the delivery of the Sustainable Economic and Social Development in a low carbon economy.	Noted - but premature to include it in Table 3.1
3	MIR836	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	John	McMorran		no	Noted
3	MIR989	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Blair	Melville		Alternative 1 suggests the preferred strategy is different from the existing, but again the basis of this statement is not spelled out in any detail. There is no obvious signal in the SDP of a change of strategic direction. What aspects of the SDP are leading the Council to suggest that amendments to strategy are necessary? Option 2 is not realistic. No definition of what zero carbon actually means. Growth appears under that policy to be a given; options should be assessed on the basis of best practicable approach to environmental impact. Option 3 contains	LDP follows the guidance from SPP and the SDP Scottish Government advocate the climate change agenda and Councils must respond as appropriate

							assertions with no evidence to support them why would full economic development be inconsistent with the aims of achieving a low carbon economy?	
3	MIR549	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	William W	Park		no	Noted
3	MIR531	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Isobel	Paterson		There should be no development in the Green Belt around Strathaven	Noted
3	MIR134	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	George	Ross		Option 2 - Zero Carbon should be taken forward.	Noted
3	MIR827	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Capefleet Limited			no	Noted
3	MIR864	Alternative options - spatial strategy	Question 3	Ryden			No	Noted
3.1	MIR152	Paragraph	3.1	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	The site is shown as a pressure for change option and it is our view that the site EK71004 should be removed from the greenbelt, incorporated within the East Kilbride settlement boundary and should be shown as a residential development site.	This would happen if the site were proposed for release through the LDP - it is premature to do this in the MIR

3.1	MIR129		Table 3.1	Neil	Gainford		The spatial strategy as presented in Table 3.1 should reconsider what is meant by the term 'sustainable locations' and recognise that rural areas are not necessarily less sustainable than their urban counterparts. This term should be defined in the Glossary of Terms.	Noted- being rural does not necessarily make a place unsustainable - there is a need to ensure that small pockets of development continue within and adjacent to rural areas but only where it is logical and sensible to locate them or where they can be implemented
3.1	MIR192		Table 3.1	Neil	Gainford		In relation to the provision in Table 3.1 'to meet communities needs by ensuring the supply of land for development to allow for the provision of housing of an appropriate size, type and quality in sustainable locations' it is not enough for Councils to rely on sites which were zoned pre-recession, or which benefit from planning consent automatically to find a place within the effective land supply. An appraisal ought to inform the Council as to which sites have a realistic chance of development in a 5 year time horizon. In this respect the existing housing sites in Netherburn are considered	Noted - this is discussed more in the Housing Technical Paper

							non effective and the most realistic way in which housing choice can be broadened in Netherburn is through the release of a limited number of house plots on Overton Road (HM/87/002)	
3.1	MIR668		Table 3.1	Ian	Gilmour		developments such as East Overton are inconsistent with the requirements in table 3.1 for a low carbon economy due to increased traffic generation and pressure on infrastructure, The word 'appropriate' needs qualification with reference to sites for renewable energy	Noted
3.1	MIR3	Paragraph	3.11			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Land lying to the north west of Millburn Road, Ashgill should be deleted from the Green Belt and put within the settlement.	This would happen if the site were proposed for release through the LDP - it is premature to do this in the MIR
3.1	MIR916	Paragraph	3.11		Essar Oil (UK)	Bell Ingram Design	The NW Ethylene Pipeline is operated by Essar Oil (UK) and is a significant Pipeline asset of strategic importance in the supplies of oil and gas from the North Sea. The NW Ethylene Pipeline is classified by the Health and Safety Executive as a	Pipeline will be shown on the map

							major accident hazard pipeline (MAHP) and as such is subject to land use planning constraints. Welcome and support the inclusion of the NW Ethylene Pipeline on the 'Strategic Map Context' which accompanies the MIR and would support its inclusion in the Local Development Plan Map.	
3.1	MIR755	Paragraph	3.11	Muse Developments		GVA Grimley	<p>The housing land supply section makes reference to a list of suggested potential changes to designations and settlement boundaries as noted within Technical Report 1. We note the potential boundary changes to Larkhall that effect the Cherryhill regeneration proposals. These minor changes relate to a "tidying up" of the settlement boundary in the vicinity of the Morgan Glen but fail to accurately accord with the area approved for residential development under planning permission in principle reference HM/09/0361. We therefore request that this boundary</p>	<p>The area along Morgan Glen needs to be 'tidied up' the MIR made an attempt to define a boundary that met the requirements of both developers and the greenspace objectives. This may need further consideration.</p>

							is amended to reflect that consent.	
3.1	MIR204	Paragraph	3.11	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	The Strategic Context Map shows the whole of the former Gasworks site Lots 1, 2 and 3 for residential purposes. It is requested that it should also show that potential exists for retail and commercial development	This will be amended if appropriate when the LDP is produced
3.1	MIR174	Paragraph	3.11	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	Strategic context map should be amended to include site EK/71/002 .	Noted - but the map will only include sites at LDP stage that are considered appropriate for development
3.1	MIR41	Paragraph	3.11	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Due to the scale some clear drafting errors are evident once the plan is enlarged otherwise fine.	Noted - this will be amended for the LDP
3.1	MIR1092	Paragraph	3.11		BMJ Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Changes should be made to the MIR maps to include sites at Balgray Rd Lesmahagow and Langlands East Kilbride	Noted - but the map will only include sites at LDP stage that are considered appropriate for development
3.1	MIR885	Paragraph	3.11		Cobelnieola	Scott Mackay Planning	Yes changes should be made to the MIR maps the Potential SEIL and Settlement Boundary at Peel Park North. East Kilbride should be amended.	Noted - but the map will only include sites at LDP stage that are considered appropriate for development
3.1	MIR216	Paragraph	3.11	CSK Farming Ltd		Scott Mackay Planning	We consider that changes should be made to the MIR maps to include additional land identified in	This will be included in the LDP if appropriate

							the attached plan within the settlement boundary at West End Farm, Jackton	
3.1	MIR663	Paragraph	3.11		Cala Homes West		The Green Belt boundary and a number of settlement boundaries need to be reviewed and reflected in the Strategy Map to take account of the requirements in SPP and the SDP. This will ensure that land to accommodate future housing to meet identified needs and demand can be accommodated in sustainable locations. There is a need for a substantial amount of additional land to be released to meet the housing shortfall.	Noted - this is discussed fully in the housing technical report
3.4	MIR96	Paragraph	3.4	Rachel	Furlong		Welcome to recognition of the role of sustainable development such as renewable energy in mitigating climate change, contributing to our national and international climate change obligations.	Noted
3.8	MIR94	Paragraph	3.8		sportscotland		Agree with the spatial strategy but recommend that a further criterion should be added: - protect and promote the assets	Noted



							and resources that contribute to people's quality of life; or simply-protect and promote quality of life in S Lanarkshire From a sportscotland perspective this would include all resources across the authority that provide for sport and physical recreation.	
4	MIR953	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Yes agree with this option provided the locations do not affect the natural biodiversity.	Noted
4	MIR197	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	Site at Hermyon House should not be allocated for industrial uses.	Noted - this will be amended for the LDP if appropriate
4	MIR902	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	Developments of a masterplan size (strategic) will require also to consider alternative uses, including employment opportunities.	Not sure what this comment means
4	MIR177	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	Preferred option should have more emphasis on rural area investment to generate sustainable growth.	Noted - rural issues will be considered fully in the LDP

4	MIR777	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Stewart Milne Group		McInally Associates	Agree in part, disagree in part. Agree with the preferred strategy as it promotes and safeguards the strategic economic investment locations identified in the SDP. However, in relation to non strategic locations it is submitted that selected sites should be rezoned in order that a wide range of uses can be allowed to encourage investment and development.	Noted
4	MIR858	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Ashfield Land (Glasgow) Ltd		Muir Smith Evans	It is submitted that the three options for employment land/locations set out in the MIR are too narrowly defined. None of them provides sufficient flexibility to allow promotion of mixed use, employment generating developments - whatever they may be - in appropriate locations. While the council's preferred option is broadly supported it is vital that the promotion and safeguarding of strategic economic investment locations does not preclude employment generating developments	Noted - this will be discussed fully in the LDP and technical paper on employment land

							lying outwith Classes 4, 5 and 6. The policies of the forthcoming LDP Proposed Plan must incorporate sufficient flexibility to allow for, and support, a full range of employment generating uses.	
4	MIR881	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4		Cobelnieola	Scott Mackay Planning	The potential SEIL at Peel Park North, East Kilbride has a poorly defined boundary to its western edge to the north of Craigpark and should include additional land up to Braehead Road and the existing footpath connection Braehead Road to East Kilbride Road.	Noted - boundary will be redefined in LDP if appropriate
4	MIR823	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Scott	MacKay planning	Scott Mackay Planning	do not agree with preferred option take up of SEILs is poor. Safeguarding these sites without flexibility for a wide range of alternative uses is blighting potential developable land and preventing economic development and job creation	The SEILs are designated under the SDP and the LDP merely reflects the wording in the SDP

4	MIR280	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Donna	Brooks		Agree generally with Bullet points 1 and 2 but do not endorse 3, carte blanche approval to add/remove areas. A more refined approach is needed to ensure the correct decisions are taken for the particular context and local communities should be involved in the decision-making process.	Noted - this will be discussed fully in the LDP and technical paper on employment land
4	MIR221	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Avril	Dobson		Agrees with the preferred option however the needs of each community should be judged individually and in partnership with that community	Noted - this will be discussed fully in the LDP and technical paper on employment land
4	MIR1024	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Robert	Freel		A wider range of uses should be considered for non strategic locations provided a set of agreed criteria can be met. Criteria should be generic but also tailored to suit the locations. This should be combined with a review of the Industrial and business areas. Large strategic sites should be preserved however where no development is forthcoming for these a mechanism for re-examining and re-	Noted - this will be discussed fully in the LDP and technical paper on employment land

							evaluating them in relation to changing land use or considering different classes of use should be built and a maximum time period for development to happen should be put in place .	
4	MIR322	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree generally with Bullet points 1 and 2 but do not endorse 3, carte blanche approval to add/remove areas. A more refined approach is needed to ensure the correct decisions are taken for the particular context and local communities should be involved in the decision-making process.	Noted - this will be discussed fully in the LDP and technical paper on employment land
4	MIR442	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree- better for units to occupied where appropriate than empty as potential tenant does not meet the right criteria.	Noted
4	MIR786	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4		Lidl UK GmbH		It is not possible to comment on this option because although reference is made to "allow a wider range of uses in some non-strategic economic locations" no information is provided on these locations or the wider	Noted - this will be discussed fully in the LDP and technical paper on employment land

							range of uses that are being considered. Reference is made to Technical Report 1 but this does not provide the suggested information.	
4	MIR1010	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Stuart	MacGarvie		Yes having cognisance of smaller settlements must be considered in terms of sustainable economic development	Noted - this will be discussed fully in the LDP and technical paper on employment land
4	MIR715	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Rachael	Macleod		Agree with the preferred option	Noted
4	MIR373	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Claire	Marr		Yes	Noted
4	MIR890	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Allan	McCulloch		Employment is important for sustainable development, especially when linked to large scale housing releases.	Noted - this will be discussed fully in the LDP and technical paper on employment land
4	MIR837	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
4	MIR550	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	William W	Park		yes	Noted
4	MIR532	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Isobel	Paterson		There should be no development in the Green Belt around Strathaven	Noted

4	MIR620	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Jim	Ravey		Scottish Coal reserves the right to comment on individual sites that are carried forward into the emerging LDP and have the potential to either impact or conflict with existing or proposed surface mining and restoration activities.	Noted
4	MIR136	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	George	Ross		A wider range of use in some non-strategic locations should not be permitted.	Noted - this will be discussed fully in the LDP and technical paper on employment land
4	MIR480	Preferred option 2 - Employment land/locations	Question 4	Roy	Scott		Broadly agree	Noted
4.2	MIR104	Paragraph	4.16	Alastair	Ness	James Barr Ltd	The statement at paragraph 4.16 requires to be tempered or evidence requires to be included within the LDP to support the claim. In terms of vacant units in town centres, a strategy requires to consider the future prospect of these units for continued retail use. Many town centres are now simply too large and have too many small retail units that are not attractive to modern retailers.	Noted

4.2	MIR105	Paragraph	4.17	Alastair	Ness	James Barr Ltd	As noted at 4.16, this information reflects the shifting purpose of town centres and the changing requirements of the retail industry.	Noted
4.2	MIR111	Paragraph	4.2	Alastair	Dickie	James Barr Ltd	Agree with specific reference to Atholl House in East Kilbride. The site forms part of the functioning town centre in every way except for the boundary drawn in the Local Plan.	Disagree that Atholl House is part of EK town centre
4.2	MIR643	Paragraph	4.23		McCarthy and Stone	The Planning Bureau Ltd	Wish to highlight the growing number of elderly people requiring specialist accommodation across the UK.	Noted
4.2	MIR991	Paragraph	4.23	Blair	Melville		Paragraph 4.23 is correct to note that the LDP is required to ensure that there is enough land to meet needs and demands perhaps for completeness and clarity it should refer to all tenures.	Noted
4.2	MIR81	Paragraph	4.23	Neil	Roberts		Previous Reporters direction should be adhered to and reference made in consideration of proposed new development.	Noted - however previous Reporters direction referred to the adopted local plan and not this LDP the decisions on this will be taken by a different Reporter



4.3	MIR926	Paragraph	4.26	Grant	Kirkhope		SDP has now been approved with Reporters modifications. MIR's should now detail SDP requirements as set out in Schedule 11A. A 10 year supply needs to be established and demonstrated that it can become effective. If there is not sufficient land then additional sites need to be brought forward.	Noted but the SPP requires a 5 year effective land supply, SDP looks at a 7 year effective land supply. The whole issue of land supply is discussed in the housing technical report.
4.3	MIR993	Paragraph	4.26	Blair	Melville		The MIR should spell out exactly what the SDP requires of the LDP i.e. the all-tenure housing requirement as set out in Schedule 11A, the fact that the established and possible sources of land supply are to be treated as preliminary and indicative, and that the onus falls on the LDP to demonstrate that it can provide a 10-year supply of land which is effective or capable of becoming effective.	This is included in the Housing Technical Report

4.3	MIR927	Paragraph	4.3	Grant	Kirkhope		Object to this 2011 Housing Land Audit does not reflect the requirements set out in SDP Schedule 11A. This section needs to be more detailed in terms of proposed unit allocations. How can we agree to a preferred strategy that details no unit allocations to preferred sites that have been suggested for inclusion. We appreciate that at this stage they are still only suggestions, however in order to make assumptions with regard to meeting housing land supply targets then there needs to be more details here.	The 2012 audit is being used for the LDP. Housing issues are fully discussed in the housing technical report
4.3	MIR994	Paragraph	4.3	Blair	Melville		Disagree with paragraph 4.30 on the basis of the 2011 Housing Land Audit there is not an adequate land supply to meet the requirements of the SDP Schedule 11A. The task of the LDP is to examine how other indicative sources of land supply urban capacity sites, sites currently non-effective, sites which can be re-designated from other uses, and potential	The 2012 audit is being used for the LDP. Housing issues are fully discussed in the housing technical report

							new sites, can combine to meet the SDP requirements.	
4.3	MIR135	Paragraph	4.3	George	Ross		The majority of people employed within the industrial areas of East Kilbride travel from out of town and the occupants of the new developments within the town travel to locations outwith the town.	Note sure what the evidence basis is for this - disagree
4.3	MIR82	Paragraph	4.31	Neil	Roberts		Supports inclusion of site EK/78/003.	Noted
4.3	MIR139	Paragraph	4.33	George	Ross		All of the sites around Thorntonhall should not be considered for development.	Noted
4.3	MIR93	Paragraph	4.33		sportscotland		Supportive of the preferred approach but any masterplan process for large residential development sites should encourage sport and physical recreation. In addition, It will be important for new development to align with the guidance set out in Designing Places and Designing Streets , both of which put walking and cycling as a priority.	Noted
4.4	MIR84	Paragraph	4.41	Neil	Roberts		New boundary proposed in EK/78/003 is a sustainable boundary	Noted

							current boundary is arbitrary.	
4.4	MIR130	Paragraph	4.42	Neil	Gainford		The spatial strategy should reconsider what is meant by the term 'sustainable locations' and recognise that rural areas are not necessarily less sustainable than their urban counterparts. This term should be defined in the Glossary of Terms.	Noted
4.4	MIR85	Paragraph	4.42	Neil	Roberts		Site EK/78/003 is noted as current us agricultural. This is incorrect the site is split usage with a large portion non--agricultural which should be removed from green belt.	Noted - the land is designated Green Belt
4.4	MIR92	Paragraph	4.43		sportscotland		Note role that the green belt plays in protecting and giving access to open space. A further criterion should be added to preferred option 9 "where development does not impact negatively on the purpose of the green belt in protecting and giving access to open space" Policy should be willing to refuse applications where there will be a significant negative impact on important paths and	Noted

							access rights where impacts cannot be acceptably mitigated against. It will be important to develop the Council's policy approach to the CSGN.	
4.5	MIR91	Paragraph	4.46		sportscotland		Supports the preferred option. In particular we support the proposal to encourage rural business in appropriate locations. Sport and recreation development in the countryside can have some specific locational requirements, often linked to the natural resources they are dependent on.	Noted
4.5	MIR190	Paragraph	4.48	Neil	Gainford		There may be merit in creating small new communities in the rural areas of South Lanarkshire. These could make a useful contribution to a sensible plan-led answer to meeting rural housing needs and taking pressure off the open countryside. However there is no evidence to suggest that Kaimend, Kersewell or Ponfeigh represent the best options	The three villages proposed were brought forward by the local development office responding to pressure for small scale development at these locations and a desire to have them designated as settlements and afforded a degree of protection in the LDP

							having regard to settlement pattern, integration into the community, and development viability. It is not clear what other options were considered or why the suggestions contained in Preferred Option 11 emerged ahead of other candidate locations.	
4.5	MIR86	Paragraph	4.48	Neil	Roberts		Proposed modifications supported.	Noted
4.5	MIR998	Paragraph	4.51	Blair	Melville		It is not clear how new development can be obliged to use local renewable or low carbon sources of heat or power, as implied in paragraph 4.51. Energy supply is a matter of consumer choice within a competitive energy market, and is not a planning matter. Again in the preferred option, planning policy cannot require developments to use “green” technologies. Nor is it clear, once again, what is meant by “zero carbon footprint”. In terms of housing. It is clear that housing can already meet the 2010 Building	Noted - this will be discussed more in supplementary guidance on climate change and renewable energy and technologies

							Standards through fabric design and construction technology, and there is increasing confidence that the 2013 Standards can also be met in this way or with minimal technological assistance. Homes for Scotland is clear that the policy priority should now be on retro-fitting older buildings, not seeking ever-smaller improvements to what are some of the highest standards of energy-efficient construction in Europe.	
4.6	MIR90	Paragraph	4.62		sportscotland		In developing policy on renewables, and in particular on wind energy, it is important to reflect the advice of the SPP. Policy on wind farms should include the need to consider impacts on sport and recreation interests.	Noted
4.7	MIR637	Paragraph	4.73	Patrick	Dunne		The LDP must take account of applications such as that at Overburns Farm. In its role as the key document in restricting inappropriate development and ensuring that the environmental	Overburns has been more appropriately considered under the minerals local development plan

							designations are accurate and are enforced appropriately through policy.	
5	MIR954	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No	Noted
5	MIR778	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Stewart Milne Group		McInally Associates	Agree in part, disagree in part. It is submitted that the site off Redwood Drive, East Kilbride should be reallocated as a mixed use development site to allow for a range of uses to include commercial, leisure, retail, residential care home, medical centre, restaurants and other similar uses.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
5	MIR1085	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5		BMJ Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Agree in part suggest that retail, commercial and leisure uses should be considered on industrial and business locations where appropriate and subject to compliance with other LDP policy objectives.	Noted
5	MIR281	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Donna	Brooks		Disagree with the alternative options, the first is too restrictive, the second would threaten the viability of existing town, village/neighbourhood	Noted



							centres.	
5	MIR222	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Avril	Dobson		Disagree with the restrictions of option 1 and option 2 could seriously damage the wellbeing of current town or village centres.	Noted
5	MIR1025	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Robert	Freel		Agree with the alternative option, but the use of terminology i.e. class 4, 5 and 6 should be removed and be fully detailed by what they actually mean. In addition a mix of retail commercial and leisure would suit some areas as opposed to others and these should be considered either on their own merits or against a guideline criteria which is detailed. Stonehouse Hospital site could be a mixture of residential, retail and leisure, Lochpark could be retail and light industry accessible from the bypass land at the ICF could also be mixed between the above uses.	Noted
5	MIR126	Appendices	5	Neil	Gainford		The term 'Sustainable Locations' should be defined in Appendix 1	Noted

							Glossary of Terms. It should be recognised that rural locations can also be sustainable.	
5	MIR323	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree with the alternative options, the first is too restrictive, the second would threaten the viability of existing town, village/neighbourhood centres	Noted
5	MIR443	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Wendy	Gilmour		No - too inflexible but need to be realistic when selecting appropriate tenants for sites	Noted
5	MIR675	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Ian	Gilmour		A wider range of uses appears preferable - e.g. social housing in Town Centres, offices on Industrial sites e.g. Job Centres	Noted
5	MIR716	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Rachael	Macleod		Agree with preferred option. The alternative options are either too restrictive in the case of retaining all allocations and will inhibit sustainable alternative uses to non strategic economic locations, or will be too flexible and lead to poorly planned and considered proposals.	Noted

5	MIR374	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Claire	Marr		No, both alternatives are too rigid. Consideration should, however, be given to permitting change of use to residential in appropriate locations and where commercial use may no longer be available.	Noted
5	MIR551	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	William W	Park		No	Noted
5	MIR481	Alternative options - employment land	Question 5	Roy	Scott		No	Noted
6	MIR955	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No	Noted
6	MIR779	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Stewart Milne Group		McInally Associates	Agree with preferred option. The site off Redwood Drive, East Kilbride, can be considered in a positive manner for redesignation as a mixed use development site to allow for a range of uses to include commercial, leisure, retail, residential care home, medical centre, restaurants and other similar uses.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

6	MIR859	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Ashfield Land (Glasgow) Ltd		Muir Smith Evans	It is important that the forthcoming LDP Proposed Plan re allocates TWO74 from industrial to mixed use in line with the extant consent. It would also be appropriate for the LDP to acknowledge that the site could be appropriate for a different mix of employment generating uses should Ashfield Land be unable to bring forward development as currently approved	Noted
6	MIR1086	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6		BMJ Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Agree that a review of existing industrial land supply is needed and any sites that are no longer considered appropriate or marketable should be considered for redesignation.	Noted
6	MIR282	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Donna	Brooks		Agree industrial land supply should be reviewed, with regard given to strategic context, with strict criteria and appropriate consultation.	Noted
6	MIR223	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Avril	Dobson		Agree that industrial land supply should be reviewed but within strategic context and in appropriate consultation with	Noted

							community stakeholders.	
6	MIR1026	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Robert	Freel		Existing land supply should be fully examined with a full report being issued with the LDP to assist in assessing what sites are no longer considered as marketable for industrial use but may fall within retail or leisure. Any such review should indicate when it was first designated, how long it has been vacant and what other uses it may be considered for.	Noted
6	MIR325	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree industrial land supply should be reviewed, with regard given to strategic context, with strict criteria and appropriate consultation.	Noted
6	MIR444	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree- but again be realistic in deciding the appropriate alternative use for each site.	Noted
6	MIR1011	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Stuart	MacGarvie		Yes	Noted
6	MIR717	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Rachael	Macleod		Agree with preferred option	Noted
6	MIR376	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land	Question 6	Claire	Marr		No, owners/developers are in a better position to	Noted - Council takes this into account

		supply					assess the marketability of sites than are the council.	
6	MIR838	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
6	MIR552	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	William W	Park		yes	Noted
6	MIR621	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Jim	Ravey		Scottish Coal reserves the right to comment on individual sites that are carried forward into the emerging LDP and have the potential to either impact or conflict with existing or proposed surface mining and restoration activities.	Noted
6	MIR482	Preferred option 3 - Industrial land supply	Question 6	Roy	Scott		yes	Noted
7	MIR956	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No	Noted
7	MIR780	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Stewart Milne Group		McInally Associates	Disagree with alternative options	Noted
7	MIR1087	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7		BMJ Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	No	Noted
7	MIR284	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Donna	Brooks		Disagree, this issue needs a more proactive and strategic approach to deal with changing economic	Noted

							context.	
7	MIR224	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Avril	Dobson		Disagree with alternative option for Industrial Land Supply - the preferred option is more proactive which is needed here.	Noted
7	MIR1027	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Robert	Freel		Would consider this if the council could guarantee that all parties / stakeholders would be notified of future change. There is also a requirement to fully examine all identified land and carry out a full assessment of sites already designated and assess whether they are likely to be marketable or not. This needs to be linked to the number of years they have been vacant with permission and nothing has been developed	Noted - reassessing sites and this is included in the housing technical report and employment land report
7	MIR326	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree, this issue needs a more proactive and strategic approach to deal with changing economic context.	Noted
7	MIR445	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree as this is more flexible. However do not be too restrictive. Alternatively a	Noted

							combination of Q6 and Q7 redesignation of some sites for "open" use but retain others for industrial. business only.	
7	MIR718	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Rachael	Macleod		Consideration should be given to sites that have been actively marketed for economic development and proved no market interest such as Wellburn Farm Lesmahagow	Noted
7	MIR377	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Claire	Marr		Yes, this offers more flexibility than the 'preferred' option.	Noted
7	MIR553	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	William W	Park		no	Noted
7	MIR537	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Isobel	Paterson		there should be no development in the Green Belt around Strathaven	Noted
7	MIR483	Alternative option - Industrial land supply	Question 7	Roy	Scott		no	Noted
8	MIR957	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No comment unless they are going to adversely affect the natural environment.	Noted
8	MIR903	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	pressure for change should consider the recently adopted Clyde Valley SDP as well as local housing supply and consents.	This is fully considered in the LDP



8	MIR178	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	The land at Kypeside (CL/65/011) should be delineated as an Eco- Rural village.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
8	MIR782	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Stewart Milne Group		McInally Associates	Agree in part, disagree in part. Although not included in the list of sites considered for redesignation, the site at Redwood Drive is capable of positive consideration.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
8	MIR898	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8		Scottish Enterprise	Montague Evans LLP	Requests a site at West Mains Road East Kilbride is redesignated for retail development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
8	MIR380	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	The former electrical substation south west of the village of Elvanfoot is a brownfield redevelopment opportunity that could come forward separately to the proposed housing sites in the village. Given its former use it is considered that a business use would be most appropriate for this location taking account of the overhead pylon connection that runs to the north of it.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

8	MIR389	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	The LDP must continue to allocate land for employment uses in villages where appropriate. Land north of the cemetery at Leadhills has a number of small scale employment uses on it that support local jobs. This should be formalised and re-identified as an employment opportunity for further limited growth.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
8	MIR797	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8		Stonehouse Ahead	Turley Associates	Proposes that Stonehouse should be considered as an area for residential development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
8	MIR225	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Avril	Dobson		The local communities should make the decisions whether these changes from industrial to other uses are acceptable.	Noted - any decisions will be based on what has happened over the last few years regarding planning permissions granted and implemented and based on officer knowledge of the areas

8	MIR1028	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Robert	Freel		<p>HM/91/003 should not be considered as a housing/retail/other site as a number of other more suitable sites remain within the village and these should be considered before a new site is released.</p> <p>HM/91/002 would appear to be adjacent to an area where housing already exists however no indication if its light industrial or housing no detail on HM/91/001 therefore in order to assess if it comes off more detail is required as we cant find any assessment sheets in the documentation. The council should look at its own ground as potential for pressure for change. The community council would like to see the existing pockets included for all consideration. The site that is at millburn marked for housing should be retained for industrial use as it links into canderside toll and NHS warehouse site.</p>	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
---	---------	--	---------------	--------	-------	--	---	--

8	MIR446	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Wendy	Gilmour		In Technical Report 2, the proposed masterplan site for Strathaven West should remain agricultural. The extensive list of other potential sites on agricultural land around town would also put pressure on the current infrastructure. Consideration should first be given to developing brownfield sites.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
8	MIR917	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Stuart	Hunter		Do not support the change of use from industrial to alternative uses. Industrial and business land is generally allocated because of their strategic location and suitability for that use. These sites should be retained in their currently allocated use to maintain a supply of land to cater for the economic upturn when it comes and new sites should be identified for any additional uses not currently catered for.	Noted
8	MIR805	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8		James Barr		Yes	Noted
8	MIR719	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for	Question 8	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with alternative options	Noted

		change sites						
8	MIR378	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Claire	Marr		We do not agree that more sites for housing should be designated. However, if there have to be some additional small sites, then we appreciate SLC's grading of the sites (3,2,1).	Noted - but there will be a requirement for more housing land across South Lanarkshire to meet the requirements of the SPP and SDP
8	MIR990	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Blair	Melville		Homes for Scotland cannot comment on specific sites, but we support the approach of examining alternative uses for non-essential employment sites.	Noted
8	MIR623	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Jim	Ravey		SRG is content with the approach set out Preferred Option 4 on the understanding that any proposed alternative use would not prejudice or sterilise any existing development opportunities and/or natural resources.	Noted
8	MIR484	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Roy	Scott		no	Noted
8	MIR757	Preferred option 4 - Pressure for change sites	Question 8	Colin	Tait		Objects to the potential development of EK/78/002	Noted
9	MIR958	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	no	Noted

9	MIR783	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Stewart Milne Group		McInally Associates	Disagree with alternative option	Noted
9	MIR286	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Donna	Brooks		Disagree strongly that there should be a generalist approach; each case must be decided on its merits and in consultation with affected parties.	Noted
9	MIR212	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Billy	Cochrane		In some towns and villages there is a requirement for all- weather sports facilities. The current solution is for an open-air 3G football pitch surrounded by high fences and floodlighting. However with our Scottish winter and rainy/stormy climate the only all- weather pitch is one which is housed in a huge building such as some of the used factory & retail sheds in industrial/ business estates and retail parks. Consideration should be given to rescheduling some of this space for indoor sports facilities.	Noted
9	MIR226	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Avril	Dobson		Pressure for change sites should not be released as a matter of course, each	Each site submitted has been assessed using the same set of criteria

							suggested change for each community should be examined individually	
9	MIR1029	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Robert	Freel		No don't accept all the proposals that have come forward. Following a full survey of sites and the length of time they have been vacant a guideline criteria should be drawn up to test whether they should be re-allocated.	Sites have all been reassessed and the LDP will reflect the most appropriate position
9	MIR328	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree strongly that there should be a generalist approach, each case must be decided on its merits and in consultation with affected parties.	Noted
9	MIR447	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Wendy	Gilmour		Disagrees with Alternative Option	Noted
9	MIR676	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Ian	Gilmour		If change required should be after full consultation	Noted
9	MIR720	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Rachael	Macleod		Supports the inclusion of the site at Wellburn Farm Lesmahagow CL/40/001	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
9	MIR721	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with alternative options	Noted
9	MIR379	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Claire	Marr		No	Noted

9	MIR555	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	William W	Park		no	Noted
9	MIR485	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Roy	Scott		no	Noted
9	MIR866	Alternative option - Pressure for change sites	Question 9	Ryden			No	Noted
10	MIR1078	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10		ASDA	Dundas & Wilson CS LLP	There is also a role for out-of-centre developments and development at commercial centres where there is shown to be a requirement, where they will not have an unacceptable impact on other centres and where a sequential approach to site selection has been shown. Given the mixed use nature of the Larkhall Cherryhill Redevelopment, the Retail Permission site and the area surrounding the Retail Permission site should be allocated as a commercial centre in the LDP. Allocation as a commercial centre would reflect the Larkhall Cherryhill Redevelopment's intended role in South Lanarkshire's	Noted - sites will be reallocated in the LDP if appropriate



							network of centres without compromising the role and function of the Town Centre. ASDA consider that there is a requirement for a further foodstore in East Kilbride. The site at Kittoch Field should be brought to the market soon if it is to be delivered in the short to medium term. If this is not the case, then the Council should consider alternative sites for the provision of the foodstore	
10	MIR741	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Muse Development s		GVA Grimley	Agrees with preferred option with the caveat that the LDP must also explicitly identify realistic opportunities to allow town centres to evolve, develop and reflect consumer's changing needs and aspirations. A fundamental part of delivering town centres should be the identification of such opportunities taking into account current proposals and consents that have the ability to eventually become an integral part of a particular centre. The site at Lesmahagow for a supermarket should be	Noted - sites will be reallocated in the LDP if appropriate

							given a formal designation in the LDP	
10	MIR959	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	agree	Noted
10	MIR198	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	Town, village and neighbourhood centres in the shopping network should continue to be the focus of retail activity and be the preferred location for new retail development. However the Uddingston Town Centre is unable to accommodate significant retail development and this should be directed to Uddingston gas works site.	Noted - sites will be reallocated in the LDP if appropriate
10	MIR109	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Alastair	Dickie	James Barr Ltd	Town, village and neighbourhood centres should remain the focus for retail activity and be the preferred location for new development but in that context the LDP requires to acknowledge the trends of retailers requirements and the fact that town centres can sometimes not provide appropriate opportunities for proposed new retail	Noted - sites will be reallocated in the LDP if appropriate

							development. The LDP should acknowledge that the town centre will not always provide the best options and that there may be other reasons to allow development outwith designated town centres. Edge of centre sites also have an important part to play in assisting town centres and providing opportunities to expand and provide additional floorspace and facilities.	
10	MIR106	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Alastair	Ness	James Barr Ltd	Town, village and neighbourhood centres should remain to be the focus of retail activity and be the preferred location for new development but in that context the LDP requires to acknowledge the trends towards retailers requirements and the fact that town centres can sometimes not provide appropriate opportunities for proposed new retail development. In this regard whilst a preference should remain, the Policy requires to properly acknowledge that the town centre will not always provide the best	Noted this will be discussed further in the LDP

							option and that there may be wider reasons to allow development outwith designated centres.	
10	MIR861	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Ashfield Land (Glasgow) Ltd		Muir Smith Evans	LDP should allow for flexibility in the application of the policy that town, village and neighbourhood centres should continue to be the focus of retail activity and the preferred location of a new retail development, given the constantly changing nature of retail and commercial activity and given that current economic conditions are projected to continue at least over the short to medium term.	Noted
10	MIR611	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Tesco Stores Limited		Redline Planning Ltd	Agree with preferred option 5 as this will allow a strong policy context to be created to focus retail development on town centre sites. The emerging LDP retail and commercial policies should provide	Noted

							increased certainty to developers of town centre or allocated retail development sites, where support will be given to compliant retail proposals, and that they will not require to be accompanied with detailed retail capacity or impact analysis.	
10	MIR911	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10		Propinvest and East Kilbride Invest	Savills	support the Council's Preferred Option 5	Noted
10	MIR264	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10		Kean Properties	Scott Mackay Planning	Supports Preferred Option 5 in so far as Town, village and neighbourhood centres in the shopping network should continue to be the focus of retail activity and be the preferred location for new retail development. However, with respect to the sequential approach, it should be made clear that village and neighbourhood centres do not have the same status as town centres. Furthermore, commercial centres and out of centre locations can and should be used for retail development where	Noted this will be discussed further in the LDP

							appropriate, for example for bulky goods retailing, or where there are no sequentially preferable sites	
10	MIR251	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Tesco Stores Limited		Scott Mackay Planning	Support Preferred Option 5 in so far as town. village and neighbourhood centres in the shopping network should continue to be the focus of retail activity and be the preferred location for new retail development. However with respect to the sequential approach, it should be made clear that village and neighbourhood centres do not have the same status as town centres. Furthermore commercial centres and out of centre locations can and should be used for retail development where appropriate. for example for bulky goods retailing, or where there are no sequentially preferable sites	Noted this will be discussed further in the LDP

10	MIR597	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10		Sainsbury's Supermarket s Ltd	Turley Associates	Sainsburys do not agree with the preferred approach. The MIR fails to provide a clear network and hierarchy of centres. The network of centres should follow the approach set out in SPP which suggests that development plans should identify a network of centres which will include town centres, commercial centres and other local centres, depending on the circumstances. The proposed plan should also take into account the approach set out in the recently approved Glasgow and Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan which identifies East Kilbride and Hamilton as strategic centres.	Noted this will be discussed further in the LDP
10	MIR798	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10		Stonehouse Ahead	Turley Associates	Existing retail offered in Stonehouse is limited and a new food retail location could help contribute to the planned growth of the village	Noted - but retail development must be redirected to appropriate locations
10	MIR288	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Donna	Brooks		Agree with the preferred option, that town, village and neighbourhood centres in the shopping	Noted

							network should continue to be the focus of retail activity and be the preferred location for new retail development. Appropriate measures should be taken by SLC to safeguard and promote existing town centres.	
10	MIR210	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Billy	Cochrane		Agree with Preferred Option	Noted
10	MIR1102	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	E A	Coogans		Refers to pages 25-28 of MIR regarding retailing. See attached rep for full details. Do not accept out of town locations should have same status as town and village centres. Opposed to any relaxation in the control of uses in town and village centres.	Noted
10	MIR419	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Agnieszka	Devine		It is unclear whether any retailing/commercial proposals affect west Strathaven	Noted
10	MIR227	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Avril	Dobson		Agrees with preferred option 5 - retailing and commercial	Noted



10	MIR1030	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Robert	Freel		In the larger towns and villages the focus should still be on village centre or neighbourhood centres but in the smaller rural villages where decline has steadily eroded the centre of retail some radical new approaches should be thought out. Smaller commercial or retail units could fit into the villages however there should be a limit on how many hot food or takeaway are located in a single area. Out of centre needs to be defined. In a small village an out of centre location could be half a mile away.	Noted
10	MIR329	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree with the preferred option, that town, village and neighbourhood centres in the shopping network should continue to be the focus of retail activity and be the preferred location for new retail development. Appropriate measures should be taken by SLC to safeguard and promote existing town centres.	Noted
10	MIR449	Preferred option 5 - Retailing &	Question 10	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree- where possible. However some very small	Noted

		commercial					units might be better as offices.	
10	MIR677	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Ian	Gilmour		Agree	Noted
10	MIR787	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10		Lidl UK GmbH		The preferred option for retailing and town centres should be expanded to state that, whereas in general, the preferred location for retail uses is in town centres, this will be applied in the context of the sequential approach, and that, in considering proposals for retail development particular weight should be attached to the extent to which proposals support new employment and reduce the need to travel for shopping requirements	Noted - but retail development must be redirected to appropriate locations
10	MIR722	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Rachael	Macleod		Broadly agree with preferred option but feel that a degree of flexibility should be allowed in the policy. Where small scale retail can be provided out with these areas, which compliments those facilities found in the local centres, these should be supported.	Noted

10	MIR381	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	Claire	Marr		Yes	Noted
10	MIR841	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
10	MIR556	Preferred option 5 - Retailing & commercial	Question 10	William W	Park		yes	Noted
11	MIR960	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Do not agree	Noted
11	MIR110	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Alastair	Dickie	James Barr Ltd	It is not clear if the term out of centre seeks to include edge of centre site. There is a difference between out of centre sites and edge of centre sites. There may be a case to give edge of centre sites more status and provide a hierarchy of town centre, edge of centre, commercial centre and out of centre locations.	Noted - this will be clarified in LDP
11	MIR107	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Alastair	Ness	James Barr Ltd	Out of centre sites should be give the same status as town centres. Out of centre development is normally viewed as a negative development due to the policy preference for town centres but they can	Noted - but retail development must be redirected to appropriate locations

							have positive benefits for the town and wider area. Suggested an alternative site in Lanark.	
11	MIR912	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11		Propinvest and East Kilbride Invest	Savills	do not support the Council's Alternative Option 5	Noted
11	MIR265	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11		Kean Properties	Scott Mackay Planning	We do not agree with the alternative option whereby out of centre retail locations should have the same status as Town, village and neighbourhood centres. This would be contrary to national planning policy contained in SPP	Noted
11	MIR256	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Tesco Stores Limited		Scott Mackay Planning	Do not agree with the alternative option of out of centre retail locations should having the same status as town village and neighbourhood centres.	Noted
11	MIR598	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11		Sainsbury's Supermarket s Ltd	Turley Associates	Disagree with the alternative option. The 'out of centre retail locations' should be revised and the MIR should reflect the terminology used in SPP and the SDP as mentioned. As a result of this policy COM7 and Table 5.6 of the adopted Local Plan should be	Noted - but this does not accord with SDP

							reviewed to fit in with the sequential approach. Kingsgate Retail Park should form part of the network of centres.	
11	MIR289	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Donna	Brooks		Strongly disagree with the suggested Alternative option Retailing and commercial: giving equal status to out of town retail locations cannot be sustainable.	Noted
11	MIR211	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Billy	Cochrane		No do not agree with the Alternative Option. Town, Village & Neighbourhood centres should have a special status and are the preferred option for retailing, local services and public transport connections. The reason is that these locations are by custom & practice accessible to many people and children as pedestrians, cyclists, disability scooters, wheelchairs or are a short local car, bus or community transport journey from home. These locations also allow workers nearby to do local shopping at lunchtime or on the way home from	Noted

							work.	
11	MIR228	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Avril	Dobson		Disagree strongly with alternative option for retailing and commercial. The approved Sainsbury's supermarket has not resulted in net gain in physical or regeneration of Strathaven's town centre.	Noted
11	MIR1031	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Robert	Freel		Retail locations could have the same status and that could affect traditional town & village centres the council need to consider relaxing the rules but considering each on their own merit. Again a check list of criteria to measure whither it could be considered could be drawn up or it is allowed to follow the planning application process whereby local stakeholders are consulted. Where no investment has been forthcoming then existing village centres need to be analysed to establish if the demographics and population are no longer near the centre.	Noted

11	MIR331	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Strongly disagree with the suggested Alternative option - giving equal status to out of town retail locations cannot be sustainable. The lack of progress towards completion of Town Centre regeneration priorities suggests there needs to be more focus on existing centres. The edge-of-town supermarket for Strathaven has not resulted in any spin-off physical improvement or regeneration nor has the impact been measured, two years on from the supermarket opening.	Noted
11	MIR450	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree if it means they pay the same rates.	Noted
11	MIR678	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Ian	Gilmour		promotion of out of town sites would mean a big carbon penalty	Noted
11	MIR382	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	Claire	Marr		No	Noted
11	MIR557	Alternative option - Retailing & commercial	Question 11	William W	Park		no	Noted

12	MIR1079	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12		ASDA	Dundas & Wilson CS LLP	It is noted from the MIR that the Larkhall Town Centre boundary is proposed to be extended to include the retail development site at Raploch Street (the Proposed Extension Site). ASDA does not support this proposal. The purpose of the existing allocation for the Proposed Extension Site was to provide a main food shopping destination for the residents of Larkhall. It is suggested that the ASDA store being constructed under the Retail Permission will now serve that function and therefore there is doubt as to whether the existing allocation for the Proposed Extension Site is necessary	Noted - but retail development must be redirected to appropriate locations
12	MIR746	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Muse Developments		GVA Grimley	The supporting paragraph 4.20 confirms that in some instances the town centre boundaries contained in the adopted SLLP may not properly reflect the area functioning as a town centre. In order to comply with the MIR's preferred option 6, Larkhall's town	Noted - but retail development must be redirected to appropriate locations



							centre definition should be amended to incorporate the commercial elements of the consented Cherryhill regeneration proposals.	
12	MIR961	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	agree	Noted
12	MIR112	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Alastair	Dickie	James Barr Ltd	Do not agree with the option in relation to East Kilbride Town Centre the boundary change ignores Atholl House which is a major town centre office building and town centre car park.	Noted - but retail development must be redirected to appropriate locations
12	MIR114	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Neil	Galloway	James Barr Ltd	Support the boundary change proposed as it relates to Hillhouse, Hamilton . The former First Milk site now has planning permission for a foodstore development and together with the existing neighbourhood centre would provide a significant improvement to the retail offer in the Hillhouse area.	Noted - this will be amended as appropriate in the LDP
12	MIR613	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Tesco Stores Limited		Redline Planning Ltd	Agree with preferred option 6 to review the town centre boundaries in order to identify new opportunities for retail	Noted

							floorspace and regeneration. Also support relaxing restrictions on changes of use to allow any commercial uses in town centres.	
12	MIR913	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12		Propinvest and East Kilbride Invest	Savills	support Preferred Option 6	Noted
12	MIR266	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12		Kean Properties	Scott Mackay Planning	We agree with Preferred Option 6 in that the review of town centre/retail designation boundaries is needed. Within Section 6 - Potential Changes - Retail Designation, we support the retail designation of land at Peel Park to reflect current planning consent.	Noted - this will be amended as appropriate in the LDP
12	MIR259	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Tesco Stores Limited		Scott Mackay Planning	Agree with Preferred option 6 in that the review of town centre/retail designation boundaries is needed. Support the retail designation of land at Peel Park.	Noted - this will be amended as appropriate in the LDP
12	MIR599	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12		Sainsbury's Supermarket s Ltd	Turley Associates	Disagree with the preferred option. A comprehensive review should be undertaken of all centres within the network not just town centres. With regard to former Strathaven Auction	Noted - this will be amended as appropriate in the LDP

							<p>Mart sites identified as retail masterplan site in the adopted Local Plan), this site has now been developed to form a Sainsburys store. Therefore, this allocation should be reviewed and the store allocated as a centre</p>	
12	MIR290	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Donna	Brooks		<p>Agree generally with 1. a pro-active approach to review, and would include Strathaven in particular the inclusion of the Town Mill within the town centre to maximise potential for regeneration of this listed building and provide a context for improving pedestrian access. Such review should be carried out in consultation with the community and other interested parties. Bullet point 2 - Disagree – not clear how there could be general de-restriction on change of use and integrity of towns as key retail centre maintained. A critical mass of retail is required to maintain footfall: other commercial uses would not necessarily bring the same</p>	<p>Noted - further consideration of the boundary will be undertaken to access if this would be appropriate</p>

							<p>footfall. in Strathaven the majority of retail floorspace lies with an edge of town supermarket – de-restriction on change of use from retail to other commercial use within the town centre could be detrimental: and start a cycle of decline with remaining retailers unable to sustain their businesses owing to insufficient footfall.</p>	
12	MIR414	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	M.R	Burgess		Requests town centre at Strathaven extended to include Town Mill and its environs.	Noted - further consideration of the boundary will be undertaken to access if this would be appropriate
12	MIR415	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	M.R	Burgess		Agrees with preferred option.	Noted
12	MIR213	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Billy	Cochrane		Should be flexible with changes of use where a genuine market exists for the new business use and has attracted sufficient investor interest but this should not be detrimental to established businesses and the town/village centre should not be compromised.	Noted

12	MIR229	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Avril	Dobson		Disagrees with part 2 of Preferred Option 6 - the integrity of the retail units in the town centre of Strathaven depends on footfall which would not necessarily be maintained by alternative use of retail space by other commercial activities. In addition the Town Mill should be included within the boundary of Strathaven Town Centre.	Noted - further consideration of the boundary will be undertaken to access if this would be appropriate
12	MIR1032	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Robert	Freel		Agree with this option, it is not just town centre boundaries that need to be reviewed, this should be extended to the smaller villages. We also agree with the removal of the restrictions on changes of use to allow any type of commercial use in the centres.	Noted

12	MIR332	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Bullet point 1 - Agree generally with a pro-active approach to review, and would include Strathaven for consideration, in particular the inclusion of the Town Mill within the town centre boundary to maximise the potential for regeneration of this locally important listed building and provide a context for improving pedestrian access. However such review should be carried out in consultation with the community and other interested parties. Bullet point 2 - Disagree - it is not clear how there could be general de-restriction on change of use and yet integrity of towns as key retail centre could be maintained. Change of use restrictions should continue with there being a strong support for the maintenance of retailing: each change of use case should be decided on its individual merits	Noted - further consideration of the boundary will be undertaken to access if this would be appropriate
12	MIR451	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree- better than empty premises, however there should be some protection from "inappropriate"	Noted

							changes and the type of signage used.	
12	MIR679	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Ian	Gilmour		Must have more flexibility in use - maybe with control over number of outlets with similar purpose but some consistency in outward appearance to reflect the centre's ambience.	Noted
12	MIR789	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12		Lidl UK GmbH		The need to review the town centre boundaries is supported but the review of town centres and their future function needs to be considerably wider than simply a review of town centre boundaries. The reason for this is that the role of town centres is inevitably changing. It is important that the LDP recognises the need for a more flexible approach to the future role of town centres and that this will require a more balanced approach between retail and service provision within these centres.	Noted
12	MIR1061	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		Yes. Voluntary bodies are about to commission a Strathaven Town centre study (after consulting	Strathaven boundaries must be considered within the timeframe of this LDP

							SLC officials). Decisions on Strathaven boundaries should await this study.	
12	MIR383	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	Claire	Marr		Yes	Noted
12	MIR842	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
12	MIR558	Preferred option 6 - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 12	William W	Park		yes	Noted
13	MIR962	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Do not agree	Noted
13	MIR615	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	Tesco Stores Limited		Redline Planning Ltd	Do not agree with the alternative option whereby out-of-centre locations should have the same status as town centres. This approach would further undermine the vitality and viability of the various town centres. Also do not agree with the alternative which seeks to retain existing town centre boundaries and a policy position that requires retailing in town centres to stay at a minimum of 50%	Noted



							of all units. Maintaining the status quo will do nothing to neither prevent the decline of centres nor encourage further investment and regeneration.	
13	MIR914	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13		Propinvest and East Kilbride Invest	Savills	Do not support alternative option 6	Noted
13	MIR267	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13		Kean Properties	Scott Mackay Planning	We do not support the alternative option	Noted
13	MIR260	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	Tesco Stores Limited		Scott Mackay Planning	Do not support alternative option. Existing town centre and retail designations should be reviewed.	Noted
13	MIR292	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	Donna	Brooks		Disagree with a generalist approach to boundary revisions which must be decided on their merits and in consultation with local communities to ensure they reflect changing needs. Agree there should be continued protection of retailing in town, village and neighbourhood centres and frontages protected from inappropriate	Noted

							changes of use. Agree core retail frontages should not fall below 50% of all units in town, village and neighbourhood centres. A critical mass of retail choice is required to ensure footfall and support centres there is insufficient data to suggest non-retail uses could sustain a town centre in the same way as retail.	
13	MIR230	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	Avril	Dobson		Disagrees that existing town centre boundaries should be retained - boundary revisions should be done on their own merit. Agrees with the restriction on non retail uses in town, village and neighbourhood centres.	Noted
13	MIR1033	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	Robert	Freel		Don't agree with this. Given the economic climate there should be no barriers to opening up a retail unit.	Noted - but retail development must be redirected to appropriate locations

13	MIR333	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree with a generalist approach to boundary revisions which must be decided on their merits and in consultation with local communities to ensure they reflect changing needs. Agree there should be continued protection of retailing in town, village and neighbourhood centres and frontages protected from inappropriate changes of use. Agree core retail frontages should not fall below 50% of all units in town, village and neighbourhood centres. A critical mass of retail choice is required to ensure footfall and support centres - there is insufficient data to suggest non-retail uses could sustain a town centre in the same way as retail.	Noted
13	MIR452	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	Wendy	Gilmour		No except there should be some protection from " inappropriate" changes and the type of signage etc	Noted
13	MIR680	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and	Question 13	Ian	Gilmour		Not keen on a specific % requirement - best to keep properties occupied	Noted

		uses						
13	MIR384	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	Claire	Marr		No	Noted
13	MIR561	Alternative option - Town centre boundaries and uses	Question 13	William W	Park		no	Noted
14	MIR435	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Watson	Forrest	929 Design Ltd	We wish consideration to be given to the site directly opposite Headspoint Garden Centre, Braidwood which recently obtained outline planning consent for housing - CL/12/0030	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR4	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Support is given to the potential for additional housing sites to be identified in order to allow for a degree of local flexibility. The site at Millburn Road, Ashgill, should be removed from the green belt and included within the settlement boundary.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR936	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Ashfield Land	Barton Wilmore	land at Jerviswood CL/37/007 should be designated for residential development and the site assessment revisited	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

14	MIR1083	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Hamilton Golf Club	Barton Wilmore	Many of the sites in the "effective" land supply have not been subjected to the tests of effectiveness set out in PAN 2/2010, and there is an over reliance on non-effective sites in the established supply for the period post-2016. As such, we maintain that additional sites which are truly effective and will deliver require to be identified at Local Development Plan level. Additional land should therefore be identified in the Local Development Plan for housing development, and that of those sites available, our client's land at Hamilton Golf Club, Ferniegair is the most logical site available within the Hamilton Housing Market Area.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR13	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Alistair	McArthur	City Property Glasgow LLP	The site of the former residential school at Nerston, East Kilbride should be designated as a residential development opportunity in the new local plan. Part of the land holding is and should remain as agricultural	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

							land. See attached plan.	
14	MIR272	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Mr J Orr	Derek Scott Planning	Disagrees with some of the assessments included in the Technical Report for site at Hyndford Bridge CL33001	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR275	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Taylor Wimpey		GL Hearn	Taylor Wimpey supports the Council's preferred approach with regards to Housing Land Supply insofar as it promotes 'a generous and flexible supply of housing sites' across South Lanarkshire and that supports 'a limited release of some sites which can be demonstrated as being effective, add flexibility to the land supply, generate economic activity and are in appropriate sustainable locations'. To achieve the aims of the MIR, an additional limited release of land for housing is required at Strathaven, and the land at West Strathaven is not only appropriate but a significant element is under the control of Taylor Wimpey, thereby clearly demonstrating market interest and effectiveness.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

							<p>Taylor Wimpey is agreeable to working with the Council and other parties to develop an appropriate masterplan for development at West Strathaven, we would commend the attached masterplan, which identifies land at Quarryhall and Colinhill as being appropriate for a modest scale of housing development within a landscape framework, and with appropriate affordable housing provision</p>	
14	MIR855	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	MacTaggart & Mickel		GL Hearn	<p>Land at Gilbertfield, Cambuslang (Site Reference: CR/66/001)</p> <p>The land at Gilbertfield benefits from an allocation for housing development in the currently adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan and our clients are committed to bringing the site forward for development and wish to see the existing allocation maintained in the replacement LDP. Consequently, we are supportive of the position set out in the LDP MIR which continues to offer</p>	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

							support for the development of the land at Gilbertfield, Cambuslang for housing.	
14	MIR750	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Muse Developments		GVA Grimley	Support the introduction of such flexibility in order that both designations and planning permissions can potentially be amended to best reflect change of economic circumstances and market conditions in terms of the overall numbers and types of units that can be delivered	Noted
14	MIR963	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Yes I agree. Any new developments should be in areas with existing infrastructure, which will help the Councils objective of a low carbon economy. I do not think any of the sites in the Technical Report 2 should be released for development.	Noted
14	MIR199	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	Uddingston Gasworks is identified as a Residential Masterplan site. However the potential exists to maintain the delivery of dwellings on Plot 1(the backside) and incorporate a food supermarket with 28 flats on the frontage site Lot 2.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"



14	MIR153	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	The release of the large CGAs has not allowed residential development to occur at the required rate, particularly given the scale of some of the CGA sites and the required infrastructure. The preferred option is proper in allowing the release of further sites for housing development	Noted - but the solution is not to release further sites unless they can be proven appropriate and effective
14	MIR46	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	The preferred option to allow the release of further sites for housing development, where appropriate is accepted. Land at Jerviswood (CL/37/004 and CI/37008) should be considered for release to accommodate further residential development. The release of this land can be considered in two ways, either as an expansion of the Lanark town boundary (in conjunction with the release of CL/37007) or as an opportunity to create a small settlement around the existing group of buildings at Stanmore. See separate attachment to MIR45.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

14	MIR904	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	There is no strategic/masterplan requirement for more houses in Strathaven as detailed in the Clyde Valley Plan and the SLLP.	Noted but the SDP does not make any reference to where further housing releases should be if required
14	MIR180	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	Please see supporting statement proposing some 30 eco houses at a site at Kypeside. This would be a suitable location due to former use (rural village brownfield site).	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR358	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Henderson	Jigsaw Planning	Disagrees with comments contained in Technical Report relating to EK/78/007 North Dripps Farm East Kilbride	All sites have been assessed using the same criteria
14	MIR120	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	J	Frame	John Duff Planning	The land at Birks Farm should be released as a housing site as it is - immediately available -Is attractive to the public and private sectors for housing building - The landowner will contribute to community benefit -The existing infrastructure in the community can cope with new development.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR132	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	Partly agree with preferred option 7 limited release of some sites could be considered. Disappointed that site EK71002 is not	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

							identified as a housing site.	
14	MIR17	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes, agree with the preferred option We consider that East Greenlees Road, CR/67/002 should be considered for longer-term release and included in the LDP as a potential area for housing for the future, subject to advanced structure planting. Agree that the sites suggested for change in Technical Report 1 should be deleted, as these are non-effective. Also consider that, Craighead Retreat - non-effective in current climate due to the quality and nature of the housing proposed and the planning gain required.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR860	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes, we agree with the preferred option. Colinhill Farm should be released and included in the LDP. The sites suggested for change in Technical Report 1 should be deleted. Craighead Retreat - should be deleted.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

14	MIR502	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Agree with the preferred option, however:- we consider that Shott Farm should be released and included in the LDP as an area for housing with a revised urban area. Agree that the sites suggested for change in Technical Report 1 should be deleted as these areas are non-effective. Also consider that, Craighead Retreat - non-effective in current climate should be deleted.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR688	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	J	Gaffney	McInally Associates	A site at Biggar Road Symington should be included as a potential residential development site.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR466	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	D	Leggat	Montague Evans LLP	The site at Broomelton Road, Larkhall HM86001 satisfies preferred option 7 and is a sustainable location whereby additional new housing could be accommodated. The planning case for identifying the site for residential development is on the following grounds: There is demand for private residential development in Larkhall.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

							The site is capable of contributing to the effective housing supply in the Larkhall Housing Market Area. Development of the site for residential purposes would not prejudice the overall objectives of Greenbelt policy. Development of the site would not lead to a coalescence of settlements in the area	
14	MIR969	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	D.W.	Leggat	Montague Evans LLP	The site to the east and west of Old Glasgow Road, Nerston is considered to be suitable and indeed a sustainable location whereby additional new housing could be accommodated. The areas identified previously have been amended to show a reduced area and are delineated on the attached plan. Development can be phased over the short-longer term	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR922	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	William	McGregor & Son	Montague Evans LLP	Supports sites at Mauldslie Road/Luggie Road Carluke as residential development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

14	MIR448	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Paradigm Real Estate Managers Ltd		Montague Evans LLP	Site to the north of Ashgillhead Road (HM90003) is effective and can add flexibility to the land supply. It is considered to be suitable and indeed a sustainable location whereby additional new housing could be accommodated. Development at Shawsburn can be delivered in the shorter term and has the appropriate infrastructure provision required which is likely to constrain alternative sites. We would submit that the Council should acknowledge this opportunity within the Proposed Plan in order that additional land can be brought forward.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR1095	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Stephen	Partington	Muir Smith Evans	Objects to the assessment of various sites around Thorntonhall that have been put forward for inclusion in the LDP. These include land at South Hill of Dripps under the control of SMH (Ref: EK/78/005)	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

14	MIR330	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	<p>The Preferred Option is wholly unacceptable. Significant further housing land release is required in sustainable locations in South Lanarkshire beyond that identified in this Local Development Plan. The Aithrie Estate objects to the non identification of land at Elvanfoot for residential development. The identification of land for development as set out below is sustainable and would contribute to meeting local employment needs and the wider SDP additional housing requirement. Residential Site 1 covers an area of approximately 4 hectares and is located to the west of the settlement and west of existing residential development along the A 702. Residential Development site 2 covers an area of approximately 0.7 hectares and forms a strip of land to the east of the A702 opposite existing residential development on the west side of the A 702.</p>	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
----	--------	--	-------------	--	----------------	----------	--	--

14	MIR68	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	The Preferred Option is wholly unacceptable given direction to planning authorities from the Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, SPP and the emerging SDP.	The MIR and LDP fully accords with SPP and SDP
14	MIR593	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	There is a need to identify land to meet the additional housing requirement as set out in the emerging Strategic Development Plan in South Lanarkshire. Representation is lodged to the MIR in relation to the non-allocation of Hamilton and Kinneil Estates land at Quarter Village to meet this requirement in part. The assessment of this site in Technical Report 2 contains a number of inaccuracies.	This is further discussed in the housing technical report
14	MIR591	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	There is a need to identify land to meet the additional housing requirement as set out in the emerging Strategic Development Plan in South Lanarkshire. Representation is lodged to the MIR in relation to the non-allocation of Hamilton and Kinneil Estates land at Shawsburn	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"



							to meet this requirement in part. The assessment of this site in Technical Report 2 contains a number of inaccuracies.	
14	MIR589	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	There is a need to identify land to meet the additional housing requirement as set out in the emerging Strategic Development Plan in South Lanarkshire. Representation is lodged to the MIR in relation to the non-allocation of Hamilton and Kinneil Estates land at Bothwell to meet this requirement in part. The assessment of this site in Technical Report 2 contains a number of inaccuracies.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR418	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	The Preferred Option is wholly unacceptable given direction to planning authorities from the Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended), Scottish Planning Policy and the emerging Strategic Development Plan. Significant further housing land release is required in sustainable locations in	The LDP will fully accord with SPP and SDP. If required appropriate housing will be released to meet any perceived shortfalls in appropriate locations.

							South Lanarkshire beyond that identified in this Local Development Plan. Such release must comply with Scottish Planning Policy and meet the requirement in full and include an element of generosity. It must also include an element of local allocation to make up shortfall in supply arising from potential delays in the delivery of strategic allocations. Whilst priority is rightly given to brownfield regeneration, the scale of additional housing need and the requirement to provide a range and choice of sites necessitates the release of appropriate greenfield land throughout the Council area including in its rural portion	
14	MIR792	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	James	Stevenson - Hamilton	Savills (L&P) Ltd	A site (two areas separated by the access road to 98 Chapel Street), located to the north east of the centre of Carluke, east of Chapel Street, should be allocated as a residential allocation in the forthcoming South Lanarkshire Proposed	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

							Plan.	
14	MIR1088	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		BMJ Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Requests a site at Balgray Road Lesmahagow is included as a residential development site.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR268	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Loch Homes Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Requests a site north of Chapelton should be included in the housing land supply.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR882	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Taylor Wimpey Homes		Warren Consultants	The representation site at Kilncadzow Road (CL/10/004) should be released for housing as it is effective and being promoted by a major PLC housebuilder. In the current economic climate, the commitment of a strong developer with significant funds is seen to be a critical factor in effectiveness. The site is also effective because it will not require major expenditure on infrastructure.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR781	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Donald	McKillop		There is no requirement to release such a large scale development of 250 houses to the west of Strathaven for the following reasons:- No strategic requirement for release site previously discounted at the last	Noted

							Local Plan Inquiry due to significant impact upon the landscape Site too large and will be hard to develop due to multiple land owners there is no clear method of securing safe access to this site, other than through significant new infrastructure.	
14	MIR361	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	P	Andrew		Strongly oppose any more land being sold and used for property development in Thorntonhall particularly EK/78/002, EK/78/003 and EK/78/005.	Noted
14	MIR710	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Archibald		Requests a site at Westburn Holdings Ravenstruther is included in the LDP	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR942	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Thomas	Barrie		there is already sufficient land allocated for building which has not been used and given the current economic climate there is, in my opinion, no need to further encroach on green belt areas.	noted
14	MIR293	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Donna	Brooks		Bullet point 1 - Agree, providing there is credible data to support the assessment of whether locations are 'appropriate' and 'sustainable' Bullet point 2 - Disagree with the	Noted - any land releases required will be assessed and appropriate locations identified.

							<p>generalist approach to settlement boundary changes, i.e., that a 'preferred option' should be identified for every settlement. Opposed to all the larger sites proposed in and around Strathaven. The site assessment forms are not consistent in their appraisals, they contain errors of fact and they do not provide a reasoned justification for the 'preferred option' . Regarding 'preferred option' (EK/77/002, EK/77/007, EK/77/009) there are concerns regarding flooding, impact on infrastructure and major impact from additional traffic generation on to local roads. There needs to be much more engagement with the community when SLC consider promoting major developments in small towns.</p>	
14	MIR824	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	jack	brown		<p>Supports the inclusion of Greenlees farm ambulant as a potential residential development site. See seperate background papers in file</p>	<p>Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"</p>

14	MIR646	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Cala Homes West		The Council's proposed development strategy does not provide sufficient housing allocations to meet this housing land shortfall (see attached supporting document) and therefore a generous land supply has not been provided. Further sites are required to meet this housing land shortfall. Any further sites considered are required to be effective and capable of development during the plan period. These sites would be required to meet the tests of effectiveness set out in PAN 2/2010.	Noted - any land releases required will be assessed and appropriate locations identified.
14	MIR647	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Cala Homes West		Site at Braehead Road, Thorntonhall EK/78/002 should be included in the LDP. This site is effective and capable of delivery during period 2008-2020. It can assist the Council to meet its housing land requirement in full and to maintain a 5 year effective land supply at all times	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR648	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Cala Homes West		Site at Peel Road Thorntonhall EK/78/003 should be included in the LDP. This site is effective	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

							and capable of delivery during period 2008-2020. It can assist the Council to meet its housing land requirement in full and to maintain a 5 year effective land supply at all times	
14	MIR649	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Cala Homes West		Site at Strathaven West EK/77/009Â should be included in the LDP. This site is effective and capable of delivery during period 2008-2020. It can assist the Council to meet its housing land requirement in full and to maintain a 5 year effective land supply at all times	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR650	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Cala Homes West		Site at Bothwell Bank Farm HM/82/008 should be included in the LDP. This site is effective and capable of delivery during period 2008-2020. It can assist the Council to meet its housing land requirement in full and to maintain a 5 year effective land supply at all times	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR850	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Gregory	Cameron		Objects to EK/77/002 as a residential development opportunity	Noted
14	MIR761	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Anne	Campbell		Objects to potential development of residential sites around Strathaven	Noted

14	MIR408	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	David	Crawford		Strathaven does not need any more houses of any kind to make this country small town grow and grow. Traffic density at the moment with all the large trucks rolling through is killing the town centre.	Noted
14	MIR763	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Iain	Dalzell		Objects to the potential development of residential sites around Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR427	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Agnieszka	Devine		Does not support any further housing release in Strathaven.	Noted
14	MIR231	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Avril	Dobson		Disagrees with preferred option 7 - Housing Land Supply. 1. Credible data is required to define 'appropriate sustainable locations' 2. The proposed change to the boundary of Strathaven only benefits developers and not the regeneration priorities of the local community. The development needs of each community should be assessed in partnership with that community.	Noted
14	MIR765	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Gerald	Dobson		Objects to the potential development of residential sites around Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR78	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Forrest		Disagrees with Councils assessment of site CL/21/002 - Holmlea	Noted



							Braidwood Rd Crossford.	
14	MIR1034	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Robert	Freel		<p>A generous supply of housing sites exists across south Lanarkshire and that no significant release of land should be allowed until all existing land has been explored and developed. Do not agree with the release of the site HM91/003 at Udston Stonehouse when a number of sites are still awaiting development. Agree that these sites within Stonehouse HM3316 Lochpark (50), HM3336 Hillfoot (25), HM3552 toft combs (45), HM3265 spittle road (60), HM3221 West Mains (140), Hm3229 Rear of Lockhart Street (7), HM3331 New Street (9) and whitelaws yard in Lochpark as well as Udston Farm, Eastmains Farm all require to be Reviewed in relation to the land audit and housing land availability around the village.</p>	Noted - any land releases required will be assessed and appropriate locations identified.
14	MIR709	Preferred option 7 - Housing land	Question 14	Robert & Fiona	Frew		Objects to potential development of site at	Noted

		supply					Gilmourton	
14	MIR671	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Catherine and Michael	Fyfe		Objects to potential development of a site at Gilmourton	Noted
14	MIR206	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Neil	Gainford		The most realistic way in which housing choice can be broadened in Netherburn is through the release of a limited number of house plots on Overton Road directly opposite the village hall (site HM/87/002). The land is fully serviced and is situated on a bus route and is directly opposite the school and village hall. With the Council's support this proposal could present a one-off opportunity for low-cost home ownership, broadening housing choice in Netherburn and further contributing to community regeneration. The assessment of this site in Technical Report 2 fails to take into account emerging Scottish Government guidance regarding the viability of development sites. Similarly, the assessment	Noted

							of this site is neither balanced nor accurate. The development of this site presents no sewerage issues, the Coal Authority has confirmed that no problems are likely because of mineral instability; and there are no issues in terms of school capacities. The assessment of the visual impact of this site is questionable.	
14	MIR208	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Neil	Gainford		The following comments are offered in respect of various sites included in Technical Report 2 Site Assessment - Site CL/04/007 Gunns Meadow Biggar should be included as a housing site. Site CL/05/001 at Carlisle Road, Blackwood ought not to be included. The Clydesdale area in general is over-supplied at present with large-scale housing sites, Site CL/06/001 Wetlea Park, Boghead represents the size, type and location of site which South Lanarkshire Council ought to be promoting through this local	Noted - any land releases required will be assessed and appropriate locations identified.

							development plan. Site CL/21/004 at Valley International Park, Crossford subject to mitigation measures should be included in the housing land supply Site CL/23/002 Carmaben Brae Dolphinton is an obvious site which must be included in the housing land supply. Site CL/37/003 Oakwood Bellfield Road, Lanark similarly ought to be included in the housing land supply. The site should also be extended to include the area of Planning Application CL/12/0207	
14	MIR334	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Bullet point 1 - Agree, providing there is credible data to support the assessment of whether locations are 'appropriate' and 'sustainable' Bullet point 2 - Disagree with the generalist approach to settlement boundary changes, i.e., that a 'preferred option' should be identified for every settlement. Opposed to all the larger sites proposed in and around Strathaven.	Noted - any land releases required will be assessed and appropriate locations identified.

							<p>The site assessment forms are not consistent in their appraisals, they contain errors of fact and they do not provide a reasoned justification for the 'preferred option' . Regarding 'preferred option' (EK/77/002, EK/77/007, EK/77/009) there are concerns regarding flooding, impact on infrastructure and major impact from additional traffic generation on to local roads. There needs to be much more engagement with the community when SLC consider promoting major developments in small towns.</p>	
14	MIR453	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Wendy	Gilmour		<p>Partly agree- that a generous supply of housing sites exists in Strathaven and Glassford at present, but disagree that there is scope for further release of land until East Overton and Brookfield are developed. Sites in Technical Report 2 should not be considered at this stage but remain agricultural. Priority should be given to</p>	<p>Noted - any land releases required will be assessed and appropriate locations identified.</p>

							developing the brownfield sites mentioned in Q8 plus completing the half developed site in Glassford.	
14	MIR681	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Ian	Gilmour		No further land should be released around Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR767	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Connie and Stephen	glass		Objects to the potential development of a site at Gilmourton	Noted
14	MIR1072	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Ged	Hainey		Yes, sites which form a logical extension to settlements and whose development would have a positive impact should be supported We would welcome the redesignation of the Carlisle Road, Kirkmuirhill site as it forms a logical and sustainable extension to the settlement and falls within a clearly defined settlement boundary	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR640	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Susan	Hamilton		The site at Gilmourton should not be developed.	Noted
14	MIR508	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Messrs W	Hamilton		Site at Mounthilly Road, Chapelton should be released for housing development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR764	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Jacqueline	hardier		Objects to potential residential sites around Strathaven	Noted

14	MIR88	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Paul	Houghton		Further submission on Glassford Road, Strathaven EK/77/001 . Full details are included in attached letter.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR918	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Stuart	Hunter		Agree with preferred option. Also object to some of the assessments of the site at south west Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR826	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	peter	inglis		Objects to some of the assessment of site HM/92/002 Cornsilloch in Technical Report	Noted
14	MIR801	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		James Barr		A site at Hills Rd Strathaven should be included in the LDP to provide for logical "rounding-off" of the settlement boundary to the south east of Strathaven. The site is for 4 houses and Community Woodland, including car park and picnic areas.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR806	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		James Barr		Requests a site at Hills Road Strathaven is included in the LDP	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR925	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Grant	Kirkhope		Not enough detail in the site scoring mechanism, there is little justification as to why some sites have been suggested for inclusion over others. Other local authorities	All the sites have been assessed in the same way using a system which does not rely on numerical scoring since the council were criticised for using this method at the last local

							have detailed numerical scoring matrix, which seems to be lacking here. Additional sites need to be identified in order to achieve a generous land supply as set out in SDP requirements.	plan. The method used this time is based on similar criteria and whether a site meets the criteria and if not whether mitigation can be used to make the site viable.
14	MIR790	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Lidl UK GmbH		It is noted that SLC are proposing a generous and flexible supply of housing sites. However this will result, in certain situations, in a potential over-supply of sites with the result that some sites are unlikely to be developed. In these circumstances regard should be had to reallocating these sites to other uses. In particular the site at Airdrie Road, Carluke, (currently housing site no. 162) should be reallocated for retail use.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR217	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Angus	Macdonald Lockhart		Four small sites at Newbigging should be included in the settlement boundary and designated as housing sites. The development pattern in Newbigging is essentially linear in character, with strands of development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"



							extending along Main Street and its junction with Dunsyre Road. The infilling of the 4 sites shown on the attached plan would be consistent with this development pattern and represents a logical extension to the community without any extraneous environmental impact.	
14	MIR1006	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Stuart	MacGarvie		Supports the release of the site at Sandford East	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR723	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Rachael	Macleod		Agree with preferred option and that Wellburn Farm should be a development framework site.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR1060	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		Opposes all the larger sites proposed in and around Strathaven in particular the potential residential masterplan site at Strathaven West.	Noted
14	MIR385	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Claire	Marr		No. It is agreed that there already exists a more adequate supply of housing land. There should also be a presumption against isolated and sporadic development in the greenbelt; particularly	Noted

							where the greenbelt is at its narrowest between East Kilbride and Glasgow i.e. the wedge which includes Thorntonhall and Jackton. Objects to release of any sites in Thorntonhall area	
14	MIR759	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Gordon	McAllan		Objects to the release of further sites for residential development around Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR891	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Allan	McCulloch		No:- Masterplan sites EK/77/002, 007, 009 (Colinhill Farm) should be deleted from the MIR. There is no requirement for such a large scale release of housing in such a sensitive landscape area. The preferred site, if there is to be a limited and viable release (with Developer interest) is EK/77/004 Crofthead/Westpark farm to the SW of Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR586	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Alison	McDowall		There should be no further release of housing sites around Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR768	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Graham	McElrath		Objects to potential development of a site at Gilmourton	Noted
14	MIR748	Preferred option 7 - Housing land	Question 14	Eric	McKenzie		Objects to the potential development of site	Noted

		supply					EK/77/009 at Strathaven	
14	MIR843	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	McMorran		Requests that site located on the northern edge of Lanark, immediately north of the established settlement boundary be released for development for low density housing or incorporated within future plans for the Ridgepark School site. The owners of the field wish to explore the opportunities open to them for development of the field. (see MIR 214)	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR590	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Matthew	McPhail		There should be no further development of housing sites around Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR995	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Blair	Melville		disagree with all options. The scale of affordable housing need cannot be fully met with available resources. It is broadly correct that the existing policy of seeking 25% of affordable housing on sites remains realistic; any increase is not deliverable in the current market and with declining resources for Housing Association Grant in particular. The LDP should recognise that the delivery of affordable	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. Any schemes brought forward by developers would need to prove itself as being truly affordable

							housing is now dependant on funds for intermediate and innovative products, on Council building, and on developers own products such as shared equity or low-cost market homes. The Council should explicitly recognise that all these types and tenures contribute to meeting affordable needs, as well as promote greater diversity within the housing stock.	
14	MIR594	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Niall	Milner		Disagrees with the assessment of sites HM/81/002 and HM/81/003 in Ashgill	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR672	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Andrew	muffed		Objects to potential residential site EK/77/009 Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR42	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	David	Nairn		Has concerns about EK/78/002 Braehead Road Thorntonhall as a pressure for change site. Full reasons are given in attached letter.	Noted
14	MIR562	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	William W	Park		Agrees with preferred option however Strathaven (west) should not be identified as a masterplan site. Sites EK/77/001 to EK/77/009 inclusive should not be designated	Noted

							for housing and should remain in green belt. Strathaven cannot sustain more housing due to limitations on road capacity and capacity of local services.	
14	MIR840	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Paterson property investment	partnership		Attachment has number CL40005 but it should be CL40006. Requests a site at Milton Farm Lesmahagow is included as a residential development site.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR538	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Isobel	Paterson		No further development on Green Belt	Noted
14	MIR596	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Alistair	Paterson		There should be no further housing releases around Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR946	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	George	Perry		Sufficient land for development has already been released to meet current and anticipated future demand and therefore no further land, especially any green belt land requires to be released for further development.	Noted
14	MIR756	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	R	Phayre		objects to sites EK76/002 and EK76/003.	Noted

14	MIR760	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Malcolm	Phillips		The site at Peel Road ( By Peel Farm) should be developed but low density (max 10-12). Suggest the consent should be granted on condition of new gateway/roundabout and footpath link to village.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR754	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	A	Prentice		Objects to the proposed housing development around Strathaven, particularly as it affects the area between the A71 and Lethame Road.	Noted
14	MIR587	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Esther A	Primrose		There should be no further development of housing around Strathaven. For full representation see attachment.	Noted
14	MIR624	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Jim	Ravey		Scottish Coal reserves the right to comment on individual sites that have the potential to either impact or conflict with existing or proposed surface mining and restoration activities. Agree with this approach and support the expansion of Coalburn settlement to include the consented (CL/08/0313) housing site at Gunsgreen, Middlemuir Road. In addition, the	Noted

							consent (CL/08/0440) should be recognised in the SLLDP as an appropriate redevelopment proposal for Ravenstruther Coal Loading Facility	
14	MIR83	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Neil	Roberts		Supports inclusion of site EK/78/003 but thinks capacity should be increased.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR137	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	George	Ross		Do not agree with the preferred option as the focus should be on regeneration of brownfield sites and improving the current housing stock.	Noted
14	MIR138	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	George	Ross		All of the pressure for change sites around Thorntonhall should not be considered for development.	Noted
14	MIR592	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	M. A	Ruddy Goodwin		The site at Bonnanhill Farm Sandford should not be released as a housing site	Noted
14	MIR487	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Roy	Scott		Does not agree with preferred option. There has been sufficient land already designated for development in East Kilbride, especially the Jackton & Thorntonhall area. There is no need to redesignate existing	Noted

							greenfield sites in and around Thorntonhall for development.	
14	MIR941	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Mary	Spence		Objects to the further release of housing land around Strathaven	Noted
14	MIR115	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		sportscotland		If any pressure for change sites are in use as pitches/playing fields, then the provisions of the SPP would need to be considered in the LDP.	Noted
14	MIR766	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Vivien	Thomson		Objects to the potential residential development site EK/78/002 at Braehead Road Thorntonhall	Noted
14	MIR641	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14		Walmsley		Objects to the possible inclusion of Bonnanhill Farm as residential development EK/76/003	Noted
14	MIR635	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		Orchardville, Hazelbank (CL/32/001) should be released for development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR642	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		Mackenzie's Yard, Auchenheath. (CL/03/002) should be released for development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR606	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		Supports the northward extension of Garrion "village". (HM/84/002/003).	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR609	Preferred option 7 - Housing land	Question 14	John	Warren		Supports The northern extension of Lanark along	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the



		supply					Bellfield Road (Oakbank Nursery).(CL/37/003)	"Call for Sites"
14	MIR610	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		supports the northern extension of the existing housing site at Manse Road, Carstairs. (CL/13/003)	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR612	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		supports residential proposals at Bothwellbank, Old Bothwell Road, Bothwell. (HM/82/008)	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR614	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		Land at Hyndfordbridge (CL33/001) should be included for development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR632	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		Boghall Road, Carlisle. (CL/10/003) should be released for development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR617	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		Linsaylands Road, Biggar. (CL/04/004) should be released for development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR622	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		Limekilnburn Road, Quarter. (HM/88/002) should be released for development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR628	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Warren		Auchenheath Farm. (CL/03/001) should be released for development.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR788	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Timothy	Ewart		Objects to site at Colinhill Strathaven EK/77/002	Noted
14	MIR364	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Michael	West		No further housing development is required for East Kilbride	Noted

14	MIR79	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Robin	White		Objects to pressure for change site EK/77/009 Strathaven West.	Noted
14	MIR516	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	John	Wright		New sites should not be released until the sites in original local development plans have been implemented. EK/78/002 should not be released as 1) Site access:- this is a small; narrow; country road 2) sewerage:- there is no mains sewage along this road and the field below is already badly stained with existing septic tanks.	Noted
14	MIR828	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Capefleet Limited			Support the preferred option on the housing land supply based on the provision of a generous and flexible supply of housing sites across South Lanarkshire with no further strategic scale release of sites to be brought forward.	Noted
14	MIR854	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	The Hometown Foundation			The LDP should recognise the need for a different form and type of development such as Owenstown and should be reconsidered in this context.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

14	MIR856	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Davidson & Robertson Rural			Requests a site at Townhead (Brackenhill) Hamilton is included as a residential development site in the LDP	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR865	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Ryden			Requests a site at Brackenhill Hamilton is released for residential purposes	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR880	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Cameron Planning			Requests a site at Whiteshaw Farm Carluke is considered as a potential residential development site	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR940	Preferred option 7 - Housing land supply	Question 14	Davidson & Robertson Rural			Objects to some of the assessment used for site CL/40/003 in Lesmahagow	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
14	MIR791	Preferred option - Housing land supply	Question 14	Niall	Milner		Additional site at Clannochdyke Lesmahagow to be considered for release through the LDP	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
15	MIR964	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No, I approve of the preferred option.	Noted
15	MIR154	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	Neither of the alternative options is appropriate	Noted
15	MIR47	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	It is considered that neither of the alternative options are appropriate	Noted
15	MIR905	Alternative option - Housing land	Question 15	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	No requirement for additional housing land	Noted

		supply					release in Strathaven.	
15	MIR181	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	The land at Kypeside (CL/65/011) should be delineated as an Eco- Rural village.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
15	MIR18	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	The alternative options are both unrealistic extremes and not a viable planning response.	Noted
15	MIR505	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	The alternative options are both unrealistic extremes and not a viable planning response	Noted
15	MIR359	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	Significant further housing land release is required in sustainable locations in South Lanarkshire beyond that identified in this Local Development Plan. Such release must comply with Scottish Planning Policy and meet the requirement in full and include an element of generosity. This does not equate to Alternative Option 1 of the MIR as not all of the sites put forward to the MIR call for sites will be sustainable.	The LDP will fully accord with SPP and SDP. If required appropriate housing will be released to meet any perceived shortfalls in appropriate locations.
15	MIR69	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	The Preferred Option is wholly unacceptable given direction to planning authorities from the Town	The LDP will fully accord with SPP and SDP. If required appropriate housing will be released to

							& Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, SPP and the emerging SDP.	meet any perceived shortfalls in appropriate locations.
15	MIR294	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Donna	Brooks		Neither alternative is credible. The preferred option as it pertains to Strathaven, i.e., Strathaven West, has no merit as there is a housing land supply which will last through to 2032 and considerable in-roads should be made into that supply before any new sites are even considered. However, that does not mean there should be no release throughout SL: each site and each settlement needs to be assessed on its own merits and in the context of wider strategy including the SLLDP MIRs stated low carbon aims. Large scale release will not kick-start the house building industry: ongoing low availability of bank credit to developers and low availability of mortgages to buyers will continue to exercise downward pressure on the	Noted

							development market.	
15	MIR191	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Richard	Brown		Site CL/06/001 at Wetlea Park, Boghead, Lesmahagow should be identified as a potential housing site in the emerging South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
15	MIR409	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	David	Crawford		No more land should be released for housing in Strathaven	Noted
15	MIR232	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Avril	Dobson		Disagrees with part 1 of alternative option - housing land supply. The potential housing sites in Strathaven identified by developers should not be released due to impact on traffic and capacity of local services. There is already sufficient land with planning consent in the town.	Noted
15	MIR1035	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Robert	Freel		Do not agree with the alternative option	Noted
15	MIR335	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Neither alternative is credible. The preferred option' as it pertains to Strathaven, i.e., Strathaven West', has no merit as there is a housing land supply which will last through to 2032 and	Noted

							considerable in-roads should be made into that supply before any new sites are even considered. However, that does not mean there should be no release throughout SL: each site and each settlement needs to be assessed on its own merits and in the context of wider strategy.	
15	MIR454	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Wendy	Gilmour		Prefer option 2- No release in the Strathaven/Glassford area until current land is used by developer.	Noted
15	MIR682	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Ian	Gilmour		No need to release further sites and extend Strathaven	Noted
15	MIR807	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15		James Barr		The details of the GCV strategic plan is noted, with direct reference to strategic releases. There is scope for small releases in appropriate locations to "round off" settlements.	
15	MIR1012	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Stuart	MacGarvie		Cognisance is now required of the details for strategic masterplan releases in the SDP. There is scope however to consider smaller, manageable and effective housing sites	

15	MIR724	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Rachael	Macleod		Do not support alternative options	Noted
15	MIR386	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Claire	Marr		Alternative option 2 is the best option to achieve the aims of the plan. If this is considered too inflexible it is suggested that developers may propose alternative sites but must relinquish at least an equivalent amount of land in exchange. This would add some flexibility without increasing the overall supply of housing land.	The LDP will fully accord with SPP and SDP. If required appropriate housing will be released to meet any perceived shortfalls in appropriate locations.
15	MIR892	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Allan	McCulloch		EK 77/004 Crofthead/Westpark is a far more appropriate site. This is reflected in the previous Local plan inquiry report and reporter's recommendations, as well as the MIR (SEA).	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
15	MIR563	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	William W	Park		No	Noted
15	MIR539	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Isobel	Paterson		No further development in the Green Belt	Noted
15	MIR947	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	George	Perry		No further Intrusions of green belt land should be made for development purposes	Noted



15	MIR140	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	George	Ross		All of the sites around Thorntonhall should not be considered for development.	Noted
15	MIR488	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Roy	Scott		Yes- There should be no release of further land until the current supply has been used	Noted
15	MIR365	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Michael	West		More detailed analysis of demographics is required before releasing further land for housing	Noted
15	MIR829	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Capefleet Limited			No	Noted
15	MIR868	Alternative option - Housing land supply	Question 15	Ryden			No although there is merit in bringing forward more smaller sites within settlement envelopes which can be delivered in the short to medium timeframe such as Brackenhill Drive site.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
16	MIR5	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Whilst the 25% target figure is reflective of current government guidance, it must be applied in flexible manner and should not be slavishly adhered to in all cases. When individual circumstances justify the use of a lower figure, for instance in cases where the higher figure would	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.

							threaten the overall viability of a development project, the plan must allow for this possibility.	
16	MIR937	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16		Ashfield Land	Barton Wilmore	LDP should make allowances for the provision of reduced levels of both affordable housing and other developer contributions where this would impact upon the financial viability of development opportunities .	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
16	MIR276	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Taylor Wimpey		GL Hearn	Taylor Wimpey accept the 25% affordable housing provision policy is well established, and enshrined in national policy as set out in SPP and do not seek to challenge the principle of a 25% benchmark for affordable housing provision. However, it is considered appropriate for the LDP to recognise that the needs, requirements and factors affecting sites will vary, and that individual solutions that divert from the 25% requirement should be fairly and reasonably	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.

							considered by the Council. Whilst we do not therefore seek to challenge the principle of Preferred Option 8, we would support the inclusion of pt. 2 of the Alternative Option.	
16	MIR752	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Muse Developments		GVA Grimley	This blanket approach to this policy area is not appropriate in the context of the current economic climate and market conditions. Future policy should allow flexibility to maximise the likelihood of residential permissions/designations being delivered in the short term. Such flexibility could take into consideration site specific infrastructure and viability issues as well as phasing implications and enable innovative approaches and partnerships to take place to maximise the likelihood of delivering affordable housing provision	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
16	MIR965	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Agree	Noted

16	MIR155	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	There is no objection to the proposed affordable housing policy. Flexibility is required in relation to how affordable housing is provided. Also, the level of affordable housing required should be flexible to some degree in order to take account of other developer contributions and any abnormal costs.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
16	MIR48	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	No objection to the proposed affordable housing policy, on the basis that there may be some instances where flexibility is required and that this will be reflected in Supplementary Guidance. Flexibility is required in relation to how affordable housing is provided, for example the opportunities for on site provision and funding of off site provision and the key to its success is the provision of a range of options. Also, the level of affordable housing required should be flexible to some degree in order to take account of other developer contributions and any abnormal costs. There should always be	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.

							flexibility in place to assess sites on a case by case basis.	
16	MIR19	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Partially - a standard across the board 25% is easy to understand but might not be appropriate in all parts of South Lanarkshire.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
16	MIR506	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Partially:- a standard across the board 25% is easy to understand but might not be appropriate in all parts of South Lanarkshire	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
16	MIR1096	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Stephen	Partington	Muir Smith Evans	It is completely illogical that the preferred option is to continue with the policy for 25% affordable housing contribution on sites of 20 units or more. The evidence is that this policy has not delivered to date and cannot deliver in the short to medium term.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.

16	MIR360	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	<p>The Estate supports the delivery of affordable housing as part of meeting wider housing needs. However, affordable housing delivery must comply with the requirements (including flexibility of tenure) set out in Planning Advice Note 2/2010 - Affordable Housing and Housing Land Audits. An automatic imposition of 25% on all sites of more than 20 units across the Council area is likely to be unworkable. Affordable housing proportional contributions should, at least, be identified on an individual Housing Market Area basis within the Council area. Furthermore, any percentage should be set as a target with exceptional circumstances set out and able to be justified on a site by site basis.</p>	<p>The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.</p>
----	--------	---	----------------	--	----------------	----------	--	---

16	MIR70	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	<p>Support the delivery of affordable housing as part of meeting wider housing needs . An automatic imposition of 25% on all sites of more than 20 units across the Council area is unworkable. This does not comply with SPP or Planning Advice produced by the Scottish Government on the matter. Affordable housing proportional contributions should, at least, be identified on an individual HMA basis within the Council area.</p> <p>Furthermore, any percentage should be set as a target with exceptional circumstances set out and able to be justified on a site by site basis.</p>	<p>The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.</p>
----	-------	---	----------------	--	----------------------------------	----------	---	---

16	MIR422	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	The trust supports the delivery of affordable housing as part of meeting wider housing needs. However, affordable housing delivery must comply with the requirements (including flexibility of tenure) set out in Planning Advice Note 2/2010 - Affordable Housing and Housing Land Audits. An automatic imposition of 25% on all sites of more than 20 units across the Council area is likely to be unworkable. Affordable housing proportional contributions should, at least, be identified on an individual Housing Market Area basis within the Council area. Furthermore, any percentage should be set as a target with exceptional circumstances set out and able to be justified on a site by site basis.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
16	MIR1089	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16		BMJ Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	do not agree that 25% affordable housing contribution is always appropriate land within the proposed Development framework site at	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair



							langlands East Kilbride is appropriate for significant affordable housing development which could meet the needs for affordable housing within the area.	and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
16	MIR269	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16		Loch Homes Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Do not agree that a 25% affordable housing contribution is always appropriate	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
16	MIR295	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Donna	Brooks		Agree this should be the general rule the requirement is simple and unambiguous. Indeed within Strathaven one of the major problems associated with housing supply relates to the provision of affordable housing for first time buyers and others that are seeking to rent suitable accommodation on a long-term basis.	Noted - but would require further private sector housing to fund affordable housing

16	MIR651	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16		Cala Homes West		The evidence for the continuation of this 25% requirement has not been set out in the MIR. This needs to be presented for each of the Council's housing market areas. It should be noted that only 3 out of the 4 HMAs have an identified housing shortfall. The Council needs to re evaluate its investment priorities in terms of location and tenure mix to establish what scale of affordable homes can be realistically financed and delivered over the LDP period.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more. Also note that all 4 market areas now have a shortfall in affordable housing
16	MIR410	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	David	Crawford		No further housing should be released in Strathaven.	Noted
16	MIR429	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Agnieszka	Devine		"Affordable Housing" is poorly defined	Noted - the definition is as per the Scottish Government
16	MIR1036	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Robert	Freel		The council should be looking at its own available stock of land and should be considering it for development as affordable housing. In small village developments where it is less than 20 units these should be covered by affordable housing	Noted - sites of less than 20 units would not be viable for affordable housing

							requirements.	
16	MIR336	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree this should be the general rule - the requirement is simple and unambiguous. Indeed within Strathaven one of the major problems associated with housing supply relates to the provision of affordable housing for first time buyers and others that are seeking to rent suitable accommodation on a long- term basis.	Noted - but would require further private sector housing to fund affordable housing
16	MIR455	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Wendy	Gilmour		disagree	Noted
16	MIR683	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Ian	Gilmour		Ensure all vacant properties are utilised. Need to be clear on what "affordable" means. Are these house for rent or sale privately or do we mean Council Housing?	Public sector housing for rent is the preferred option for affordable housing but there are other types of 'affordable' units that could be considered
16	MIR1073	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Ged	Hainey		A more focused and sophisticated approach to the delivery of affordable housing is required. A blanket 25% policy across South Lanarkshire will not deliver affordable housing in areas where it is most acutely needed. Economic viability must also be	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more. Also note that all 4 market areas now have a

							considered when determining planning applications and where this is threatened, a more flexible approach is required.	shortfall in affordable housing
16	MIR919	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Stuart	Hunter		Agrees with preferred option	Noted
16	MIR928	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Grant	Kirkhope		Agree that affordable housing is necessary, however requirements should be site specific and subject to funding availability	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more. Also note that all 4 market areas now have a shortfall in affordable housing
16	MIR1013	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Stuart	MacGarvie		There should be further flexibility on types and tenure of affordable housing.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more. Also note that all 4 market areas now have a shortfall in affordable housing

16	MIR726	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Rachael	Macleod		Do not support this approach to affordable housing delivery. The flat rate of 25% of units in sites of 20 or more units is a blunt tool and should be refined to reflect the varying housing market conditions present throughout the authority. 25% should be the upper limit with lower limits agreed that reflect the local circumstances. The financial burden imposed through the implementation of affordable housing will significantly suppress already fragile economic development. In order to promote economic growth, there needs to be a degree of flexibility incorporated into affordable housing provision.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more. Also note that all 4 market areas now have a shortfall in affordable housing
16	MIR1062	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Peter	Mansell- Moullin		Yes. but SLC must recognise that affordable housing does not address the main need for cheap rented accommodation. The more private developers agree to provide affordable housing the less contribution to off-	Noted - but would require further private sector housing to fund affordable housing

							site infrastructure can be expected.	
16	MIR388	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Claire	Marr		Yes	Noted
16	MIR844	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
16	MIR996	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Blair	Melville		Agree with retaining current policy, but redrafted Supplementary Guidance should recognise the roles of all the types and tenures of affordable housing set out in Scottish Planning Policy and PAN2/2010.	Noted but the Councils preference is for social rented affordable housing
16	MIR564	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	William W	Park		yes	Noted
16	MIR489	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Roy	Scott		Agreed in principle	Noted
16	MIR869	Preferred option 8 - Affordable housing	Question 16	Ryden			A more focused and sophisticated approach to the delivery of affordable housing is required. A blanket 25% policy across South Lanarkshire will not deliver affordable housing in areas where it is most acutely needed. Economic viability must also be considered when determining planning	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more. Also note that all 4 market areas now have a shortfall in affordable housing

							applications and where this is threatened, a more flexible approach is required.	
17	MIR277	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Taylor Wimpey		GL Hearn	Whilst we do not seek to challenge the principle of Preferred Option 8, we would support the inclusion of pt. 2 of the Alternative Option.	Noted
17	MIR966	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No	Noted
17	MIR200	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	Developers should be allowed to bring forward their own affordable housing solutions and consider each site on its own merit, assessing the level of contribution that can be accommodated taking into account the financial viability of the development.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more. Also note that all 4 market areas now have a shortfall in affordable housing
17	MIR156	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	No objection to the preferred option but it is considered that alternative option 2 has merit in allowing increased flexibility.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more. Also note that all 4

								market areas now have a shortfall in affordable housing
17	MIR49	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	No objection to the preferred option but it is considered that alternative option 2 has merit in allowing increased flexibility. The Council will still be able to retain control of the affordable housing provision but also consider flexibility where there are financial or other indicators that affect the viability of the development.	Noted
17	MIR20	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Allowing developers/builders to bring forward their own affordable housing solutions considering each location on need would be a more flexible approach and may deliver affordable housing in a more targeted way whilst increasing the commercial viability of short-term development sites in this difficult environment.	Noted but the Councils preference is for social rented affordable housing



17	MIR509	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Allowing developers/builders to bring forward their own affordable housing solutions considering each location on need would be a more flexible approach and may deliver affordable housing in a more targeted way whilst increasing the commercial viability of short-term development sites in this difficult environment.	Noted but the Councils preference is for social rented affordable housing
17	MIR1097	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Stephen	Partington	Muir Smith Evans	Alternative Option 2 in the MIR is to be preferred. This would move the focus away from theoretical levels of supply to actual, deliverable development on the ground. Certainly Alternative Option 1 an increase in the developer contribution to 30% - would be completely counter-productive and should not be pursued.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more. Also note that all 4 market areas now have a shortfall in affordable housing
17	MIR71	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	Support the delivery of affordable housing as part of meeting wider housing needs but disagree with preferred option.	Noted

17	MIR1090	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17		BMJ Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Consider that Alternative Option 2 is worthy of further consideration to enable developers to bring forward their own affordable housing solutions and consider each site on its own merit. Not all sites are appropriate for affordable housing, whereas other sites lend themselves to 100% affordable housing	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
17	MIR270	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17		Loch Homes Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Alternative option 2 is more appropriate	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.
17	MIR772	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Mike	Andrews		Agree with one of the alternative options for the delivery of affordable housing. The 25% rate for provision of affordable homes will place undue burden on the development industry. A 'blanket' policy is also inappropriate as it fails to target areas of specific need or recognise areas where there is no need.	The Council is well aware of the shortfall in funding for affordable housing and has been realistic in setting development targets. The 25% affordability level is fair and if appropriate can be amended either to be less or more.

							Developers should be allowed to bring forward their own affordable housing solutions and sites should be considered on their individual merits, when assessing the level of contribution that can be accommodated.	
17	MIR296	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Donna	Brooks		Disagree with either alternative being imposed across the board - there may be a case for discretion in some instances but these should be exceptional cases only. It is unfortunate that sites cannot be identified for development by Housing Associations and other such housing providers.	Noted
17	MIR233	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Avril	Dobson		A generalised approach is not appropriate as needs should be analysed within each local community.	Noted
17	MIR1037	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Robert	Freel		Thresholds could be increased and where developers are offering their own solution these should be examined and considered on their own merit.	Noted

17	MIR337	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree with either alternative being imposed across the board - there may be a case for discretion in some instances but these should be exceptional cases only. It is unfortunate that sites cannot be identified for development by Housing Associations and other such housing providers.	Noted
17	MIR456	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree but perhaps graded on larger sites, say 35% on more than 150 houses.	Noted - but unlikely to be accepted
17	MIR684	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Ian	Gilmour		Need to be flexible on this issue	Noted
17	MIR929	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Grant	Kirkhope		Disagree with the proposal to increase the affordable housing policy to 30% across the board. There needs to be a mechanism in place that assesses requirements on a site specific basis.	Noted
17	MIR1014	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Stuart	MacGarvie		no	Noted
17	MIR727	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Rachael	Macleod		Supports alternative option 2 which considers affordable housing delivery on a site by site basis.	Noted

17	MIR390	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Claire	Marr		no	Noted
17	MIR565	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	William W	Park		no	Noted
17	MIR830	Alternative options - Affordable housing	Question 17	Capefleet Limited			Suggest that the alternative option of allowing developers to bring forward their own affordable housing solutions and consider each site on its own merit, assessing the level of contribution that can be accommodated taking into account the financial viability of the development should be progressed in the Proposed Plan.	Noted - but Councils preference is for public sector rented housing
18	MIR6	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	The potential for development to come forward on appropriate brown field sites within the green belt should be reflected in the wording of the Green Belt Policy.	Noted
18	MIR967	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Agree with preferred option. Consideration should also be given to the proximity of designated sites and the landscape impacts of a development.	Noted

18	MIR146	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	The Greenbelt boundary should be amended to include site EK71002	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
18	MIR21	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes, this is a reasonable approach to Development Management once the LDP has defined the extent of the Green Belt.	Noted
18	MIR510	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes, this is a reasonable approach.	Noted
18	MIR1098	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Stephen	Partington	Muir Smith Evans	The greentbelt policy of the LDP must take full account of the SPP. A particular case in point would be at South Hill of Dripps in Thorntonhall where there is a sound case for redrawing the green belt boundary to include all of the existing housing on Peel Road to the south of the railway line along with adjoining land that could be developed to round-off the settlement.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
18	MIR72	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	Green Belt designation is a policy tool and not an environmental one. SPP does not preclude development in the Green Belt where appropriately planned for.	Noted

18	MIR943	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Thomas	Barrie		Given the limited amount of green belt land in many parts of the country, it important this should be conserved	Noted
18	MIR297	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Donna	Brooks		Agree in part. It should be noted in regard to the preferred option for Strathaven West residential Masterplan/settlement boundary modification, the only way that the preferred option would meet any of the four criteria offered would be as "part of a planned expansion of a settlement". No case for such an expansion of Strathaven has been set out. Care has to be taken to ensure that the integrity of the green belt is maintained.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
18	MIR652	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18		Cala Homes West		The proposed policy framework for the LDP on development in the green belts is acceptable. However, there is a fundamental need for the Council to first reassess the existing Green Belt boundary in accord with the policy requirements in SPP and the SDP. The	Noted

							Green Belt needs to be reviewed and redefined within a context of not only accommodating future development but to comply with SPP. As a consequence, it needs to set boundaries which are capable of standing for the longer term (20 years) rather than being used to restrict development from one development plan cycle to the next.	
18	MIR411	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	David	Crawford		Green belt should not be used for development	Noted
18	MIR235	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Avril	Dobson		Agrees with the criteria in the preferred option. However in the case of Strathaven there has been no case presented for a planned expansion of the settlement satisfying any aspect of the four criteria which have been set out. The proposal to release green-belt land for housing is detrimental to the small town community of Strathaven and the health and well-being of its inhabitants	Noted
18	MIR1038	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Robert	Freel		Disagree with this option, you can have a development in the green	Noted



							belt and then five years later because its now classed as housing or industrial it can be expanded without the need to review within the local plan.	
18	MIR338	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree in part. It should be noted in regard to the preferred option' for Strathaven West residential Masterplan/settlement boundary modification, the only way that the preferred option' would meet any of the four criteria offered would be as "part of a planned expansion of a settlement". No case for such an expansion of Strathaven has been set out. Care has to be taken to ensure that the integrity of the green belt is maintained.	Noted
18	MIR457	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree in part- particularly with last point about consolidation of buildings and brownfield sites in sustainable locations of an appropriate scale and design	Noted
18	MIR685	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Ian	Gilmour		Agree with bullet point 1 and 4 but disagree with 2	Noted

							and 3. Who establishes the need for planned expansion?	
18	MIR1074	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Ged	Hailey		yes	Noted
18	MIR920	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Stuart	Hunter		Does not support the preferred option and consider that a review of the greenbelt should be undertaken.	Noted
18	MIR808	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18		James Barr		Noted reference must be made to site characteristics where "rounding off" is acceptable, whereby settlement boundaries are logical and permanent.	Noted
18	MIR930	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Grant	Kirkhope		In order to achieve SDP objectives set out in Schedule 11A, further land may need to be released from the greenbelt in suitable locations.	Noted
18	MIR1063	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		Yes. But more care needs to be taken over granting permissions.	Noted
18	MIR391	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Claire	Marr		The green belt policy should be made stronger. It should refer to the green belts role in providing corridors of countryside between conurbations. There must be a presumption against housing development in	Noted

							the green belt in order to control the built-up area and to stop East Kilbride becoming just another suburb of Glasgow.	
18	MIR893	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Allan	McCulloch		Development can occur in the greenbelt when there is a need for development. Sites should be properly assessed in terms of landscape and previous decisions must be reflected into any decisions. This is the case for EK77/004 whereby this site is recognised as the preferred area for development.	
18	MIR845	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
18	MIR997	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Blair	Melville		In view of the scale of housing land supply shortfall it is likely that the Council will have to review the Green belt boundaries to accommodate further land allocations.	
18	MIR566	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	William W	Park		yes	Noted
18	MIR540	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Isobel	Paterson		No further development in Green Belt	Noted

18	MIR141	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	George	Ross		Green belt plays an important role in separating villages from other settlements. The countryside is well used for recreation purposes and benefits Council residents in many ways. The loss of further countryside would have a detrimental affect on wildlife and in particular certain species of birds.	Noted
18	MIR490	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Roy	Scott		No - no development on the green belt.	Noted
18	MIR366	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Michael	West		NO - ongoing and proposed developments in countryside in and around Jackton and Thorntonhall, are contrary to previous structure plans and national policies	Noted
18	MIR518	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	John	Wright		An area e.g. Thorntonhall can only take so much development of housing before the country roads require upgrading or widening.	Noted
18	MIR870	Preferred option 9 - Green Belt	Question 18	Ryden			Yes	Noted
19	MIR968	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No	Noted

19	MIR906	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	"rounding off" is acceptable when considering settlement boundaries.	Noted
19	MIR168	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	Greenbelt policy should be relaxed to allow for more single houses to be built within the Greenbelt area, providing that such development would not compromise the overall integrity of the Greenbelt.	Noted
19	MIR22	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Neither alternative is preferable to the Council's proposed option.	Noted
19	MIR511	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Neither alternative is preferable to the Council's proposed option	Noted
19	MIR73	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	Green Belt designation is a policy tool and not an environmental one. SPP does not preclude development in the Green Belt where appropriately planned for.	Noted
19	MIR298	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Donna	Brooks		Disagree Green Belt designation should serve the purpose of driving development to brownfield urban sites and preventing the sprawl of the urban area into the countryside. If development in the Green Belt was unhindered, the urban	Noted

							fabric would suffer fragmentation and additional vacant and derelict land sites would be created, with associated blighting effect on urban communities.	
19	MIR653	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19		Cala Homes West		We do not agree with the alternative option	Noted
19	MIR412	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	David	Crawford		No development should be allowed in the Green Belt around Strathaven	Noted
19	MIR237	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Avril	Dobson		Categorically disagree, it is brownfield sites which should considered for development linked within the community's needs.	Noted
19	MIR1039	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Robert	Freel		Restrictions are still required, where single house sites are being proposed these should be examined in relation to the physical area, is it house for a retiring farmer, his family or glass house owner.	Noted
19	MIR339	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree - Green Belt designation should serve the purpose of driving development to brownfield urban sites and preventing the sprawl of the urban area into the countryside. If development in the Green Belt was	Noted

							unhindered, the urban fabric would suffer fragmentation and additional vacant and derelict land sites would be created, with associated blighting effect on urban communities.	
19	MIR458	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Wendy	Gilmour		Disagree certainly should not be free for all development on Green Belt land.	Noted
19	MIR686	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Ian	Gilmour		Prefer Preferred Option	Noted
19	MIR931	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Grant	Kirkhope		Appropriate types of development should be allowed in the greenbelt if it can be proven that these developments are an economic and social benefit to the community.	Noted
19	MIR392	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Claire	Marr		No	Noted
19	MIR567	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	William W	Park		no	Noted
19	MIR541	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Isobel	Paterson		No further development in the Green Belt around Strathaven	Noted
19	MIR142	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	George	Ross		No	Noted
19	MIR492	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Roy	Scott		No. Restrictions are essential.	Noted

19	MIR369	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Michael	West		Planning should conform to the "presumption against" housing development in Green Belt defined as the fringes separating adjacent conurbations. The area between East Kilbride and Glasgow was identified by the Green Belt Review and GCVSP as the most sensitive wedge of Greenbelt in the whole GCVSP area. this should be taken into account when considering the housing the needs for extra housing.	Noted
19	MIR871	Alternative options - Green Belt	Question 19	Ryden			No	Noted
20	MIR970	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Agree, but second bullet point should be amended to read only on sites which were previously developed.	Noted
20	MIR50	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	There is no objection to the merging of the rural area policies. Clusters of housing may be appropriate in such areas.	Noted
20	MIR182	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	Agree in principle with preferred option 10. However the reference to small scale should be deleted as each proposal	Noted



							should be treated on its own merits.	
20	MIR603	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20		Scottish and Southern Energy	Jones Lang LaSalle	The LDP should specifically recognise that renewable energy and infrastructure development, in principle, are acceptable forms of development within the rural area. It is recognised that there requires to be a robust approach to permitting developments such as housing and business development within the rural area to avoid sporadic growth; however, this should not apply to renewable energy and infrastructure development. The preferred option is therefore not agreed.	Noted
20	MIR169	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	Agree with the Council's preferred option.	Noted
20	MIR23	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Agree with preferred option.	Noted
20	MIR512	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Agree with preferred option	Noted

20	MIR707	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	J	Gaffney	McInally Associates	Support the suggestion of merging the accessible rural area, rural investment area and the remoter rural area into one area called the rural area. Support is also offered for the consolidation of buildings or small clusters of housing which may be appropriate for development, to a high standard design, particularly on sites which were previously developed. In addition a policy should be included within the LDP which enables the replacement and/or conversion of existing buildings (to include single agricultural buildings e.g. barns that are not of a traditional design or of some architectural/historic interest) in the rural area for other suitable purposes such as residential.	Noted
20	MIR362	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	The Estate supports the MIR stance on rural development as this reflects national policy on the matter. The vast majority of the Council area is rural in nature and	Noted

							<p>the rural economy supports many local jobs in towns and villages. The Local Development Plan must take a positive stance in promoting rural economic development opportunities as required by Scottish Planning Policy and the Strategic Development Plan. It should include a presumption in favour of development that supports rural enterprise and diversification. With regard to new business in the countryside the Local Development Plan must be supportive. It is suggested that the principle of small scale business use in the countryside be acceptable. Small scale should be defined e.g. no more than 1,000 sqm and subject to appropriate environmental controls on siting, design and materials.</p>	
20	MIR425	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	<p>The Trust supports the MIR stance on rural development as this reflects national policy on the matter. The vast majority of the Council</p>	Noted

							<p>area is rural in nature and the rural economy supports many local jobs in towns and villages. The Local Development Plan must take a positive stance in promoting rural economic development opportunities as required by Scottish Planning Policy and the Strategic Development Plan. It should include a presumption in favour of development that supports rural enterprise and diversification. With regard to new business in the countryside the Local Development Plan must be supportive. It is suggested that the principle of small scale business use in the countryside be acceptable. Small scale should be defined e.g. no more than 1,000 sqm and subject to appropriate environmental controls on siting, design and materials.</p>	
20	MIR944	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Thomas	Barrie		<p>conserve existing rural areas wherever possible</p>	Noted

20	MIR299	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Donna	Brooks		Agree. There are concerns, however, regarding the high design standards set by SLC. The Councils track record of achieving quality design standards in the rural area (and indeed urban areas) is not good and there are, unfortunately, many permanent reminders of that in and around Strathaven.	Noted
20	MIR654	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20		Cala Homes West		Agree with the Council's preferred option to accord with SPP.	Noted
20	MIR638	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Patrick	Dunne		Rural policy should include major development other than residential and rural businesses.	Noted
20	MIR1040	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Robert	Freel		The plan should clearly indicate what is classed as a rural area. Small business should be encouraged.	Noted
20	MIR193	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Neil	Gainford		A simplification of the policy framework to merge all three classifications into one is welcomed. Similarly, a policy which consolidates clusters of buildings within the rural area is logical and sensible and ought to create more opportunities	Noted

							for the construction of one-off houses. However this should be accompanied by a complete review of the boundaries of village envelopes otherwise more opportunities may exist for development in building groupings and clusters in the open countryside than in the villages which are the focus for rural community life.	
20	MIR340	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree. There are concerns, however, regarding the high design standards' set by SLC. The Council's track record of achieving quality design standards in the rural area (and indeed urban areas) is not good.	Noted
20	MIR459	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree	Noted
20	MIR687	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Ian	Gilmour		Agree	Noted
20	MIR1015	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Stuart	MacGarvie		There should be more flexibility to exist in stimulating sustainable growth in more rural areas. Agree with rural area policy	Noted
20	MIR1064	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		Yes	Noted

20	MIR393	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Claire	Marr		yes	Noted
20	MIR894	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Allan	McCulloch		Agree in principle	Noted
20	MIR846	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
20	MIR568	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	William W	Park		No. Development of existing farmhouses and steadings into clusters of private dwelling houses should be discouraged. Existing permissions have led to traffic congestion and inadequate vehicle access in many cases.	Noted
20	MIR948	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	George	Perry		existing rural areas should be maintained	Noted
20	MIR625	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Jim	Ravey		SRG agrees with the use of a single rural area/countryside land use designation to cover the non Green Belt areas of South Lanarkshire. However, SRG do not feel that this single designation should include the Douglas Valley Rural Investment Areas which operates as a economic and sustainable development policy within rural South Lanarkshire	Noted

20	MIR143	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	George	Ross		No.	Noted
20	MIR494	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	Roy	Scott		No- Keep the sub-classifications, which take account of the identity & purpose of land. Allow small scale business in appropriate locations.	Noted
20	MIR520	Preferred option 10 - Rural area	Question 20	John	Wright		The electricity supply in an area like Thorntonhall will require upgrading to avoid further power cuts	Noted
21	MIR971	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Do not agree	Noted
21	MIR51	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	There is no support for either of the alternative options.	Noted
21	MIR604	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21		Scottish and Southern Energy	Jones Lang LaSalle	In terms of the alternative option, it would be wholly unreasonable to not permit any development outwith settlements within the rural area as there are some forms of development that necessitate a rural setting, such as onshore wind farms and essential infrastructure.	Noted
21	MIR170	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	Do not agree with the alternative option that no development can take place outwith settlement in the rural area. This option	Noted



							is overly restrictive and would inhibit investment in rural areas.	
21	MIR24	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	No	Noted
21	MIR300	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Donna	Brooks		No restriction would cause development to leapfrog the Green Belt, the urban fabric would suffer fragmentation and additional vacant and derelict land sites, with associated blighting effect on urban communities. It would be unrealistic to forbid all development in the rural area, but any such developments are of a high design standard.	Noted
21	MIR430	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Agnieszka	Devine		Wetland/pond/bird sanctuary or wildlife reserve would be preferable with wildlife corridors.	Noted
21	MIR1041	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Robert	Freel		Disagree with this some developments may fit appropriately out with settlements.	Noted

21	MIR341	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	No restriction would cause development to leapfrog the Green Belt, the urban fabric would suffer fragmentation and additional vacant and derelict land sites, with associated blighting effect on urban communities. It would be unrealistic to forbid all development in the rural area, but it is extremely important to ensure that any such developments are of a high design standard	Noted
21	MIR460	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Wendy	Gilmour		Disagree with both other options.	Noted
21	MIR689	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Ian	Gilmour		Reads as very restrictive	Noted
21	MIR1016	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Stuart	MacGarvie		No	Noted
21	MIR394	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Claire	Marr		No	Noted
21	MIR569	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	William W	Park		No	Noted
21	MIR144	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	George	Ross		No development should be allowed outwith the settlement but strict restrictions on the type of development should be imposed	Noted
21	MIR495	Alternative option - Rural area	Question 21	Roy	Scott		Yes	Noted

22	MIR436	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Watson	Forrest	929 Design Ltd	Settlement boundary of Braidwood could be adjusted to include the site put forward for development and the Headspoint garden centre site.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR853	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		Andrew Bennie (un-named client)	Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Requests a site at Millburn Road Ashgill is released from the Green Belt	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR7	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Area of land to the north west of Millburn Road, Ashgill, should be included within the settlement boundary.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR938	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		Ashfield Land	Barton Wilmore	the settlement boundary of Lanark should be adjusted to reflect our proposed changes to the status of land east of Lanark at Jerviswood (CL37007) as suitable for future expansion of the town.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR1084	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		Hamilton Golf Club	Barton Wilmore	As per our response to Preferred Option 7 - Housing Land Supply, we submit that the settlement boundary of Ferniegair be adjusted to reflect our proposed changes to the status of land at Hamilton Golf Club as suitable for future expansion of the town and part of the CGA.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

22	MIR125	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	W	Cruickshank	Derek Scott Planning	Supports the inclusion of the land CL50002 within the Ravenstruther Settlement Envelope but requests the larger site at CL50001 is reconsidered.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR972	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Objects to the Strathaven proposal to the west of the town. There has been a large development recently approved on the east of the town and the infrastructure of the town can cope with any more large developments.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR157	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	The southern boundary of East Kilbride should be redrawn to remove the site EK/71/004 at Shields Road from the greenbelt and include it as a residential designation within the boundary of the settlement. Taylor Wimpey fully supports a change to the East Kilbride settlement boundary to accommodate the release of this site for housing.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR52	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	In relation to the designation of new settlement boundaries Stanmore should have its own settlement designation in	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

							conjunction with the designation of sites CL/37/004 and CI/37008 as residential land.	
22	MIR907	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	No - there is no requirement for large scale additional housing release in Strathaven	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR108	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Alastair	Ness	James Barr Ltd	St Leonards/Stanmore Road should be included within the settlement boundary of Lanark. The settlement boundary proposed runs along the road and includes development on the southern side of the road but ignores the allocation under COM4.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR183	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	Kypeside should be a settlement.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR171	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	Do not agree with the Council's preferred option 11 East Kilbride settlement boundary should be amended to include EK/71/002 within the overall settlement designation.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

22	MIR25	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Agree with those proposed, although National Planning Policy seeks a 20 year view, therefore some early indication of longer-term release potential, subject to detailed landscaping mitigation being undertaken in advance, would provide a settlement strategy for the longer-term. The site at East Greenlees Road is particularly suitable for such treatment although it is not expected it will be released in the short-term through this Local Plan, but very much a site for the future.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR513	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Agree with those proposed especially at Colinhill Farm, Strathaven, but consider that Shott Farm Blantyre can be released to create a sustainable urban extension.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR708	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	J	Gaffney	McInally Associates	The settlement boundary at Symington should be altered to include a site at Biggar Road for development	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

22	MIR1099	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Stephen	Partington	Muir Smith Evans	There is a requirement for a fundamental reassessment of appropriate boundaries around Thorntonhall in association with consideration of housing land requirements.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR1100	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Stephen	Partington	Muir Smith Evans	It is noted that the preferred option is for the council to take a reasonable and proportional approach to the nature, scale and timing of developer contribution required in association with any development proposal. It is also noted that the council will expect submission of some information regarding financial viability in such discussions.	Noted
22	MIR363	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	The Estate objects to the Preferred Option put forward in the MIR. This does not take account of the issues raised above. There is no viable alternative promoted by the MIR and this is unacceptable. A simple alternative would be to identify sustainable	Noted

							locations within rural villages, such as Elvanfoot, to accommodate a proportion of the development requirements imposed upon the Local Development Plan by the emerging Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan.	
22	MIR74	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	Objects to the Preferred Option. This does not include land at Bothwell, Shawsburn and Quarter Village that is promoted for development through this Report. There is no viable alternative promoted by the MIR and this is unacceptable.	Noted
22	MIR426	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	The Trust objects to the Preferred Option put forward in the MIR. . A simple alternative would be to identify sustainable locations within rural villages, such as Leadhills (population circa 850) - a major local tourist attraction, to accommodate a proportion of the development requirements imposed upon the Local	Noted



							Development Plan by the emerging Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan. The position taken by the current Local Plan for the area where there is a flexible approach to development at Leadhills is supported and should be continued.	
22	MIR1091	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		BMJ Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Agree modifications to settlement boundaries are needed. We consider that proposed boundary changes at Langlands EK do not go far enough and do not relate well to physical features and landscape topography. See seperate plan for details	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR883	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		Cobelnieola	Scott Mackay Planning	Agree that modifications to the settlement boundaries are necessary to reflect physical changes to the built environment. The settlement boundary at Peel Park North at Braehead Road/East Kilbride Road should be amended to also include land to the west to better reflect physical features and landscape topography	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

							and provide a more defensible settlement boundary.	
22	MIR271	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		Loch Homes Ltd	Scott Mackay Planning	Agree with Preferred option 11 in that modifications to the settlement boundaries are needed.	Noted
22	MIR207	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	CSK Farming Ltd		Scott Mackay Planning	We agree with Preferred Option 11 in that modifications to the settlement boundaries are needed. However we consider that proposed boundary change at West End Farm (East Kilbride 1) should also include land within West End farm to the east of the proposed boundary change (see plan attached to MIR 216)	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR773	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Mike	Andrews		The settlement boundary at Cambuslang should be changed to include CR/67/003 Lightburn Rd	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR945	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Thomas	Barrie		Existing settlement boundaries should be retained	Noted
22	MIR301	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Donna	Brooks		Modifications to boundaries should not be sought for all settlements as a matter of course. Each modification should be decided on its own merits and in consultation	Noted

							with local communities, where the proposed modification is major and supported or promoted by the local authority, the local community should be engaged directly in discussions. Strongly disagree with proposed settlement boundary change at Strathaven.	
22	MIR655	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		Cala Homes West		There is a need for the Council to release further land for new homes over the LDP period in order to meet the anticipated housing shortfall. This case has been set out in the response to Question 14. There are a number of sustainable sites at the edge of existing settlement boundaries which should be included in the Council's proposed settlement boundary amendments. The sites at Peel Road, Thorntonhall EK/78/003, Bothwell Bank Farm HM/82/008, Strathaven West EK/77/009 should be included within the settlement boundaries.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

22	MIR239	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Avril	Dobson		Disagree with proposed settlement boundary changes involving Strathaven. Each proposal should be considered on its own merits in discussion with each local community.	Noted
22	MIR1042	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Robert	Freel		disagree with this	Noted
22	MIR194	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Neil	Gainford		It is not enough retrospectively to adjust settlement boundaries to reflect development management decisions taken since the adoption of the previous plan. There needs to be a comprehensive review of all settlement boundaries. The proposals for Kaimed, Kersewell and Ponfeigh are too small and insignificant to merit being described as new settlements, and in any strategic sense would make no useful contribution towards meeting housing needs	Noted

22	MIR342	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Modifications to boundaries should not be sought for all settlements as a matter of course. Each modification should be decided on its own merits and in consultation with local communities, where the proposed modification is major and supported or promoted by the local authority, the local community should be engaged directly in discussions. Strongly disagree with proposed settlement boundary change at Strathaven.	Noted
22	MIR461	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Wendy	Gilmour		No comment Do not appear to affect Strathaven or Glassford	Noted
22	MIR690	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Ian	Gilmour		No real comment but reads as if boundaries get changes to reflect reality rather than keeping to agreed Green Belt areas.	Noted
22	MIR921	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Stuart	Hunter		We do not disagree with the proposed settlement boundary changes, but feel that further changes will be required to allow for those developments allocated in this Plan to be delivered	Noted

22	MIR809	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22		James Barr		Requests the settlement boundary at Strathaven is amended to include the site at Hills Road	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR1017	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Stuart	MacGarvie		Agree with the settlement boundary change for sandford (1)	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR728	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Rachael	Macleod		Support the proposed settlement boundary change at Wellburn Farm Lesmahagow and also recommend that consideration is given to modifying the settlement boundary surrounding around the Wellburn Farm proposal to include the proposed wider scheme.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR1065	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		There is no case for changing the present Strathaven boundaries.	Noted
22	MIR395	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Claire	Marr		Yes	Noted
22	MIR895	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Allan	McCulloch		No - masterplan site EK/77/002, 007, 009 should be deleted and replaced with a smaller scale more appropriate site in landscape terms - EK77/004 (Crofthead/Westpark)	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
22	MIR847	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	John	McMorran		yes	Noted

22	MIR570	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	William W	Park		yes	Noted
22	MIR542	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Isobel	Paterson		No further development in the Green Belt	Noted
22	MIR949	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	George	Perry		existing boundaries should be maintained	Noted
22	MIR626	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Jim	Ravey		Scottish Coal reserves the right to comment on individual sites that are carried forward into the emerging LDP and have the potential to either impact or conflict with existing or proposed surface mining and restoration activities. Concern is expressed at the proposed new settlement north of Rigside (Owenstown) and its potential for the sterilisation of national resources of coal.	Noted
22	MIR87	Preferred option 11 - Settlement boundaries	Question 22	Neil	Roberts		Supports new boundary of EK/78/003.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
23	MIR8	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Disagree strongly with the alternative option as it would threaten and harm the long term wellbeing of those settlements within the plan area, all of which	Noted

							should allow for future development opportunities.	
23	MIR158	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	There is no merit in the alternative option suggested.	Noted
23	MIR53	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	There is no merit in the alternative option suggested.	Noted
23	MIR908	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	guidance should be taken from the Strategic Plan and the SLLP monitoring report.	Guidance has been taken from SPP SDP and from the monitoring exercise carried out when drafting the MIR
23	MIR172	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	Do not agree with the Council's alternative option not to modify settlement boundaries.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
23	MIR26	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	No	Noted
23	MIR75	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	There is no viable alternative promoted by the MIR and this is unacceptable.	Noted
23	MIR884	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23		Cobelnieola	Scott Mackay Planning	No the LDP provides the correct opportunity and procedure by which to reconsider and redefine settlement boundaries given changes in circumstances.	Noted
23	MIR215	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	CSK Farming Ltd		Scott Mackay Planning	Settlement Boundaries should be reviewed as part of the LDP process and therefore do not agree	Noted



							with the Alternative option	
23	MIR302	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Donna	Brooks		Disagree with the generalist approach. Each modification should be decided on its own merits and in consultation with local communities.	Noted
23	MIR242	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Avril	Dobson		A generalised approach is not appropriate as local needs should be analysed and consulted on within each local community.	Noted
23	MIR11	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Donald	Filshie		Requests area of land at Gilmourton is released for a country style garden centre/bistro with a possible future extension of a few timber chalets .	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
23	MIR1043	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Robert	Freel		Agree	Noted
23	MIR343	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree with the generalist approach. Each modification should be decided on its own merits and in consultation with local communities.	Noted
23	MIR691	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Ian	Gilmour		Must be open to change	Noted
23	MIR810	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23		James Barr		Two small sites in Strathaven should be released	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"

23	MIR729	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with preferred option	Noted
23	MIR396	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Claire	Marr		No	Noted
23	MIR571	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	William W	Park		no	Noted
23	MIR543	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Isobel	Paterson		No further development in Green Belt	Noted
23	MIR627	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Jim	Ravey		Does not agree with alternative option for settlement boundaries.	Noted
23	MIR12	Alternative option - Settlement boundaries	Question 23	Hugh	Steel		Requests site at Kibblestane Place Strathaven is released from the green belt as a small scale housing land release.	Noted - site has been assessed as part of the "Call for Sites"
24	MIR974	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Agree	Noted
24	MIR201	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	Agrees with the preferred option.	Noted
24	MIR159	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	No objection to the preferred strategy with regards policies and proposals aimed at mitigating the causes of	Noted

							climate change, but policy wording must assume a realistic approach in relation to the availability of technologies and the financial implications of such. There must therefore be flexibility built into the policy to allow for varying site conditions and requirements.	
24	MIR54	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	There is no objection to the preferred strategy with regards policies and proposals aimed at mitigating the causes of climate change, however any policy wording must assume a realistic approach in relation to the availability of technologies and the financial implications of such. There must therefore be flexibility built into the policy to allow for varying site conditions and requirements.	Noted
24	MIR27	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	A balanced and measured approach requires to be taken to avoid making sites non-effective and unusable.	Noted

24	MIR515	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	This is a big question that cannot be ignored, therefore requires to have policy input. Whilst generally agreeing with the preferred option, a balanced and measured approach requires to be taken to avoid making sites non-effective and unusable	Noted
24	MIR367	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	The Estate generally supports the MIR position on climate change but considers that it must maximise renewable energy opportunities wherever appropriate to meet Scottish Government targets.	Noted
24	MIR428	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	The Trust generally supports the MIR position on climate change but considers that it must maximise renewable energy opportunities wherever appropriate to meet Scottish Government targets	Noted
24	MIR303	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Donna	Brooks		Agree strongly with the preferred option and would point out the contradiction between this preferred option and one which suggests further large	Noted

							scale development at Strathaven West might be appropriate.	
24	MIR657	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24		Cala Homes West		Agree with preferred option. The principles underlying this option are in accord with SPP and the SDP. The Council needs to acknowledge in the LDP policy that sustainable sites accessible by public transport will be on both brownfield and greenfield land.	Noted
24	MIR1044	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Robert	Freel		No	Noted
24	MIR95	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Rachel	Furlong		Agree with preferred option	Noted
24	MIR131	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Neil	Gainford		The Bruntland definition of sustainability does not support the argument that urban locations in principle are more sustainable than their rural counterparts. It is suggested that South Lanarkshire Council reject the outdated concept that rural locations by their nature are 'unsustainable', and join the growing body of opinion that recognises that a different planning	Noted

							approach is required	
24	MIR344	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree strongly with the preferred option and would point out the contradiction between this preferred option' and one which suggests further large scale development at Strathaven West might be appropriate.	Noted
24	MIR463	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Wendy	Gilmour		Does not object to the preferred option but feels it would be difficult to achieve in practice	Noted
24	MIR692	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Ian	Gilmour		Agreed but inconsistent with East Overton development in Strathaven	Noted
24	MIR730	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Rachael	Macleod		Agree with the preferred strategy but are slightly concerned about the requirement to ensure that new developments aim for a zero-carbon footprint. Sustainability is an important consideration in any development, but achieving zero-carbon can be extremely onerous and may deter development in South Lanarkshire, especially in the current financial climate.	Noted
24	MIR1066	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		Yes. But its application should mean no more windfarms are approved in	Noted

							Avondale	
24	MIR397	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Claire	Marr		yes	Noted
24	MIR848	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
24	MIR572	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	William W	Park		yes	Noted
24	MIR629	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Jim	Ravey		SRG agree with the principle of the positive management of climate change but consideration will require to be given to the fact that rural development will happen in more remote areas that could have limited public transport options and require the use of private vehicles	Noted
24	MIR238	Preferred option 12 - Climate change	Question 24	Toby	Wilson		Agrees with preferred option	Noted
25	MIR975	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Disagree	Noted
25	MIR160	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	There is no merit in the alternative option suggested.	Noted
25	MIR55	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	There is no merit in the alternative option	Noted

							suggested.	
25	MIR28	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Agree that the implications of climate change policies should not be a reason to restrict development which is otherwise acceptable.	Noted
25	MIR517	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	The implications of climate change policies should not be a reason to restrict development.	Noted
25	MIR304	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Donna	Brooks		The alternative option is unrealistic and would be contrary to SPP/SDP, national and European policy, strategy, regulation and legislation. Any significant development has to be properly assessed against the impacts of climate change and other important environmental considerations.	Noted
25	MIR1045	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Robert	Freel		each needs to be looked at on its own merit	Noted
25	MIR97	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Rachel	Furlong		Do not consider the alternative option an appropriate	Noted
25	MIR345	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	The alternative option is unrealistic and would be contrary to SPP/SDP, national and European policy, strategy, regulation and legislation. Any significant development	Noted



							has to be properly assessed against the impacts of climate change and other important environmental considerations.	
25	MIR464	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree- more practical- level of impact must be a consideration.	Noted
25	MIR693	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Ian	Gilmour		Depends on your view of what causes climate change	Noted
25	MIR1075	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Ged	Hainey		generally yes	Noted
25	MIR731	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with the alternative option; climate change is an important issue that needs to be taken into consideration when considering development proposals but climate change and the environmental impacts are only one aspect of creating sustainable developments, social and environmental impacts also need to be taken into account when considering proposals. The focus cannot solely be on environmental issues; there needs to be a balance.	Noted

25	MIR398	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Claire	Marr		Yes	Noted
25	MIR573	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	William W	Park		no	Noted
25	MIR496	Alternative option - Climate change	Question 25	Roy	Scott		Yes	Noted
26	MIR437	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Watson	Forrest	929 Design Ltd	Yes	Noted
26	MIR9	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Support is given to the Council's proposed approach to the issue of developer contributions particularly the implicit recognition on the part of the Council that unreasonable and unjustifiable demands in relation to developer contributions could, especially in the current economic climate, threaten the economic viability of many development schemes.	Noted
26	MIR1080	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26		ASDA	Dundas & Wilson CS LLP	ASDA supports the preferred option but would stress the importance that any developer contributions sought by the Council are in compliance with the five policy tests identified in Circular 1/2010: Planning Agreements. Planning	Noted

							officers need to be provided with appropriate and sufficient information as to the wider pressures of delivering development.	
26	MIR753	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Muse Development s		GVA Grimley	Agree with this preferred option approach and stress the importance that any developer contributions sought are in compliance with the five policy tests identified within circular 1/2010	Noted
26	MIR202	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	The adoption of a reasonable and proportional approach to developer contributions. An "open book "approach is not appropriate given the self-evidently high remediation costs involved.	Noted
26	MIR161	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	The merits of the Council taking cognisance of the financial viability of developments in assessing the levels of developer contributions is desirable and supported.	Noted
26	MIR56	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	The merits of the Council taking cognisance of the financial viability of developments in assessing the levels of developer contributions is	Noted

							desirable and supported.	
26	MIR29	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes openness, transparency, proportionate and measures are all key aspects of negotiating developer contributions.	Noted
26	MIR519	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes openness, transparency, proportionate and measures are all key aspects of negotiating developer contributions.	Noted
26	MIR76	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26		Hamilton & Kinneil Estates	PPCA Ltd	The flexibility endorsed by the Council in MIR is welcomed in light of current economic circumstances.	Noted
26	MIR799	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26		Stonehouse Ahead	Turley Associates	Stonehouse Ahead supports the proposed reasonable and proportionate approach to the consideration of development contributions, including an 'open book' approach to ensure transparency.	Noted
26	MIR774	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Mike	Andrews		Agree with the preferred strategy covering developer contributions . A reasonable and proportional approach which takes account of individual site circumstances is essential.	Noted

26	MIR305	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Donna	Brooks		Agree.	Noted
26	MIR656	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26		Cala Homes West		Agree with preferred option. The key issue is not whether a development creates an impact but whether there is a need to mitigate the impacts arising as set out in Circular 1/2010. It is preferable that the Council continues with negotiating financial contributions on a case by case basis. To avoid creating a financial burden on any development, up front developer contributions should be avoided.	Noted
26	MIR1046	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Robert	Freel		Don't agree with this contributions should be from all applications	Noted
26	MIR346	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree	Noted
26	MIR465	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Wendy	Gilmour		Disagree- too open to interpretation.	Noted
26	MIR694	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Ian	Gilmour		Agree	Noted

26	MIR1076	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Ged	Hainey		Yes. A pragmatic and reasonable approach is required to deliver contributions, which must be mindful of both the economic viability of particular sites and also the wider economy.	Noted
26	MIR932	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Grant	Kirkhope		Developer contributions are necessary, however we would encourage that 'fair and reasonable' policy testing should be carried out. It should be noted that deferred payments of Section 75 obligations should be continued to be upheld. There should be a clear distinction as to what contributions are required in relation to the proposed development as apposed to what is required at national level.	Noted
26	MIR1018	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Stuart	MacGarvie		Noted this should also take into account previously agreed contributions as part of any CGA or RES release in the adopted plan	Not clear what this comment means
26	MIR732	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Rachael	Macleod		Agree with the preferred option whereby the council will take a reasonable and proportional approach to the nature, sale and timing	Noted

							of developer contributions	
26	MIR399	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Claire	Marr		yes	Noted
26	MIR849	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	John	McMorran		yes	Noted
26	MIR999	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Blair	Melville		Q26 – 27 The Council is correct that the only practicable and viable option in the current market is to ensure that developer obligations are proportionate, meet the tests of Circular 1/2010, that attempts are made to minimise the burdens placed on development, and that options for payment of contributions are fully explored. Infrastructure funding is a key issue for action at all levels of Government, and can no longer be left to the private sector to fund alone.	Noted
26	MIR574	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	William W	Park		yes	Noted
26	MIR630	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Jim	Ravey		Agree in principle to the Preferred Option 13; however, reference should be made in the relevant policy to taking a .	Noted

							reasonable and proportional approach, including site and market conditions, to the nature,....	
26	MIR240	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Toby	Wilson		Agree with the preferred option. Developer contributions should include measures to enhance the natural environment.	Noted
26	MIR831	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Capefleet Limited			Agree with the preferred option. As part of this an 'open book' approach from developers will be required to ensure transparency in assessing the financial viability of a development.	Noted
26	MIR872	Preferred option 13 - Developer contributions	Question 26	Ryden			Yes	Noted
27	MIR162	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	The alternative strategies are not supported.	Noted
27	MIR57	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	The alternative strategies are not supported.	Noted
27	MIR30	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Council's preferred approach most realistic.	Noted
27	MIR521	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Preferred approach is most realistic.	Noted
27	MIR77	Alternative option - Developer	Question 27		Hamilton & Kinneil	PPCA Ltd	Agree with preferred option	Noted



		contributions			Estates			
27	MIR306	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Donna	Brooks		Disagree with both alternatives: they represent two extremes, neither of which should be imposed across the board, although an element of developer contribution should be sought in every case.	Noted
27	MIR420	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Agnieszka	Devine		Concerned about use of community benefit funding to provide AstroTurf pitch - would prefer it to be spent on other facilities.	Community benefit it used where it has been requested or a need has been established.
27	MIR1047	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Robert	Freel		the developer should address all impacts and make necessary financial contributions	Noted
27	MIR347	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree with both alternatives: they represent two extremes, neither of which should be imposed across the board, although an element of developer contribution should be sought in every case.	Noted
27	MIR467	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree first option - Developers will be expected to address all impacts. Do not agree with second option - Developers will not make	Noted

							a contribution.	
27	MIR695	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Ian	Gilmour		Does not understand alternative option	Noted
27	MIR933	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Grant	Kirkhope		The Council should use 'fair and reasonable' policy testing when calculating the suggested level of developer contributions sought.	Noted
27	MIR733	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with alternative options.	Noted
27	MIR575	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	William W	Park		no	Noted
27	MIR497	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Roy	Scott		Yes	Noted
27	MIR873	Alternative option - Developer contributions	Question 27	Ryden			Economic viability of schemes must be a consideration.	Noted
28	MIR438	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Watson	Forrest	929 Design Ltd	Yes	Noted
28	MIR976	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	The cumulative effect of several windfarms in the one area must be taken into account, in particular around Strathaven.	Noted

28	MIR605	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28		Scottish and Southern Energy	Jones Lang LaSalle	<p>SSE has a fundamental disagreement with Preferred Option 14. The MIR fails to take account of recent Scottish Government policy and guidance and does not set out how South Lanarkshire will contribute to meeting the Scottish target of 100% renewable energy by 2020. Of significant concern is the position expressed within the MIR that the existing Supplementary Planning Guidance on renewable energy development is in accordance with SPP. SSE have a number of significant concerns regarding the way in which the SPG has been progressed, in terms of its inconsistency with SPP, primarily, with regard to identifying areas where cumulative impact limits further development. It would be inappropriate to rely on the SPG as being up-to- date, consistent with SPP and appropriate to integrate within the LDP.</p>	Noted
----	--------	--	-------------	--	------------------------------	--------------------	--	-------

28	MIR31	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted
28	MIR523	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted
28	MIR307	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Donna	Brooks		Agree in principle pending the publication of the new Supplementary Guidance on Renewable Energy where SLC's detailed proposals will be presented. The SG should contain the following in relation to the Avondale area: When all current proposals are operational Avondale will be contributing more than its fair share towards achieving the governments target. The area of Avondale should, therefore be removed from the suggested areas of search in the new Supplementary Guide on renewable energy. Regarding single and small scale developments we propose that a minimum distance of 500m between turbines (on different developments) is	Noted

							stipulated. Regarding grid connections, SLC should include within the LDP a statement on how it proposes to satisfy itself that condition ENV37 is met.	
28	MIR658	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28		Cala Homes West		Agree with preferred option	Noted
28	MIR421	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Agnieszka	Devine		Renewable energy developments should provide benefits to local residents.	Noted
28	MIR245	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Avril	Dobson		Avondale already contributes more than its fair share of achieving the government's target for renewable energy and should be removed from the suggested areas of search in the New Supplementary Guide on renewable energy.	Noted
28	MIR1048	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Robert	Freel		agree that this should be a consideration however the Dovesdale application had as part of the application a renewable energy element that was used in part to push the application thro however this was subsequently amended as the developer thought it was too expensive an	Noted

							option. Careful consideration must be made of all applications which intimate that they provide this option and these must be monitored and followed up. Single wind farm applications needs to be examined.	
28	MIR98	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Rachel	Furlong		Agree with preferred option	Noted
28	MIR348	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree in principle pending the publication of the new Supplementary Guidance on Renewable Energy where SLC's detailed proposals will be presented. The SG should contain the following in relation to the Avondale area: When all current proposals are operational Avondale will be contributing more than its fair share towards achieving the governments target. The area of Avondale should, therefore be removed from the suggested areas of search in the new Supplementary Guide on renewable energy. Regarding single and	Noted

							small scale developments we propose that a minimum distance of 500m between turbines (on different developments) is stipulated. Regarding grid connections, SLC should include within the LDP a statement on how it proposes to satisfy itself that condition ENV37 of SLLP2006) is met.	
28	MIR468	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Wendy	Gilmour		Partly agree- need to consider if is this a cost effective production of electricity and give considerable consideration to cumulative impact	Noted
28	MIR696	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Ian	Gilmour		Agree along with question 29 but no renewable energy method is 100% efficient, Recent research shows Wind Turbines at 20% efficient.	Noted
28	MIR1019	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Stuart	MacGarvie		Agreed	Noted
28	MIR734	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Rachael	Macleod		The preferred option could be more supportive of renewable energy development by supporting rather than considering renewable energy. The Renewable	Noted

							Energy SPG is a relatively recent publication and is still fit for purpose therefore it seems logical to incorporate the policies and proposals in the LDP	
28	MIR1067	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		Yes. But its application should mean no more windfarms are approved in Avondale	Noted
28	MIR400	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Claire	Marr		yes	Noted
28	MIR102	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Peter	Murray		Agree with preferred option	Noted
28	MIR576	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	William W	Park		yes	Noted
28	MIR544	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Isobel	Paterson		No further development in Green Belt	Noted
28	MIR631	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Jim	Ravey		Agrees in principle with the Preferred Option 14, although would welcome further opportunity to be consulted on the policy direction and Supplementary Planning Guidance, as this element of the LDP is developed.	Noted
28	MIR241	Preferred option 14 - Renewable energy	Question 28	Toby	Wilson		Generally support the preferred option, but also support measures to ensure new buildings are	Noted



							as efficient as possible. Support a combination of the preferred option and alternative option 2.	
29	MIR977	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	I prefer the alternative options. Both of them should be pursued along with encouragement for existing properties to be fully insulated, plus other energy saving ideas.	Noted
29	MIR607	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29		Scottish and Southern Energy	Jones Lang LaSalle	In terms of the alternative options, it would be inappropriate for the LDP to prioritise a certain form of renewable energy development over another. This would be inconsistent with the SG's advice on renewable energy development. The most appropriate alternative option to progress would be to undertake a wholesale review of the renewable energy SPG and identify the areas within that SPG that require to be revisited in order to achieve consistency with SPP and other expressions of renewable energy policy by the Scottish Government.	Noted

29	MIR32	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	No, unrealistic option.	Noted
29	MIR524	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	No, this is an unrealistic option	Noted
29	MIR368	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29		Aithrie Estate	PPCA Ltd	The Estate considers that the MIR must maximise renewable energy opportunities wherever appropriate to meet Scottish Government targets.	Noted
29	MIR434	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Lord Linlithgows Trust		PPCA Ltd	The Trust considers that the MIR must maximise renewable energy opportunities wherever appropriate to meet Scottish Government targets.	Noted
29	MIR308	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Donna	Brooks		Agree that there may be merit in the alternative options they are not mutually exclusive with the preferred option.	Noted
29	MIR423	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Agnieszka	Devine		Concerned about economic viability of renewables.	Noted
29	MIR246	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Avril	Dobson		None of the alternative options are mutually exclusive with the preferred option and all may be of benefit.	Noted
29	MIR1049	Alternative options - Renewable	Question 29	Robert	Freel		agree with some of the alternative options, solar	Noted

		energy					and ground water should also be examined.	
29	MIR99	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Rachel	Furlong		Alternative options proposed are not realistic	Noted
29	MIR349	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree that there may be merit in the alternative options - they are not mutually exclusive with the preferred option.	Noted
29	MIR469	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Wendy	Gilmour		Consideration of other renewable energy sources such as energy from waste as well as carbon capture, solar and ground source heating. Consideration should also be given to energy saving.	Noted
29	MIR697	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Ian	Gilmour		Solar is very variable in the South Lanarkshire climate.	Noted
29	MIR737	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with either of the alternative options. Onshore wind is the most proven and cost effective form of renewable energy generation therefore it would be illogical to give other, less proven technologies a higher priority. With regards to the second alternative option, even if all new developments were 100% energy efficient the	Noted

							existing building stock which accounts for the majority of energy demand would still require to be provided with energy and to meet the Scottish Government targets by 2020 this should be from a renewable source.	
29	MIR577	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	William W	Park		no	Noted
29	MIR499	Alternative options - Renewable energy	Question 29	Roy	Scott		Agreed	Noted
30	MIR978	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Agree	Noted
30	MIR184	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	Does not agree with preferred option as localised flooding may be in existence due to inadequate management or design.	Noted
30	MIR173	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Blossom Investments Ltd		Jones Lang LaSalle	Propose the Council reword preferred option 15 - Flooding. It is overly restrictive for "any development proposed" not to be at risk of flooding. This option should be reworded to allow for developments which are able to manage	Noted

							flood risk effectively to be permitted.	
30	MIR33	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted
30	MIR525	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted
30	MIR309	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Donna	Brooks		Agree.	Noted
30	MIR659	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30		Cala Homes West		Agree with preferred option	Noted
30	MIR749	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Douglas	Campbell		Objects to potential development of site EK/77/009 at Strathaven	Noted
30	MIR424	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Agnieszka	Devine		Concerned about water damage to existing properties which are on the boundary of potential development site at Strathaven west	Noted
30	MIR247	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Avril	Dobson		Agrees with preferred option on Flooding	Noted
30	MIR639	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Patrick	Dunne		The spatial strategy of the LDP should protect the functional floodplain of watercourses	The spatial strategy fully accords with SEPA's water framework directive and policy direction on the functional floodplain
30	MIR1050	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Robert	Freel		Agree with preferred option	Noted

30	MIR350	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree	Noted
30	MIR470	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree	Noted
30	MIR698	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Ian	Gilmour		Agree	Noted
30	MIR738	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Rachael	Macleod		Agree with preferred option	Noted
30	MIR401	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Claire	Marr		yes	Noted
30	MIR103	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Peter	Murray		Agree with preferred option	Noted
30	MIR578	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	William W	Park		yes	Noted
30	MIR633	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Jim	Ravey		Agree in principle with the Preferred Option 15, although this approach should not rule out development proposals that are temporary and/or implement flood mitigation measures	The spatial strategy fully accords with SEPA's water framework directive and policy direction on the functional floodplain
30	MIR500	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Roy	Scott		Agreed	Noted
30	MIR243	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Toby	Wilson		Supports the preferred option.	Noted
30	MIR874	Preferred option 15 - Flooding	Question 30	Ryden			Yes	Noted
31	MIR979	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Disagree	Noted

31	MIR185	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	Supports the Alternative Option as localised flooding can be addressed, particularly where management is an issue. Each site proposal should be treated on its own merits.	The spatial strategy fully accords with SEPA's water framework directive and policy direction on the functional floodplain
31	MIR34	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	No	Noted
31	MIR526	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	No	Noted
31	MIR310	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Donna	Brooks		Disagree - however, it should be noted that larger sites may contain floodplain and non- floodplain land all within the site boundary such sites should not be regarded as if they were wholly within the floodplain, a position which SLC appear to be taking with respect to SLLDP MIR site assessment forms.	The spatial strategy fully accords with SEPA's water framework directive and policy direction on the functional floodplain
31	MIR248	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Avril	Dobson		Disagree with alternative option for flooding as floodplains are generally unsuitable for normal building practices and may have detrimental events on the surrounding	Noted

							environment.	
31	MIR1051	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Robert	Freel		do not agree with this	Noted
31	MIR351	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree - however, it should be noted that larger sites may contain floodplain and non-floodplain land all within the site boundary - such sites should not be regarded as if they were wholly within the floodplain, a position which SLC appear to be taking with respect to SLLDP MIR site assessment forms.	The spatial strategy fully accords with SEPA's water framework directive and policy direction on the functional floodplain
31	MIR471	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Wendy	Gilmour		Completely disagree- flood plains vital	Noted
31	MIR699	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Ian	Gilmour		Disagree	Noted
31	MIR739	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with alternative option	Noted
31	MIR402	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Claire	Marr		no	Noted
31	MIR579	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	William W	Park		no	Noted
31	MIR875	Alternative option - Flooding	Question 31	Ryden			No	Noted
32	MIR980	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Agree. All steps should be taken to encourage even more recycling of waste, and retailers should help by minimising packaging	Noted



							of their products and have schemes for recycling consumer goods when no longer required.	
32	MIR163	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	The preferred option is agreed.	Noted
32	MIR58	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	The preferred option is agreed.	Noted
32	MIR35	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted
32	MIR527	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted
32	MIR311	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Donna	Brooks		Agree	Noted
32	MIR660	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32		Cala Homes West		Agree with preferred option	Noted
32	MIR431	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Agnieszka	Devine		Further housing development in Strathaven would result in Increase in landfill increase in sewage/ public health risk.	Noted
32	MIR249	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Avril	Dobson		Agrees with Preferred Option 16 - Waste	Noted
32	MIR1052	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Robert	Freel		Should identify sites within the LDP rather than a criteria based policy which can be adjusted or moved to suit the application. If areas are defined then everybody knows where they will be and they can not just appear on the	Noted

							doorstep following a planning application. The thermal treatment plants should be avoided due to the health and safety reasons with concentration on the reuse, recycle options.	
32	MIR352	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree	Noted
32	MIR472	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree in theory but zero waste is impractical	Noted
32	MIR700	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Ian	Gilmour		Agree	Noted
32	MIR740	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Rachael	Macleod		Agree with the preferred option in relation to the guiding the location of new waste sites by criteria rather than defining locations on a plan. Ensuring that new developments minimise their waste during both construction and operational phases complies with waste hierarchy; it puts the emphasis on prevention.	Noted
32	MIR403	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	Claire	Marr		yes	Noted
32	MIR580	Preferred option 16 - Waste	Question 32	William W	Park		Agreed with preferred option	Noted

33	MIR981	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No	Noted
33	MIR36	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	No	Noted
33	MIR529	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	No	Noted
33	MIR312	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Donna	Brooks		Disagree SLC would never be able to reach government-set targets for waste management and the operation would be entirely unsustainable.	Noted
33	MIR250	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Avril	Dobson		Disagrees with Alternative Option for waste - government targets could never be met for waste management.	Noted
33	MIR1053	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Robert	Freel		Not viable option	Noted
33	MIR353	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree - SLC would never be able to reach government-set targets for waste management and the operation would be entirely unsustainable.	Noted
33	MIR473	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Wendy	Gilmour		No- must consider reducing landfill. Consideration should be given to energy from waste- complete zero waste policy is unrealistic	Noted

33	MIR701	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Ian	Gilmour		Disagree	Noted
33	MIR742	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with alternative option	Noted
33	MIR404	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Claire	Marr		no	Noted
33	MIR581	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	William W	Park		no	Noted
33	MIR501	Alternative option - Waste	Question 33	Roy	Scott		Yes	Noted
34	MIR982	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Yes	Noted
34	MIR203	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	It is considered that a more tolerant approach towards traffic growth and congestion should be taken in order to assist an economic recovery. This will encourage site development and provide a boost to construction and employment.	Noted
34	MIR164	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	It is agreed that the preferred strategy should aim to alleviate transport issues and congestion whilst supporting economic growth and regeneration.	Noted
34	MIR59	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	It is agreed that the preferred strategy should aim to alleviate transport	Noted

							issues and congestion whilst supporting economic growth and regeneration.	
34	MIR909	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Stuart	Mcgarvie	James Barr Ltd	Noted- traffic should reflect the local transport network and appropriate TA's including improvements.	Noted
34	MIR186	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	Each site proposal should be treated on its own merits.	Noted
34	MIR37	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted
34	MIR533	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted
34	MIR800	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34		Stonehouse Ahead	Turley Associates	Stonehouse Ahead supports the preferred option, in particular the delivery of the A71 which will facilitate the economic recovery, regeneration and sustainable growth of Stonehouse. The development proposals set out by Stonehouse Ahead will also support existing and potentially enhanced local public transport services, and provide routes for walking and cycling.	Noted

34	MIR313	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Donna	Brooks		Agree strongly but doubt SLCs ability to influence public transport, specifically bus transport in rural areas. It is difficult to see how the impacts of traffic growth can be alleviated in Strathaven if SLC is promoting a major residential development to the west of the town, shortly after consenting the residential development at East Overton. The proposed growth of the town to such a degree would surely make the provision of an A71 road by-pass essential.	Noted
34	MIR661	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34		Cala Homes West		Agree with preferred option	Noted
34	MIR751	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Douglas	Campbell		Objects to potential development of sites EK/77/009, EK/77/002 EK/77/007 at Strathaven	Noted
34	MIR124	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	William	Cochrane		Agrees with preferred option 17 Traffic Growth and Congestion but does not consider this has been applied to Strathaven	Noted
34	MIR432	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Agnieszka	Devine		Further housing development in Strathaven will have environmental	Noted

							impact as well as child safety issues e.g. less safe walking or cycling to school	
34	MIR252	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Avril	Dobson		Agree strongly but would question how well SLC could encourage public transport in rural areas.	Noted
34	MIR1054	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Robert	Freel		a mix of the alternative and this option may work areas need to be identified.	Noted
34	MIR354	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree strongly but doubt SLC's ability to influence public transport, specifically bus transport in rural areas. It is difficult to see how the impacts of traffic growth can be alleviated in Strathaven if SLC is promoting a major residential development to the west of the town, shortly after consenting the residential development at East Overton. The proposed growth of the town to such a degree would surely make the provision of an A71 road by-pass essential	Noted
34	MIR475	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree in principle though cycling in many areas is hazardous. In many areas	Noted

							there is no viable alternative to the car.	
34	MIR702	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Ian	Gilmour		Less emphasis perhaps on cycling routes.	Noted
34	MIR743	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Rachael	Macleod		Agree with preferred option	Noted
34	MIR1068	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		Yes. But see comments on preferred option 7.	Noted
34	MIR405	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Claire	Marr		Yes, with the proviso that the development of safe walking and cycling networks should take priority over tackling road traffic congestion.	Noted
34	MIR896	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Allan	McCulloch		Traffic is an important matter in forward planning sites and is a material consideration in any new sites being promoted in the MIR.	Noted
34	MIR582	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	William W	Park		yes	Noted
34	MIR545	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Isobel	Paterson		No new building should be allowed around Strathaven because the road system is inadequate	Noted
34	MIR634	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Jim	Ravey		The approach set out in the MIR regarding traffic should not prejudice any future development of	Noted



							businesses, particularly related to the Scottish Renewables Group.	
34	MIR503	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Roy	Scott		Yes	Noted
34	MIR89	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34		sportscotland		Support the proposals to develop walking and cycling networks. In developing policy in this area it will be important to reflect the relationship between functional walking and cycling and that done for recreational purposes, each reinforcing and overlapping with the other. It is important not to develop active travel in isolation from recreational walking and cycling and to aim to develop an integrated network that joins recreational and commuting routes up. It is important to realise that provision for functional cycling or walking is in most cases also provision for recreational cycling and walking (and vice versa) and that both sorts of provision should consider the needs of both types of users.	Noted

34	MIR522	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	John	Wright		EK/78/002 and EK/78/003 are narrow country roads and cannot take any further increase in traffic.	Noted
34	MIR876	Preferred option 17 - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Ryden			Yes	Noted
34	MIR1077	Preferred option - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 34	Ged	Hainey		Yes, preferred option promotes a balanced approach.	Noted
35	MIR983	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No	Noted
35	MIR187	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	Each site proposal should be treated on its own merits.	Noted
35	MIR38	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Not realistic options	Noted
35	MIR534	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Not realistic options	Noted
35	MIR314	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Donna	Brooks		Alternative 1. is not feasible/realistic, Alternative 2. is unsustainable.	Noted
35	MIR253	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Avril	Dobson		Neither alternatives are feasible, nor can be implemented in a generalised manner. There may be different approaches for different communities and	Noted

							situations.	
35	MIR1055	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Robert	Freel		Not a viable option	Noted
35	MIR355	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Alternative 1. is not feasible/realistic, Alternative 2. is unsustainable.	Noted
35	MIR476	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Wendy	Gilmour		No- must consider all consequences	Noted
35	MIR704	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Ian	Gilmour		The alternatives are hardly viable	Noted
35	MIR744	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with alternative options	Noted
35	MIR406	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Claire	Marr		no	Noted
35	MIR583	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	William W	Park		no	Noted
35	MIR877	Alternative options - Traffic growth and congestion	Question 35	Ryden			No	Noted
36	MIR10	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36			Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Supplementary Guidance is acceptable provided there is full consultation and that a careful balance is struck between the level of detail set out within the plan and the	Noted

							level of detail included in any SG.	
36	MIR984	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	Yes	Noted
36	MIR165	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Ruth	Highgate	James Barr Ltd	The strategy for producing Supplementary Guidance documents to complement the local plan is agreed.	Noted
36	MIR60	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	The strategy for producing Supplementary Guidance documents to complement the local plan is agreed. The consultation periods for commenting on these documents should be well advertised and an appropriate length to ensure the ability to respond.	Noted
36	MIR188	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Country Capers Kypeside		James Barr Ltd	Noted. The public should be able to comment on the detail as it impacts on design and cost.	Noted
36	MIR39	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted
36	MIR535	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	Yes	Noted

36	MIR1101	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Stephen	Partington	Muir Smith Evans	LDP is likely to be more general in nature with details reserved for any supplementary guidance. . The LDP process is the proper, democratic process by which such matters should be consulted on, proposed and tested. While there might be a role in some circumstances for some supplementary guidance it is important that the overall approach to the LDP is to include as much detail about matters such as developer contributions and affordable housing within the LDP Proposed Plan itself.	Noted
36	MIR315	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Donna	Brooks		Agree strongly and would urge that the guidance is expedited. Little progress is being made in conservation area character appraisals it is essential that SLC allocates sufficient resources to this process and would benefit from involving communities and other interest groups in the survey work/collection of data.	Noted

36	MIR662	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36		Cala Homes West		Agree with preferred option. We request to be notified when the draft supplementary guidance documents are available for consultation	Noted
36	MIR433	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Agnieszka	Devine		Site EK/77/002 has badger setts and bats within the site	Noted
36	MIR254	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Avril	Dobson		Agree with preferred option. Supplementary Guidance setting out the Council's position more clearly would be beneficial from everyone's viewpoint. Further survey work and collection of data involving communities and community groups should form part of this process.	Noted
36	MIR1056	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Robert	Freel		Agree	Noted
36	MIR356	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Agree strongly and would urge that the guidance is expedited. In particular it is noted that little progress is being made in conservation area character appraisals - it is essential that SLC allocates sufficient resources to this process	Noted

							and would benefit from involving communities and other interest groups (Civic Societies, Community Councils) in the survey work/collection of data	
36	MIR477	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Wendy	Gilmour		Agree	Noted
36	MIR705	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Ian	Gilmour		Agree	Noted
36	MIR745	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Rachael	Macleod		There are merits in producing Supplementary Guidance however, we have concerns over how this is produced. As set out in the MIR SGs are not subject to independent scrutiny, yet they often carry similar weight in decision making as LDP policies which will have been subject to an independent review. The other issue with producing a large volume of SGs is that it can become unclear what the policy is as it is split between a number of documents. The advantage of having them	Noted

							all in one plan is that all polices are in one place and are easily accessible.	
36	MIR1069	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Peter	Mansell-Moullin		Strongly Support. Two new SG's are urgently needed. The first is to deal with the relationship between SLC, SLLC and the voluntary sector. This is to encourage local self-help. the second is to deal with listed buildings, conservation areas and heritage generally.	Noted
36	MIR407	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Claire	Marr		We are concerned that the use of supplementary guidance may be used to remove contentious issues from the SLLP thereby avoiding discussion, consultation and challenge. Therefore, we do not agree with the preferred option.	Noted
36	MIR584	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	William W	Park		yes	Noted
36	MIR636	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Jim	Ravey		Agrees with preferred option subject to appropriate consultation	Noted
36	MIR504	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary	Question 36	Roy	Scott		Yes	Noted



		Guidance						
36	MIR116	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36		sportscotland		Support the preferred option	Noted
36	MIR244	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Toby	Wilson		Agrees that natural environment to be dealt with through Supplementary Guidance. Express our concern about the lack of clarity over the status of local wildlife sites and SINC's, which are not included on the Strategic Context Map. These sites are extremely valuable in protecting areas which are deemed to be of environmental importance but do not meet the criteria for designation as SSSI. We would welcome a review of the status of local wildlife sites and the inclusion of a suite of them within the Supplementary Guidance.	Noted
36	MIR887	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Bruce	Wilson		Scottish Wildlife Trust would like to see the inclusion of locally designated sites within the plan. It is hoped that at the very least they will be covered in detail in the	Noted

							proposed list of supplementary guidance documents.	
36	MIR878	Preferred option 18 - Supplementary Guidance	Question 36	Ryden			Yes	Noted
36	MIR608	Supplementary guidance	Question 36		Scottish and Southern Energy	Jones Lang LaSalle	The list set out within the MIR of approved SG documents is incorrect. In order to avoid confusion through the LDP Examination process it is recommended that the LDP recognises that the approved documents do not have SG status. recommended that SLC set out their approach to reviewing the current SPG as well as a methodology for incorporating the relevant sections of this SPG into SG within the draft LDP. It would also be appropriate for the LDP to set out those areas that require refinement, such as the approach to assessing the areas of SLC that are found to be at cumulative capacity.	Noted

36	MIR100	SLDP MIR	Question 36	Kenneth	Sludden	South Strathclyde Raptor Study Group	There is a lack of locally designated sites - SINC's or Local Wildlife Sites in the LDP.	Noted
37	MIR985	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Michael	Pink	Hamilton Natural History Society	No	Noted
37	MIR40	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	J	Brown	Keppie Planning Ltd	No	Noted
37	MIR536	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Wallace Land		Keppie Planning Ltd	No	Noted
37	MIR316	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Donna	Brooks		Disagree Supplementary Guidance should be produced, but with fully public consultation and participation.	Noted
37	MIR255	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Avril	Dobson		Disagrees with alternative option on Supplementary Guidance.	Noted
37	MIR1057	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Robert	Freel		No	Noted
37	MIR357	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	W	Gilmour	Strathaven Community Council	Disagree - Supplementary Guidance should be produced, but with full public consultation and participation.	Noted
37	MIR478	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Wendy	Gilmour		No	Noted

37	MIR706	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Ian	Gilmour		Disagree	Noted
37	MIR1020	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Stuart	MacGarvie		Supplementary guidance must be open to public comment and challenge	Noted
37	MIR747	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Rachael	Macleod		Do not agree with the alternative option but have concerns about how SGs are produced and made available.	Noted
37	MIR585	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	William W	Park		No	Noted
37	MIR879	Alternative option - Supplementary Guidance	Question 37	Ryden			No	Noted
Glos sary	MIR262	Appendix 1 glossary of terms		Neil	Gainford		The glossary should clarify the distinction between 'ribbon development' and 'linear development' as these are two different things. An extension to linear development in a rural context should not be confused with 'ribbon development'. Environmental capacity ought to determine the extent to which it would be appropriate to extend linear development in any given context.	Noted

SEA	MIR205	Appendix 2 - SEA non technical summary		National Grid Property Ltd		Hargest and Wallace Planning Ltd	SEA Page 109 Appendix 7 refers to HM/82/003 Former Gasworks, Uddingston. with a potential use for Retail and Commercial. SLC concludes that the potential use of the site raises minimum or no SEA issues. HM/82/011 and HM/82/012 also refer to the former Gasworks following submissions by parties other than NG. Although relating to the same site the SEA assessments differ from that for HM/82/003 most notably in the case of impact upon Cultural Heritage.	Noted
SEA	MIR61	Appendix 2 - SEA non technical summary		Margaret	Hodge	James Barr Ltd	Disagrees with some of the SEA assessment criteria as applied to sites CL37004 and CL37008	Noted
	MIR775			James	Barclay		Identical comments to those submitted by Claire Marr on behalf of Jackton & Thorntonhall Community Council. SEE MIR 370-374, 376-379, 381-385, 388-407	Noted





## **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)