

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

85

Blair Melville

Homes for Scotland

Agent?

New Representation Number: **2340** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The second paragraph (under 'Policy', sub-heading 'Open Space Provision', Part a) of the revised Policy ENV 2 as it is unreasonable and does not conform with Circular 12/1996. If a development is proposed in an area which has an identified surplus of open space provision, then it is evident that the development is neither creating nor worsening a deficit of provision and, therefore, has no impact to be mitigated. In those circumstances, there is no justification to seek any contribution from the applicant to facilities locally or elsewhere in the City.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2341** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **742**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **504, 597, 741, 1078**

Objects To: Policy ENV 15 is unworkable and should be withdrawn. It relies for justification on various Government policy statements. Homes for Scotland has raised objections with the Scottish Government on the way in which micro-renewables and energy-efficiency measures are being pursued, and opposes policies such as ENV 15 being promoted in development plans. The principles of passive solar design and energy efficiency measures are not disputed. However, the requirement for a 15% reduction in energy consumption through micro-renewables technologies, as set out in SPP 6, is impractical at the present time.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

95

Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd

Agent?

Turley Associates

New Representation Number: **2338**

Representation Number of Change Objected to: **488**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The change in the threshold of 2500 sqm floorspace above which proposals for retail or commercial leisure development will require to be accompanied by supporting information (e.g. retail impact assessment) - as set out in Policy SC 4. Such new thresholds are currently being debated by the Structure Plan Team ('Town Centres and Retail Issues Report') and so should not automatically be accepted by the City Plan Team.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2337**

Representation Number of Change Objected to: **489**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: Request that policy ENV 2 be clarified to make it clear that it only applies to new stores of greater than 2,000 sqm gross floorspace in the City Centre, and not small extensions to existing stores which may already exceed this floorspace.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

105

Helen Barnard

Pollokshields Heritage

Agent?

New Representation Number: **2342** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **2331**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The de-designation of a stretch of Green Corridor (formerly Corridor of Wildlife and Landscape Importance) at Darnley Street. The treatment of the railway embankments as a zone of vegetation is a key feature of the East and West Pollokshields Conservation areas and contributes to both areas' diversity.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

136

Co-operative Group Property Division

Agent?

GL Hearn

New Representation Number: **2344** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **415**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **416**

Objects To: The proposed addition of text after the first paragraph at policy SC 1, to read: "Investment will also be supported where it can be demonstrated to maintain and improve other retail and commercial/leisure centres within the wider network, especially where it can meet the relevant requirements of the Plan including high accessibility by public transport." It is not considered that this is required, given that SPP 8 focusses development in town centres. It is suggested that this be removed.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2346** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **486**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **423, 425, 1112, 1440**

Objects To: The replacement of 400 sqm (gross) with 1000 sqm (gross) as the threshold for sequential assessment, as set out in Policy SC 3, is not agreed with. This could result in a proliferation of medium sized retail development which, particularly cumulatively, could have an adverse impact on the hierarchy of centres.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2345** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **580**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: Proposal to amend policy SC 1 by deleting last sentence of first paragraph and replacing with "Investment to safeguard and improve Other Retail and Commercial/Leisure Centres in the City's Network of Centres (in line with Policy SC 3: The Sequential Approach for Retail and Commercial Leisure Developments), will be encouraged where such investment will not undermine the vitality and viability of town centres". It is not considered that this is required, given that SPP 8 focuses development in town centres. It is suggested that this be removed.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2343** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **918**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: Changes being made to the note to Part C of policy SC 3. It appears that this needs further amendment in relation to changes proposed to policy SC7. Specifically, reference to 'Local Shopping Parade' and the flexibility being introduced in relation to the size of the individual unit.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

174

Tesco Stores Ltd (Beith Street)

Agent?

Development Planning Partnership LLP

New Representation Number: **2406**

Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1635**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To:

The proposed extension to the Partick/Byres Road Town Centre boundary to the west of Maule Drive. This extension seeks to combine the distinct local retail parades situated within Thronwood south east and Thornwood south west within the Town Centre. No strong evidential basis has been advanced which would justify the proposed change. Concerned that the City Council have simply responded to pressure from Glasgow Harbour, who are seeking this change to try and justify further retail proposal at Glasgow Harbour.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

182

Jean Charsley

Hillhead Community Council

Agent?

New Representation Number: **2359** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **195**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The proposed amendment of paragraph 5.26 to read: "Appropriately designed lighting has an important role to play in defining the character of streets, spaces and buildings." Mention of light pollution measures are required somewhere in the design guidance.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2357** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **330**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **348**

Objects To: Proposed amendments to policy DES 3, part relating to LISTED BUILDINGS, subsections on RETENTION OF LISTED BUILDINGS and DEMOLITION on the grounds that the proposed amendments do not go far enough. Reference to the possibility of repairs notices and CPOs re maintenance should be added.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2354** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **404**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: Whilst supporting the proposed amendment to the first sentence of paragraph 6.81, to read: "Where an existing Town Centre is in the process of substantial redevelopment/renewal, or where such redevelopment is committed, further edge of/out of centre development, which would be likely to significantly impact on the vitality and viability of the Centre, will not be encouraged.", it is considered that additional text should be added.

Commentator's Suggested Changes? *Amend the amended first sentence of paragraph 6.81 to read: "Where an existing Town Centre is in the process of substantial redevelopment/renewal, where such redevelopment is committed, or where Town Centre Action Plans are contemplated or are in progress, further edge of/out of centre development, which would be likely to significantly impact on the vitality and viability of the Centre, will not be encouraged."*

New Representation Number: **2353** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **576**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The proposed amendment to the first sentence of paragraph 6.75 - inserting "in edge-of-centre locations, Other Retail and Commercial/ Leisure Centres or out-of-centre locations" after "retail development". This makes it more difficult to refuse planning consent for a large retail store in such locations. There are good reasons for rejecting some such applications so this should be left more open and less restrictive.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2355** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1059**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The insertion of a new paragraph, at the end of the Clyde Waterfront section, immediately after action point (blue text) relating to the redevelopment of the Southern General Hospital. Hillhead CC have concerns about the implications for access through the Clyde Tunnel of further development in association with the Southern General.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2347** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1164**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **1168**

Objects To:	<p>The proposed amendment to paragraph 7.57 by inserting new sentence at end of paragraph, to read: "Applications for purpose built student accommodation are encouraged, particularly on appropriate sites, in areas close to the city's colleges and universities." There are several problems with this proposed amendment: any further such accommodation within Hillhead, Woodlands or areas of Partick (e.g. Beith Street) would add to problems of sustainability and add to the adverse changes to transport, shops, schools and other essential infrastructure which supports families and a settled population. The load should be spread.</p> <p>The quality and type of accommodation is also an issue which is relevant to supply. Cluster flats of the type promoted by Glasgow University (GU) are a more modern, more popular and acceptable form of such provision, without student leisure centres or discos or so-called unions, or licensed premises. Proper supervisory and support systems and accommodation, such as is provided by purpose built accommodation for Glasgow University 24 hours a day, are essential characteristics of any purpose built student accommodation. Mention should be made of this also, otherwise we are of the view that this provision will add to existing problems.</p> <p>In the view of GU accommodation officer there may be an over-supply of accommodation such as that generally proposed by other providers and for the Beith Street site.</p> <p>The text 'close to' should be removed from the proposed amendment.</p>
--------------------	--

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2360** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1243**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To:	<p>Proposed amendments to paragraph 6.58 and policies DEV 1 and TRANS 2 in relation to the density at which sites on nodes and corridors on the public transport network achieving high accessibility should be developed at. There are concerns regarding this in relation to stressed points on the network.</p>
--------------------	--

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2358** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1272**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To:	<p>The addition of text to policy DES 3 relating to the demolition of listed buildings. An option for marketing must be considered and this should be added to the text.</p>
--------------------	--

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2348** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1659**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To:	<p>The extension of the Dumbarton Road/Byres Road Town Centre to Glasgow Harbour: a case can be made for there being a town centre at Glasgow Harbour, but there will be intervening land between this and Partick which should remain free of town centre developments. It could also have a negative impact in terms of additional traffic in Byres Road.</p>
--------------------	---

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2356** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1668**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The insertion of new paragraphs, after paragraph 2.17 and 7.16 relating to Glasgow's Economic Development Strategy, referring to the importance of the metropolitan core/ Corridor of Growth and the need to ensure its continued successful transition towards a more knowledge based economy and indicating that this area, which includes the City Centre/Clyde Waterfront and West End, contains Glasgow's highest value services and is a vital location for priority industries, including financial services, digital media and tourism. Hillhead CC have some objections to industry being located in the West End where not previously existing and to financial services under some conditions, e.g. offices in residential property.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2361** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1748**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: Proposed amendments to policy RES 1, in relation to the densities at which housing may be developed in particular parts of the City, as a result of Hillhead CCs objections to increased density and pressures on certain transport nodes.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

194

John Paton

Turley Associates

Agent?

New Representation Number: **2352**

Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1426**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To:

The Council's revised approach in Policy DES 11 to tall buildings is commended, and follows good practice which has been used by developers in justifying such developments. Nevertheless, one line in the policy is considered to be vague and open to wide interpretation, which is: "Tall buildings are unlikely to be suitable built forms within areas of sensitive urban character". There are areas in the city centre where tall buildings have been approved which could be considered to have "sensitive urban character" such as Custom House Quay and the Central Conservation Area.

Commentator's Suggested Changes? *Revise the new policy DES 11: Tall Buildings by deleting the final sentence of the section of the policy headed 'Location' and replacing it with: "In areas of sensitive urban character, tall building proposals will require to prove that they do not detract from the characteristics that give these areas their quality and sensitivity."*

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

228

Robertson & McIntosh

Agent?

Bryce Associates

New Representation Number: **2351**

Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1748**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To:

Revisions to policy RES 1 which mean that it is a static policy which does not facilitate changes in accessibility and frustrates the ability of transport systems to take account of opportunities to increase services within their capacity by the unnecessary constriction of development opportunity. There is a further consideration in support of higher density development in the Dawsholm area to assist the public transport services, particularly the new rail station. The relatively recent low density development to the south and east of the railway line along Skaethorn Road was constructed prior to the opening of the railway link and new station. It may be reasonable to conjoin and average the densities of the Skaethorn Road sites to the south and the Robertson & McIntosh site to the north of the railway. This would facilitate a higher density on the Robertson & McIntosh site.

Commentator's Suggested Changes? *Amend the third bullet point of Part A of the amended policy RES 1, under the heading General Standards, by deleting the text "within High Accessibility Outer Urban Areas".*

*Insert new bullet point between second and third bullet points of Part B of the amended policy RES 1, under the heading General Standards, to read:
"Proposals above the higher end of the range may be acceptable in high accessibility locations and/or frontage of public transport routes/appropriate adjoining blocks/key gateways/nodal points if clearly justified in terms of design quality and the general principles of this policy."*

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

246

Buchanan Partnership

Agent?

GVA Grimley

New Representation Number: **2413** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed Tall Buildings policy (DES 11) on the basis that it identifies a number of potential appropriate locations for tall buildings, but this needs to be supported by clear evidence of why these areas have been chosen.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2419** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that a plan showing search/location areas is not included.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2418** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that it refers to sustainable areas, but judgements are required in relation to density, and the height of existing buildings, and this requires greater clarity and justification.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2417** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that it does not include a definition of "sensitive urban character". This requires to be remedied.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2416** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that its definition of "tall buildings" requires clarification, at the very least. The proposed definition requires a number of judgements to be made in relation to the height of the proposed building, surrounding buildings and the effect on the skyline. Clear guidance for what would constitute a tall building is probably hampered by the lack of a clear evidence base supporting the policy and, accordingly, the policy and justification requires reconsideration.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2415** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that the proposed policy makes no reference to the potential that tall buildings can offer towards significant investment in city centres, entirely in accordance with the general principles of securing sustainable economic development within Glasgow, and contributing to National Planning Policy objectives.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2414** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed Tall Buildings policy (DES 11) on the basis that the policy justification for the proposed policy makes very definite statements about potential impact on the cityscape, but there does not appear to be any clear evidence base relied upon.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2412** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed Tall Buildings policy (DES 11) on the basis that it indicates particular areas where tall buildings are likely to be more acceptable - City Centre Western and Northern Fringes, the International Financial Services District and selected parts of the river frontage (from Clyde Gateway to Clyde Tunnel). Clarification is sought on the boundaries of the City Centre Western and Northern Fringes as, at present, they are not defined in the Plan.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2425** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that there is no clear land use justification for requiring developers to contribute to existing public realm, as this simply has the effect of a local tax.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2421** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the National Planning Policy basis for open space requirements is set out in SPP 11. The policy justification also refers to draft SPP 11, which is not appropriate. The use of developer contributions is further governed by the Scottish Government policy guidance set out in Circular 12/1996 (Planning Agreements). The policy justification should clearly be cross-referenced to national policy and guidance.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2422** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the requirement for public realm is being presented as aligned with open space requirements, but this is not clearly supported within SPP 11. If SPP 11 (paragraph 2) and PAN 65 are considered, these do not clearly justify a City Plan definition of public realm that would appear to encompass all public thoroughfares and spaces within the City.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2423** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that national policy requires a policy justification based on clear evidence i.e. an up-to-date open space audit. The supporting text clearly states that this has not been carried out, and accordingly there is currently no clear justification for the policies as drafted.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2424** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that Circular 12/96 requires developer contributions to be clearly related to civic land use proposals, and proportionate in scale. The thresholds applied under Policy ENV 2 have been taken from Draft SPP 11, and not the final version. Accordingly, there needs to be a clear justification for the thresholds proposed, and an explanation of why this applies to the City Plan definition of public realm, as opposed to the definitions used in SPP 11.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2420** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that they do not comply with National Planning Policy. There is no clear evidence base, there is a lack of clear justification based on land use planning objectives and the proposed costs for developer contributions would have a significant effect on development viability.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2411** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **742**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **504, 597, 741, 1078**

Objects To: The amended policy ENV 15 in respect of the timing of applying this policy to proposals. The construction methodology for the Buchanan Galleries extension is already well advanced and, as such, this policy should be amended to reflect proposals that have been under consideration for some time.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2426** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To: The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that there is reference to the public realm definitions and standards set out in draft SPP 11. This is not the up-to-date national policy basis. SPP 11 (as finalised) requires an up-to-date open space audit, that has not been carried out for the purpose of the Plan. Accordingly, there is no clear evidence base for the development guide set out.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2427** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To: The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the worked examples provided for potential financial contributions demonstrate a potentially significant cost on new development, using the proposed historic cost allocations. There needs to be much clearer information and justification provided on how these historic costs have been established, and clarification that these have been properly applied to genuine public (civic) realm.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2410** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **1832**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The proposed change in the status of Glasgow Harbour, as identified in Schedule SC (ii) of policy SC 4, from edge of/out of centre to edge of centre. The justification provided [the regeneration of Glasgow Harbour is of national significance and will complement the existing town centre and that the existing town centre buildings do not lend themselves to large floorplates] have no relevance in considering the site's location in sequential terms. The SPP 8 definition of edge of centre is that it should be interpreted as adjacent to the boundary of the town centre. The proposed boundary for the Glasgow Harbour site is not adjacent to Partick Town Centre, access from the town centre to the site is not straightforward and the site is not within comfortable walking distance. The site is an out of centre location and the Plan should be amended to reflect this.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

254

Councillor David Meikle

Agent?

New Representation Number: **2339**

Representation Number of Change Objected to: **2331**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The removal of the corridor of Wildlife and/or Landscape Importance designation from the railway embankment between Darnley Street and the railway, and between Albert Drive and Maxwell Road.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

255

HBG Developments

Agent?

GVA Grimley

New Representation Number: **2367** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that it refers to sustainable areas, but judgements are required in relation to density, and the height of existing buildings, and this requires greater clarity and justification.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2368** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that, notwithstanding the lack of a clear evidence base, specific potential search/location areas for tall buildings are identified. Without a clear evidence base, there is no clear justification for these areas being identified. Furthermore, there is no accompanying plan to show where these specific areas are delineated.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2366** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that it does not include a definition of "sensitive urban character". This requires to be remedied.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2365** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that its definition of "tall buildings" requires clarification, at the very least. The proposed definition requires a number of judgements to be made in relation to the height of the proposed building, surrounding buildings and the effect on the skyline. Clear guidance for what would constitute a tall building is probably hampered by the lack of a clear evidence base supporting the policy and, accordingly, the policy and justification requires reconsideration.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2364** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that the proposed policy identifies a number of potential appropriate search areas/locations, but without any clear evidence of why these areas have been chosen.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2363** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that the proposed policy makes a number of definitive but essentially unsubstantiated statements about potential impact on the cityscape, but there is no reference to the clear evidence base relied on.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2362** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that the proposed policy makes no reference to the potential that tall buildings can offer towards significant investment in city centres, entirely in accordance with the general principles of securing sustainable economic development within Glasgow, and contributing to National Planning Policy objectives.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2370** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the National Planning Policy basis for open space requirements is set out in SPP 11. The policy justification also refers to draft SPP 11, which is not appropriate. The use of developer contributions is further governed by the Scottish Government planning policy guidance set out in Circular 12/1996 (Planning Agreements). The supporting policy justification should clearly cross-reference national policy and guidance, which it currently does not.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2378** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the requirement for developers to provide or contribute to public realm needs to be clearly justified in relation to scale and limited to new provision; retrospective financial contributions cannot reasonably be required.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2374** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that there is no clear land use planning justification for requiring developers to contribute to existing public realm, as this simply has the effect of a supplementary local tax.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2373** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that Circular 12/96 requires developer contributions to be clearly related to specific land use proposals, and proportionate in scale. The proposed thresholds applied under Policy ENV 2 appear to have been taken from the Consultation Draft of SPP 11, and not the approved version. Accordingly, there needs to be a clear, specific justification for the thresholds proposed, and an explanation of why this properly applies to the City Plan definition of public realm, as opposed to the definitions used in SPP 11.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2372** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the national policy requires a policy justification for open space provision/contributions which is based on clear evidence i.e. an up-to-date open space audit. The supporting text clearly states that this has not been carried out, and accordingly there is currently no clear justification for the policies as drafted.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2371** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the requirement for public realm provision and/or equivalent financial contributions is being presented as fairly and reasonably aligned with general open space requirements, but this is not clearly supported within SPP 11. If SPP 11 (paragraph 2) and PAN 65 are considered, these do not clearly support the proposed City Plan definition of public realm which would appear to encompass all public thoroughfares and spaces within the City.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2369** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that they do not comply with National Planning Policy on open space and developer contributions. There is no clear evidence base to support the proposed policy, and there is no clear linkage to sound land use planning objectives. The proposed costs for developer contributions would have a significant effect on development viability, and the proposed costs are not clearly explained and justified.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2377** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To: The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the legal and administrative costs should be borne by the City Council and reference to a requirement for developers to pay for this should be deleted from the proposed policy.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2376** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To: The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the worked examples provided for potential financial contributions demonstrate a potentially significant cost on new development, using the proposed historic cost allocations. There needs to be much clearer information and justification provided on where these historic costs have been taken from, and clarification that these have been properly applied to genuine public (civic) realm as set out in SPP 11/PAN 65, as opposed to general environmental improvements to the city centre, that may require to be properly funded by the City Council (through central grant/council tax).

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2375** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To:	The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that there is reference to the public realm definitions and standards set out in draft SPP 11. This is not the up-to-date national policy basis. SPP 11 (as finalised) requires an up-to-date open space audit, that has not been carried out. Accordingly, there is no clear evidence base for the development guide set out.
--------------------	--

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

256

Duddingston House Properties

Agent?

GVA Grimley

New Representation Number: **2385** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that, notwithstanding the lack of a clear evidence base, specific potential search/location areas for tall buildings are identified. Without a clear evidence base, there is no clear justification for these areas being identified. Furthermore, there is no accompanying plan to show where these specific areas are delineated.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2380** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that the proposed policy makes a number of definitive but essentially unsubstantiated statements about potential impact on the cityscape, but there is no reference to the clear evidence base relied on.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2381** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that the proposed policy identifies a number of potential appropriate search areas/locations, but without any clear evidence of why these areas have been chosen.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2382** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that its definition of "tall buildings" requires clarification, at the very least. The proposed definition requires a number of judgements to be made in relation to the height of the proposed building, surrounding buildings and the effect on the skyline. Clear guidance for what would constitute a tall building is probably hampered by the lack of a clear evidence base supporting the policy and, accordingly, the policy and justification requires reconsideration.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2383** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that it does not include a definition of "sensitive urban character". This requires to be remedied.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2384** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that it refers to sustainable areas, but judgements are required in relation to density, and the height of existing buildings, and this requires greater clarity and justification.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2379** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **116**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **117, 326, 357, 526, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430,**

Objects To: The proposed policy DES 11: Tall Buildings on the basis that the proposed policy makes no reference to the potential that tall buildings can offer towards significant investment in city centres, entirely in accordance with the general principles of securing sustainable economic development within Glasgow, and contributing to National Planning Policy objectives.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2395** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the requirement for developers to provide or contribute to public realm needs to be clearly justified in relation to scale and limited to new provision; retrospective financial contributions cannot reasonably be required.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2386** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that they do not comply with National Planning Policy on open space and developer contributions. There is no clear evidence base to support the proposed policy, and there is no clear linkage to sound land use planning objectives. The proposed costs for developer contributions would have a significant effect on development viability, and the proposed costs are not clearly explained and justified.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2387** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the National Planning Policy basis for open space requirements is set out in SPP 11. The policy justification also refers to draft SPP 11, which is not appropriate. The use of developer contributions is further governed by the Scottish Government planning policy guidance set out in Circular 12/1996 (Planning Agreements). The supporting policy justification should clearly cross-reference national policy and guidance, which it currently does not.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2388** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the requirement for public realm provision and/or equivalent financial contributions is being presented as fairly and reasonably aligned with general open space requirements, but this is not clearly supported within SPP 11. If SPP 11 (paragraph 2) and PAN 65 are considered, these do not clearly support the proposed City Plan definition of public realm which would appear to encompass all public thoroughfares and spaces within the City.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2389** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the national policy requires a policy justification for open space provision/contributions which is based on clear evidence i.e. an up-to-date open space audit. The supporting text clearly states that this has not been carried out, and accordingly there is currently no clear justification for the policies as drafted.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2390** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that Circular 12/96 requires developer contributions to be clearly related to specific land use proposals, and proportionate in scale. The proposed thresholds applied under Policy ENV 2 appear to have been taken from the Consultation Draft of SPP 11, and not the approved version. Accordingly, there needs to be a clear, specific justification for the thresholds proposed, and an explanation of why this properly applies to the City Plan definition of public realm, as opposed to the definitions used in SPP 11.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2391** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that there is no clear land use planning justification for requiring developers to contribute to existing public realm, as this simply has the effect of a supplementary local tax.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2393** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To: The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the worked examples provided for potential financial contributions demonstrate a potentially significant cost on new development, using the proposed historic cost allocations. There needs to be much clearer information and justification provided on where these historic costs have been taken from, and clarification that these have been properly applied to genuine public (civic) realm as set out in SPP 11/PAN 65, as opposed to general environmental improvements to the city centre, that may require to be properly funded by the City Council (through central grant/council tax).

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2392** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To: The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that there is reference to the public realm definitions and standards set out in draft SPP 11. This is not the up-to-date national policy basis. SPP 11 (as finalised) requires an up-to-date open space audit, that has not been carried out. Accordingly, there is no clear evidence base for the development guide set out.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2394** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To:	The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the legal and administrative costs should be borne by the City Council and reference to a requirement for developers to pay for this should be deleted from the proposed policy.
--------------------	---

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

257

Kenmore Investments

Agent?

GVA Grimley

New Representation Number: **2396** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that they do not comply with National Planning Policy on open space and developer contributions. There is no clear evidence base to support the proposed policy, and there is no clear linkage to sound land use planning objectives. The proposed costs for developer contributions would have a significant effect on development viability, and the proposed costs are not clearly explained and justified.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2397** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the National Planning Policy basis for open space requirements is set out in SPP 11. The policy justification also refers to draft SPP 11, which is not appropriate. The use of developer contributions is further governed by the Scottish Government planning policy guidance set out in Circular 12/1996 (Planning Agreements). The supporting policy justification should clearly cross-reference national policy and guidance, which it currently does not.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2398** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the requirement for public realm provision and/or equivalent financial contributions is being presented as fairly and reasonably aligned with general open space requirements, but this is not clearly supported within SPP 11. If SPP 11 (paragraph 2) and PAN 65 are considered, these do not clearly support the proposed City Plan definition of public realm which would appear to encompass all public thoroughfares and spaces within the City.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2399** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**
Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the national policy requires a policy justification for open space provision/contributions which is based on clear evidence i.e. an up-to-date open space audit. The supporting text clearly states that this has not been carried out, and accordingly there is currently no clear justification for the policies as drafted.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2400** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that Circular 12/96 requires developer contributions to be clearly related to specific land use proposals, and proportionate in scale. The proposed thresholds applied under Policy ENV 2 appear to have been taken from the Consultation Draft of SPP 11, and not the approved version. Accordingly, there needs to be a clear, specific justification for the thresholds proposed, and an explanation of why this properly applies to the City Plan definition of public realm, as opposed to the definitions used in SPP 11.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2401** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that there is no clear land use planning justification for requiring developers to contribute to existing public realm, as this simply has the effect of a supplementary local tax.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2405** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **400**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **489, 560, 1031, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1619, 2107, 159**

Objects To: The proposed revised policy ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision and development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the requirement for developers to provide or contribute to public realm needs to be clearly justified in relation to scale and limited to new provision; retrospective financial contributions cannot reasonably be required.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2402** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To: The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that there is reference to the public realm definitions and standards set out in draft SPP 11. This is not the up-to-date national policy basis. SPP 11 (as finalised) requires an up-to-date open space audit, that has not been carried out. Accordingly, there is no clear evidence base for the development guide set out.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2403** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To: The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the worked examples provided for potential financial contributions demonstrate a potentially significant cost on new development, using the proposed historic cost allocations. There needs to be much clearer information and justification provided on where these historic costs have been taken from, and clarification that these have been properly applied to genuine public (civic) realm as set out in SPP 11/PAN 65, as opposed to general environmental improvements to the city centre, that may require to be properly funded by the City Council (through central grant/council tax).

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

New Representation Number: **2404** Representation Number of Change Objected to: **785**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to: **178, 1369, 1598, 1599**

Objects To:	The proposed revised development guide DG/ENV 2: Open Space and Public Realm Provision on the basis that the legal and administrative costs should be borne by the City Council and reference to a requirement for developers to pay for this should be deleted from the proposed policy.
--------------------	---

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

NEW OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

258

Miller Homes (Glasgow Zoo/Broomhouse)

Agent?

Turley Associates

New Representation Number: **2430**

Representation Number of Change Objected to: **2330**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The new designation of Local Site of Importance for Nature Conservation as extended over the pond and surrounding area in the former zoo site and to its east. Environmental examination of this area has been undertaken by Envirocentre as part of the project team of the CGA masterplan process and the findings have been considered as part of the development strategy for the area. No technical environmental evidence has been provided by the Council (or indeed in the assessment by Envirocentre) as to why this should now be included as an L-SINC. The designation of an L-SINC at this location may also frustrate potential regeneration strategies for this area. The masterplan team is investigating the potential to clean up this dilapidated pond (a victim of fly-tipping in recent years) and re-landscape part of its banking so that it can be used as both an amenity feature and for SUDS provision. This should be addressed through the CGA masterplan process.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2428**

Representation Number of Change Objected to: **2330**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The inclusion of a spur from the River Calder, near Calder Bank House, in the 'Green Corridor' (formerly Corridor of Wildlife and/or Landscape Importance). Although this area was designated within City Plan 1, a planning consent has since been granted for the first phase of Miller Homes' development at the former zoo site. The Green Corridor lies over a small area of land already consented for housing, therefore the designation is not reflective of the current situation. This should be addressed through the CGA masterplan process.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?

New Representation Number: **2429**

Representation Number of Change Objected to: **2330**

Additional Representation Numbers Objected to:

Objects To: The identification of a spur from the River Calder, near Calder Bank House, as a City-wide Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. This area is already designated as Ancient Woodland and the two additional allocations of Green Corridor and C-SINC, on top of a blanket TPO, are unnecessary and unjustified. It also restricts the ability of the CGA masterplan to propose required infrastructure to facilitate the development of the zoo site and may impact on the ability for the CGA to provide a north-south link road being sought by the Council to improve transport accessibility for the entire CGA. This should be addressed through the CGA masterplan process.

Commentator's
Suggested Changes?