



Planning and Building Standards Services

South Lanarkshire Local development plan 2

Proposed plan
MIR consultation responses

July 2018



Community and Enterprise Resources



Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Rebecca Hay	1		4.46	Supports the proposed extension of Langlands Moss. This area is a wildlife haven and a wonderful asset for the community. It should be protected from being disturbed and should be nurtured by the council.	Support for extension to Langlands Moss noted.
Jim Thomson	2		4.7	Objects to the proposed residential developments at East Overton and Glassford Road Strathaven. In particular because of traffic issues this is likely to cause.	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
Michael Philip	3		4.34	Supports the development of further Local Nature Reserves.	Support for development of Local Nature Reserves is noted.
Michael Philip	4		4.36	Supports the identification of Cadzow Glen as an exemplary LNR	Support for Cadzow Glen is noted.
Catherine Pendreigh	5	Woodland Trust	4.3	The current wording of the preferred option in regards to balancing the economic benefit of mineral development against environmental impact suggests that if the economic benefit were great enough environmental detriment could be overlooked. We strongly disagree with this position. The preferred option does not make any mention of ensuring land for forestry and woodland creation, this is a significant flaw.	Noted - The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy policy in the proposed plan. These comments will be considered and amendments made if appropriate.
Catherine	6	Woodland Trust	4.4	We believe that alternative option 1 would be	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Pendreigh				the most appropriate option to accord with the Scottish Government's Climate Change objectives.	
Catherine Pendreigh	7	Woodland Trust	4.7	We oppose the following sites proposed on the grounds that they would detrimentally impact ancient woodland: Blairbeth Golf Course, Rutherglen – this proposed site covers an area of ancient woodland 1b LEPO (Long Established Plantation Origin) in Cathkin Braes Park.	The proposals for Blairbeth include a small element of residential but the majority of the site is to be retained as greenspace and enhanced as parkland/greenspace.
Catherine Pendreigh	8	Woodland Trust	4.12	We strongly oppose to the proposal for further development at Kaimend. The proposed development boundary includes an area of ancient woodland 2b LEPO (Long Established Plantation Origin). Therefore development within this boundary is completely inappropriate	The small area defined as ancient woodland 2b LEPO (Long Established Plantation Origin) which falls within the proposed settlement boundary of Kaimend is already predominately occupied by houses and garden ground. The proposal in the MIR is to define Kaimend as a settlement by drawing a settlement boundary. This does not involve new development and there is therefore no loss of ancient woodland associated with this proposal. Alternatively the proposed boundary can be amended to exclude this land. The Council will assess which option would be most appropriate.
Catherine Pendreigh	9	Woodland Trust	4.33	Agree that policy 15 should be changed to make provision for future identification of Local Nature Conservation Sites.	Support noted
Catherine Pendreigh	10	Woodland Trust	4.36	Yes we agree that all of these sites should be designated Local Nature Reserves.	Support noted
Ian Barr	11		4.31	Objects to the extension of East Overton as a proposed housing development. Reasons given include parking, traffic congestion and noise and disturbance.	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
D.W. Leggat	12		4.31	Objects to the non inclusion of a site at Broomelton Farm Larkhall as a proposed housing release in the MIR	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Catherine Pendreigh	14	Woodland Trust	4.13	Opposed to Development Framework Site at Hamilton International Technology Park, and would recommend 50m buffer zone around ancient woodland if it goes ahead.	Comments relating to the proposals at HITP have been passed to the relevant development management team for consideration as this is now outwith the development plans provision - an application has already been approved for the site.
Emilie Wadsworth	15	Central Scotland Green Network Trust	4.33	CSGNT strongly supports the creation of LNCS in South Lanarkshire, and agrees with the proposal to amend the policy to include provision for LN	Support noted
Emilie Wadsworth	16	Central Scotland Green Network Trust	4.35	CSGNT strongly supports the designation of LNRs, bringing the area into line with other CSGN Local Authorities.	Support noted
Emilie Wadsworth	17	Central Scotland Green Network Trust	4.36	CSGNT supports the suggested LNR sites. In reality, it will take many years to designate all the sites as LNRs, and we suggest that the list is ranked, to enable the most important sites to be designated first. The others sites should be considered as LNCS's in order to protect them whilst the LNR designation process is progressed.	Noted. We are prioritising the potential LNR sites as we move towards designations. It is likely that LNCS designation will be occurring along the same timetable, so it may not be possible to consider potential LNRs as LNCS but we will keep this in mind as an option.
Gillian Robertson	18		4.37	Supports the designation of LNRs particularly Neilsland and Earnock. Has questioned why the area is not joined by the 'black path'.	Noted, we will consider the proposed boundary expansion.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Ian Dixon	19		4.31	Objects to inclusion of EK10/002 on grounds of over supply of housing land and impact on local road network, services and environment.	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
Neil MacDonald	20	Network Rail	3.1	The MIR and LDP should recognise that by directing growth towards public transport corridors, without the provision of additional capacity or where required, improved facilities, the network will become constrained and will not be able to provide increased service. The MIR should look to follow the Developer Contribution pooling approach, being advocated and endorsed through both SDPs and LDPs. Network Rail should be clearly excluded from having to make developer contributions as a publicly owned company.	Noted. This comment has been passed to our Roads and Transportation Service.
Neil MacDonald	21	Network Rail	4.38	LDP site assessments must take cognisance of the impact of development proposals affecting level crossings. Transport assessment and developer contributions policy and supplementary guidance must ensure infrastructure risks are identified and mitigation secured i.e. level crossing upgrades; alternative crossings etc.	This is a matter for the Local Transport Strategy. However, it should be noted that there are only two level crossings in SL and it is not proposed that new development will occur in the proximity of these facilities.
Neil MacDonald	22	Network Rail	4.38	Request that the MIR provides a strategic context for LDP's to provide a designated	This comment relates to the strategic development plan rather than the MIR for a local development plan.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				notification zone around all operational railway infrastructure within which any development application proposals would be notified to Network Rail. This strategy would be similar to that associated with the oil and gas pipelines which run through the SDP area.	
Neil MacDonald	23	Network Rail	4.38	Support the general requirement for developer contributions for infrastructure provision, but request that the LDP provides a specific policy requiring developer contributions to be grouped and pooled across sites as an Infrastructure Levy for qualitative improvements towards rail infrastructure and/or station capacity facilities and level crossings where required as a direct consequence or generated requirement from a proposed development.	This will be considered when the policy on Developer Contributions is refreshed.
Neil MacDonald	24	Network Rail	4.38	It considered appropriate to reserve the areas of land at Symington and Law, for future rail development however the WCML is extremely busy and is nearing capacity. Providing additional stops is likely to be quite challenging from a timetable perspective.	As specified in the MIR this is being considered through a STAG assessment and if available the outcome will be reflected in the proposed plan.
Neil MacDonald	25	Network Rail	4.38	Noted that the existing Park and Ride facilities at both East Kilbride and Hairmyres Stations are at capacity and discussions with SLC on improvements have taken place.	Noted. If there are any land use implications this will be reflected in the proposed plan.
Neil MacDonald	26	Network Rail	4.38	The interchange between car and rail is very limited in Cambuslang which results in significant on-street parking. A Park and Ride facility is required to service Cambuslang. Any further development will	The Council are aware of this issue and are endeavouring to find a solution by providing further park and ride facilities.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				require consideration to be given to contributions for construction of new infrastructure.	
Neil MacDonald	27	Network Rail	4.38	Blantyre/Bothwell/Uddingston. Interchange between car and rail is at capacity in Uddingston resulting in on-street parking. An extension to the existing Park and Ride facility is required. Any further development will require consideration to be given to contributions for construction of new infrastructure.	The Council are aware of this issue and are endeavouring to find a solution by providing further park and ride facilities.
Neil MacDonald	28	Network Rail	4.38	Route Study Choice for Funders: Carstairs Area Enhancement. To enhance gauge to W12 between Carstairs and Grangemouth has now been expanded to encompass the G&SW line and the West Coast Main Line south to Carlisle.	Noted. This is a matter for the Local Transport Strategy.
Neil MacDonald	29	Network Rail	4.38	Route Study Choice for Funders: W12 Gauge Enhancements from West Coast Main Line to Grangemouth. To enhance gauge to W12 route from the border through Carstairs to Grangemouth. This offers the opportunity for more freight operations between ECML and WCML terminals at Mossend, Coatbridge and Grangemouth, and enables operators to better meet freight demand while minimising the requirement to increase the frequency or length of freight services to carry the equivalent volume of goods.	Noted
Neil MacDonald	30	Network Rail	4.38	Route Study Choices for Funders: High Speed Enabling Projects is to provide funding to undertake development work to	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				determine how High Speed 2 (HS2) and High Speed Rail Scotland (HSRS) can be efficiently integrated into the existing rail network in Scotland.	
Simon Cook	31		2.15	Regarding consultation with SEPA and Scottish Water with respect to the proposed expansion of houses in the Strathaven area : Sewage treatment works for Strathaven is that it is running to "near" capacity. If this is the case what provision is being made to deal with the sewage generated from the proposed new houses?	The Council has sought comments from both SEPA and Scottish Water on the capacity of their systems as part of the Call for Sites process. If any sites were to come forward the capacity of the systems would be considered in detail and any issues raised with a prospective developer. Development would not be able to proceed if infrastructure capacities were not adequate.
Simon Cook	32		4.3	The spatial strategy does form a sound basis on which to prepare the policies and proposals however the balance between sustainable economic development and environmental issues are in some cases very badly out of proportion. In particular the proposed new housing in Strathaven does not take account of impacts on traffic and infrastructure.	Comments noted – any new development sites require to meet a number of service standards and must be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
Simon Cook	33		4.4	As an alternative to releasing greenfield land for housing in smaller communities the spatial strategy could promote redevelopment of "tired" areas of East Kilbride. This generates none of the environmental issues that new development of the smaller rural communities would.	The LDP strategy contains a strong commitment to supporting urban regeneration and brownfield sites are given a high priority for redevelopment for appropriate uses including housing. To ensure flexibility of supply, there is a need to provide a range of sites in terms of size, location and tenure across the Council area, this can require small scale development in smaller rural communities.
Simon Cook	34		4.7	Both Strathaven developments can only be approved as long as improvements to the local infrastructure, i.e. roads, sewage treatment works, public transportation and provision of local amenities (school rolls to	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				be looked at for example) get addressed first.	has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
Simon Cook	35		4.47	The Minerals Local Development Plan should remain as a separate document and dealt with on its own. It is too important/contentious to be included as part of another document.	Comments noted however as outlined in the MIR with the demise of the Scottish coal industry there is no longer a requirement to produce a separate minerals plan. The current Development Plan system encourages the use of focused development plans alongside more detailed guidance. Production of two separate development plan would put undue pressure on resources and may result in targets for production of updated plans not being met.
Brian Fotheringham	36	SEPA	3.4	Acknowledge that the DFS site at Craighead is now being promoted solely as a residential development. Highlight the proximity of the site to the adjacent road network and to the site of a proposed EfW facility (off Whistleberry Road). The designation of the whole site as residential may have implications for the developers of both the residential and the industrial site, in terms of the potential air quality/human health impacts.	Noted. The impacts on any potential residential development will be assessed alongside detailed planning application for these developments.
Brian Fotheringham	37	SEPA	Table 4.1	Generally supportive of this approach, however offering advice/comments on additional wording that may be required for specific policies to reflect the changes in SG Policies & Guidance (e.g. Flood risk/ District heating and SEPA policies (e.g. 2nd set of river basin plans).	Noted – alternative/additional wording will be incorporated into the proposed plan as required.
Brian	38	SEPA	4.2	Supportive of the approach we would	Noted this will be addressed at proposed plan and review

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Fotheringham				however emphasise that the spatial strategy requires to be more aware of the potential impacts that climate change may have on the developable capabilities of sites as current evidence appears to show increased frequency of storms and flooding, which may cause changes to site design. In addition there is a drive from SG for heat mapping and district heating systems for major developments and this requirement may also start to influence the aims of the spatial strategy	of policies.
Brian Fotheringham	39	SEPA	4.3	Supportive of the 'Preferred option - Spatial Strategy', its aims and how it seeks to balance the key consideration of delivering sustainable economic growth without it being the cause of significant environmental impacts. The monitoring of the policies appear to show that overall this strategy is working well and the need to undertake some modifications as well as inclusion of some emerging policy areas it should continue into LDP2.	Support noted. Modifications will be undertaken when proposed plan is prepared.
Brian Fotheringham	40	SEPA	4.4	SEPA is not supportive of the preferred alternative policy which we think would have a detrimental impact on our interests and the wider environment.	Noted
Brian Fotheringham	41	SEPA	4.5	No issues in principle to the DFS sites provided that the developable footprint is subject to the potential new development requirements as detailed in Technical Appendix 2, however we would expect that all of these sites should be required to prepare Feasibility Statements or	Noted – we will add this requirement to the list of sites in Appendix 2

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Energy Statements within the list of relevant documentation submitted by the developers. Development plans to require all substantial developments (urban expansions, large regeneration or masterplans etc) to meet their heat demand through a district heating system.	
Brian Fotheringham	42	SEPA	4.8	The preferred approach is favoured by SEPA as it establishes from the start what is being proposed at the site, what the constraints are and what information is required to deliver the site and resources are therefore not directed to considering sites that for a variety of reasons may not prove to be sustainable.	Noted
Brian Fotheringham	43	SEPA	4.13	SEPA's interests are not significantly compromised by the settlement boundary changes and our focus would be to sure that the infrastructure for the settlements has the capacity to deal with the extra development opportunities the boundary changes may offer.	Noted – SEPA will be consulted on any sites that are brought forward through the local development plan process.
Brian Fotheringham	44	SEPA	4.14	It is unlikely the preferred option for employment land will prejudice our interests.	Noted.
Brian Fotheringham	46	SEPA	4.17	Changes to neighbourhood centre boundaries not deemed to be of any significant impact on SEPA's interests	Noted
Brian Fotheringham	47	SEPA	4.31	Supportive of the preferred approach and the additional proposed housing sites as detailed in Q.13, however as stated previously for all larger sites subject to the Stage 2 assessment process expect a	Noted – this will be added to the list of requirements for Development Framework/Masterplan sites and as part of the Stage 2 requirements

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				requirement for a Feasibility or an Energy Statement to be undertaken as part of the supporting documentation.	
Brian Fotheringham	48	SEPA	4.37	SEPA is in principle supportive of plans to create more Local Nature Reserves however we have no specific comments to add on the individual sites that are being selected.	Support noted
Brian Fotheringham	49	SEPA	4.40	With regard to reserving sites at Law and Symington for potential stations, any measures that may reduce road transport which have the potential to bring about associated benefits to human health and the environment are supported.	Noted
Brian Fotheringham	50	SEPA	Figure 4.1	SEPA have no issues with preferred option and the revised policy of wording as it relates to the spatial strategy for windfarms.	Support noted
Brian Fotheringham	51	SEPA	4.47	Agree with policy approach to unconventional hydrocarbons	Support noted
Brian Fotheringham	52	SEPA	4.45	Agree with this approach, however the number of factors used to determine if a site is unsuitable should include carbon rich soils, deep peat and priority peatland and also any water assets identified in Clyde river basin management plan.	Noted. Criteria will be expanded upon within policy.
Brian Fotheringham	53	SEPA	4.44	No issue with the preferred approach to minerals development in South Lanarkshire,	Noted
Brian Fotheringham	54	SEPA	4.48	Not supportive of alternative approach of retaining separate Minerals LDP	Noted
Brian Fotheringham	55	SEPA	4.48	Heat Mapping - We strongly recommend that the proposed policy covering these issues is	Noted. Appropriate policies will be amended and text altered as per this representation.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				amended to include points on working towards the Scottish Government ambitions on low carbon energy and delivering climate change targets. Connected to this, we require development plans to include policy wording which supports low carbon district heating networks. Additionally, recommend that the text which currently references the Council's waste resource management objectives is amended to read: "supporting the Scottish Government's Zero Waste objectives and the Council's waste resource management objectives.	
Adele Clarkson	56		4.46	There should be no gas extraction in South Lanarkshire	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position.
Adele Clarkson	57		4.47	There should be no consideration of extraction of gas / methane in South Lanarkshire	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position.
Marie Maling	58		4.47	Detailed comments on Scottish Water's requirements for protecting drinking water which should be referred to in the LDP Minerals policy	Noted this will be included in the proposed plan and revised policies
Marie Maling	59		Figure 4.1	Detailed comments on Scottish Water's requirements for protecting drinking water which should be referred to in the LDP Renewable Energy policy a	Noted this will be included in the proposed plan and revised policies
Marie Maling	60		4.31	Site EK04/003 and EK04/014– these sites have Scottish Water infrastructure running through them – early engagement with our Asset Impact Team is encouraged to discuss detailed plans for the sites. Philipshill Waste Water treatment Works currently has limited	Noted – these comments have been added to the site assessment process

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				capacity for growth and as such a growth project may be required at this works to accommodate the development. CR02/007 - comments submitted at call for sites stage. All sites should have separate surface water solutions.	
Marie Maling	62		4.14	Balgray Road Lesmahagow – Daer WTW currently has capacity Lesmahagow WwTW currently has limited capacity and as such early engagement with Scottish Water Development Operations team and Trade Effluent Team is vital to ensure proposed use of the site can be accommodated. Should growth be required, Scottish Water are funded to provide growth for the domestic element of the industrial site only. Bouverie Street, Rutherglen – Milngavie WTW and Shieldhall WwTW currently has capacity to accommodate the redevelopment of this site.	Noted
Marie Maling	63		4.5	Scottish Water supports the inclusion of development framework sites and residential Masterplan sites and site specific comments have been provided.	Support noted
Marie Maling	64		2.1	Scottish Water fully supports the Glasgow Region City Deal and the projects within the South Lanarkshire Area that are funded by the City Deal.	Support and comments noted.
Walker Group	65	Walker Group (Scotland) Ltd	Table 2.1	In respect Hallside East, Cambuslang, the Walker Group acknowledges that it will be important to consider how the site would link into the existing allocation. An assessment of the development stand-off requirements	The Council invited the developer to submit Stage 2 documentation outlining how the site could be made effective and be progressed to the next stage in the process. The necessary information was not submitted to the Council and the extension to Hallside East will not be

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				arising from the gas pipeline will be carried out, however, it is not considered that this will have significant implications for the overall development area. The capacity of the existing allocation will remain at 180 units, the pipeline itself has no implications for additional 80 units now included (Hallside East, CR02/007). A Transport Statement will be undertaken for submission as part of the Stage 2 Assessment of this site as will an assessment of schools capacity. The Stage 2 Assessment will also include Service and Infrastructure statements.	promoted in the proposed plan. The original Hallside East site was promoted in a previous local plan and has been on the housing land audit for a number of years.
Walker Group	66	Walker Group (Scotland) Ltd	4.2	Supports the preferred strategy which acknowledges new opportunities and to continue supporting existing development sites, although we would argue that the Plan should seek to ensure more than just an adequate supply of land for housing. Continued support for existing sustainable locations provides certainty and continuity for developers. However, in view of the associated need to ensure that a range of sites in terms of size, location and tenure can be provided across all of the Council's housing market it is appropriate to consider additional sites brought forward through the Call for Sites process.	Support noted, however, the Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in LDP2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
Walker Group	67	Walker Group	4.31	Supports the inclusion of Hallside East,	Support noted. However, the Council invited the developer

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
		(Scotland) Ltd		CR02/007 (80 units) as an option in the MIR. The designation of the site for housing, associated with the existing Hallside East allocation (LP Ref 273, CR2098, 180 units) and the recent Bellway development immediately to the west represents a logical rounding off of the urban area at this location.	to submit Stage 2 documentation outlining how the site could be made effective and be progressed to the next stage in the process. The necessary information was not submitted to the Council and the extension to Hallside East will not be promoted in the proposed plan. The original Hallside East site was promoted in a previous local plan and has been on the housing land audit for a number of years.
Liz Young	68		2.14	Questions what happens to Clyde and Avon Valleys Partnerships once the project finishes.	This is not a matter for the LDP. However although the overarching project is now finished, individual projects in the local area will continue.
Liz Young	69		4.33	Supports the proposed future identification of local nature conservation sites.	Support noted
Liz Young	70		4.35	Supports the proposed designation of Local Nature Reserves.	Support noted
Liz Young	71		4.36	Suggests two additional sites for Local Nature Reserves: the path along the Clyde where the Mashock Burn joins the Clyde and The Clayhole at Carluke.	The Clayhole site is included within the Milton potential LNR. The site at Crossford does not meet our LNR criteria for proximity to centres of large population, but will be assessed as a potential Local Nature Conservation Site
Liz Young	72		4.37	Does not support the alternative option of designating no new local nature reserves	Noted
Liz Young	73		4.47	Supports including a new policy for Mineral Development within the LDP	Support noted
Liz Young	74		4.48	Supports including residential developments within town centres as this will reduce development pressure in rural areas such as Clyde Valley.	Support noted
Virginia Sharp	75		4.49	In relation to access to the New Lanark World Heritage Site, would welcome early	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				consultation on this prior to inclusion in the LTS and Proposed Plan.	
Virginia Sharp	76		4.7	Redevelopment of The University of West of Scotland, Almada Street / Barrack Street, Hamilton site has the potential for impacts on the setting of A listed buildings, content that these could be mitigated through the robust application of national and LDP historic environment policies. Welcome that the proposed development requirements include an obligation for masterplanning of the site to take account of the potential historic environment impacts. Reference to 'Grade A' listed buildings should be amended to 'Category A' listed buildings.	Comments noted - these will be passed to the case officer dealing with the application.
Virginia Sharp	77		4.3	Content with the preferred option for the spatial strategy, and welcome that protection and enhancement of the historic environment is included as a key element of the strategy.	Support noted.
Virginia Sharp	78		2.19	We understand that the majority of proposed sites submitted under the 'Call for Sites' process were rejected as a result of the Stage 1 assessment, and that these are not considered to be reasonable alternatives. We consider that the following proposed development sites have the potential for significant adverse effects on the historic environment: HM11/003; CR02/004; CL28/001; CL38/002	The Council agree with this comment. In addition the four sites listed have been rejected for a variety of reasons including significant adverse effects on the historic environment.
Virginia Sharp	79		2.22	Comments on the SEA Environmental Report	Noted - these will be addressed in SEA response.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Hilary Paton	80		4.37	All these sites should be designated as local nature reserves	Support noted
Hilary Paton	81		4.36	Agrees with proposed designation of Holmhills Park Cambuslang as an LNR. Suggests that boundaries could be extended to include the other woodland which runs along Langlea Road and is bordered by Langlea Grove and Cathkin high school car park on the other side in addition to this there are important wildlife corridors and bird habitat along the side of the school grass playing fields.	Noted, we will consider the proposed boundary expansion.
Hilary Paton	82		4.34	Strongly agree that SLC should designate a number of sites as Local Nature Reserves in order to improve biodiversity and quality opportunities for recreation and education. It is valuable to provide a network of sites near to urban areas to provide contact with nature and outdoor environments.	Support noted
	83	Sava Estates Ltd	2.18	Given the new opportunities for the South Lanarkshire Council area, as a result of the Glasgow City Deal, we are disappointed that the Council only identified 12 out of the 118 sites submitted as being potential additions to the land supply for residential development or industrial development. The MIR reflects the Council's Housing Land Supply target as set out within the proposed Clydeplan 2. However, we draw the Council's attention to the Reporter's recommendations in respect of Clydeplan 2 and in particular the proposed application of a 15% Generosity Margin to all tenures and	The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				subjects. This is not reflected within the MIR and it is disappointing given the quantity of well located and developable sites put forward to the Call for Sites.	mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
	84	Sava Estates Ltd	3.2	In order to promote the continued growth and regeneration across all parts of South Lanarkshire it is disappointing that the Council has not chosen to embrace and allocate additional housing sites across the area. We are therefore concerned that the Council has chosen not to adopt the Reporter's Recommendation of a 15% Generosity Margin here.	See response to No 83
	85	Sava Estates Ltd	4.2	Broadly support the proposed Spatial Strategy of SLLDP2 but we are disappointed that the sites referenced CL38/003 and CL38/004 were not consider to accord with strategy given the location of the sites, within Lanark in close proximity to the centre.	Support noted, See response to No 83
	86	Sava Estates Ltd	4.3	Given what the Reporter Recommended in respect of the proposed Clydeplan 2 a Generosity Margin of 15% against the proposed 10% housing generosity margin set out within the MIR of the South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2, we consider that the Council could have been more generous and allocated additional land for housing within sustainable locations such as Lanark	See response to No 83
	87	Sava Estates Ltd	4.8	Consider that site references CL38/003 and CL38/004 should be considered as viable other options for residential masterplan	See response to No 83

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				sites.	
	88	Sava Estates Ltd	4.20	We would remind the Council of the Reporter's recommendations in respect of Clydeplan 2 and in particular the proposed application of a 15% Generosity Margin for all housing tenures. Such an increase would allow more of the 118 sites brought forward as having potential for residential development to be identified as Proposed Housing Sites.	See response to No 83
	89	Sava Estates Ltd	4.31	The two sites under control of our client are ideal Alternative Housing Sites and we therefore ask that they are considered as such. Request that the settlement boundary for Lanark is changed to incorporate the two parcels of land at Bellefield Road, and also the existing housing at Bellefield Crescent.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The sites have been assessed and do not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
	90	Sava Estates Ltd	4.12	Requests the Council consider changing the settlement boundary in respect of Lanark. The settlement boundary is too tightly drawn around Lanark and given the presence of the New Lanark World Heritage Site and New Lanark World Heritage Site Buffer to the south of Lanark, which is a constraint to any new development to the south, the amending of the Lanark site boundary to include our client's sites - South Lanarkshire Council reference CL38/003 and CL38/004 and the existing recent residential development at Bellefield Crescent, would provide an opportunity for the town to grow and provide a sustainable housing site.	The Council does not consider that a settlement boundary amendment to include these sites is required. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. The sites have been assessed and do not accord with the LDP strategy. A neighbouring site at Bellefield Road Lanark was considered at the Examination of LDP1. This site was rejected by the Reporter on the following grounds: <i>The site is not designated green belt but is currently within a Special Landscape Area, defined in the local development plan glossary as a local designation for quality and value of landscape. The site has a particular value as it is contained within a narrow band of land between the northern boundary of Lanark itself and a large group of relatively new houses. I believe the loss of the site to further development at this location would</i>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					<p><i>have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the vicinity and bring the two areas of housing even closer together.</i></p> <p>The Council considers these arguments equally apply to sites CL38/003 and CL38/004</p>
Neil Martin	91	Homes for Scotland	4.24	<p>Non-Effective Land Supply is dominated by the Community Growth Areas and whilst these will deliver a number of new homes up to 2029, they will also likely continue to be developed beyond 2029. In addition, the Non-Effective Land Supply also includes some large brownfield sites that have so far failed to come forward into development for over 10 years. 3 sites for up to a total of 295 new homes are identified as possible additional sites for inclusion within the local development plan. The emerging plan needs to actually release land for up to 1,500 new homes that is effective of capable of becoming effective up to 2024. Homes for Scotland strongly encourages South Lanarkshire to publish an up to date housing land audit that clearly highlights historic past completions with detailed information and evidence as to where the figures were obtained from and calculated.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position.</p> <p>To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan.</p> <p>All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.</p>
Neil Martin	92	Homes for Scotland	4.21	<p>It is noted that the MIR reflects the Housing Land Supply targets as set out in proposed Clydeplan 2 and therefore includes a private tenure housing Generosity Margin of 10% as also set out within the proposed Clydeplan 2. The Council will be aware of the Reporter's recommendations in respect of Clydeplan 2 and in particular the proposed application of</p>	<p>See response to No 91</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				a 15% Generosity Margin to all tenures. Notwithstanding that the MIR reflects the full 17 year plan period set out within Clydeplan 2, there are some differences between the sub-periods set out within Clydeplan 2. There is a higher annual Housing Supply Target for the first 12 year sub-period for private housing and a subsequently slightly reduced annual Target for the following 5 year sub-period.	
Neil Martin	93	Homes for Scotland	4.4	Any review of a local development plan is an opportunity to embrace change and new opportunities and need not simply be a rolling forward of the current plan's vision and spatial strategy. That said, change for change's sake is in no party's interest and as such an appropriate balance must be struck. . The proposed Vision and Spatial Strategy are adequate statements of intent in their own right but perhaps fail to effectively encompass the potential that will inevitably arise through the City Deal and associated subsequent investments that should also arise.	See response to No 91
Alison Park	94		4.34	Strongly agree with the proposal that South Lanarkshire Council considers designating a number of sites as Local Nature Reserves in order to improve biodiversity and quality opportunities for recreation and education. It is valuable to provide a network of sites near to urban areas to provide contact with nature and healthy environments.	Support noted
Alison	95		1.4	Errors in supporting documents Technical	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Park				Report 1 and Monitoring Statement both relating to sale and development of Priority Greenspace land within Holmhills Park, Cambuslang. This site is not included in the list of deletion of Priority Greenspace areas in Technical Report 1 and Table 6.1 of Monitoring Statement records zero loss of Priority Greenspace in Cambuslang.	
Alison Park	96		2.14	In 2016 Priority Greenspace land was lost from Holmhills Park when it was sold and subsequently granted permission under Planning Application CR/16/0129 to develop as private gardens. Additionally a further area still within Park was damaged by dumping of waste material during building and landscaping works. There has been no move to compensate for loss of the sold land or damage of adjacent Priority Greenspace as yet. The identification of land in Holmhills Park as Priority Greenspace in LDP did not protect all of it from development and the omission of details relating to the lost and damaged section from relevant SLLDP2 reports adds to my concern that other losses are excluded and priority greenspace may be less secure than portrayed in MIR	Planning Application CR/16/0129 was assessed against Policy 14 – Green Network and Greenspace. The assessment concluded that given the size of the site that there would be no significant adverse impact and the overall function of the park would not be affected. The designation of an area as priority greenspace does not exclude it from development but recognises that where possible any loss which may have a significant affect on the area should be compensated elsewhere. As noted in paragraph 1.2 of the LDP Monitoring Statement, monitoring data is provided for the 4 year period 2011/12 – 2014/15 (financial years) or from 2011-15 calendar years. The figures in Table 6.1 are based on a GIS analysis of planning consents implemented during that period. There were no relevant planning consents recorded during that period which affected the Holmhills priority greenspace.
Alison Park	97		Table 4.1	Loss of Priority Greenspace at Holmhills Park is not reflected in Technical Report 1. The identification of this land as an environmental asset in LDP did not protect it from development nor did it bring about compensatory action. Omitting this evidence of greenspace loss from relevant SLLDP2 reports contrasts with the strong	See response to No 96

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				commitment to protect of Green Network and Greenspace	
Alison Park	98		4.3	Welcome the recognition of importance of protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment including the green network. Concerned that directing housing development in my area of Cambuslang may adversely impact the environment unless there is more investment/incentives for public transport, walking and cycling. There is already too much traffic and dangerous levels of air pollutants and more housing on the greenfield sites is likely to exacerbate problems.	The Council do not intend to release further housing in this part of Cambuslang through the LDP process. Any sites coming forward through the Development Management process would be assessed for their impact on the environment and infrastructure.
Alison Park	99		4.4	I lean towards Alternative Option 1 though accept there is need for some new development. It is vital to protect the environment to retain a place where people want to live. I think there is too much emphasis on planning towns for cars and not for people. Shopping in main streets is too often made unattractive and unhealthy because of heavy traffic and bad parking - then there are no useful shops so have to go to superstore by car.	Comments noted
Alison Park	100		4.33	I strongly approve the proposal to amend Policy 15 towards identifying future Local Nature Conservation Sites (LNCS). Identification of sites with local significance for nature conservation is essential but there must be additional policies to provide support for appropriate management and protect against damaging development proposals on identified sites.	Support noted. The Council seeks to give a level of protection for sites identified as LNCS from inappropriate development through this policy. We will continue to work with existing community groups to ensure appropriate site management, and we are keen to develop these relationships through the LNR designation process. LNR designation helps to raise awareness of the importance of the sites with the Council Planning department as well as with developers.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Alison Park	101		4.35	Designating more LNRs is an appropriate way to further the conservation of biodiversity. Providing a network of LNRs would definitely benefit people by offering a range of education and health and well-being experiences	Support noted
Susan Lindner-Kelly	102		4.36	The area that our group cares for is Millheugh, Greenhall and Barnhill. We support the LNR proposal for Millheugh and Greenhall however it is difficult to ascertain if Barnhill is included in the proposals for Local Nature Reserve Status. However, whilst Local Nature Reserve status will offer a certain level protection, we would like to see the site designated an Urban Fringe Special Landscape through SNH. In addition we would advise that an up-to-date flora survey is required to ascertain whether the site should be designated a special area of conservation.	Barnhill is included in the potential LNR designation. There is no <i>Urban Fringe Special Landscape</i> designation recognised by the Council or SNH. However, the site is already designated as part of the Lower Clyde & Calderglen Special Landscape Area as identified on the LDP Strategy Map. With regard to designating the site as a SAC, firstly the site would require to already be designated by SNH as a Site of Special Scientific Interest and this is not the case. SNH are understood not to be considering any new SSSI designations at present.
Alison Park	103		4.46	I am against the option of extraction of hydrocarbons through unconventional extraction methods. South Lanarkshire Council should concentrate on developing renewable energy and energy conservation policies rather than considering introducing new forms of hydrocarbon extraction that would cause disturbance and potentially pose dangers to local communities and add to carbon dioxide emissions that cause worldwide damage.	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position.
Alison Park	104		4.36	I strongly agree with proposal to designate Holmhills Cambuslang as LNR. As a member of Friends of Holmhills Park I	Noted. We will consider the proposed boundary expansion.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>completed a Phase 1 Habitat Survey and I am aware that there is a good range of habitats and species and the area is highly suited for increased educational opportunities. I am disappointed to find that the site boundary excludes several areas and habitats that I know to be of nature conservation interest and ask that the site boundary could be extended to include: 1) scrub/grassland adjacent to path between Westcoats Rd and Whitlawburn Ave 2) grassland on slope south of Whitlawburn Ave, 3) tree/scrub line between Grenville Dr and playing field 4) tree/scrub border on east, north and west boundary of playing field behind Stewarton Dr and 4) woodland and scrub between Langlea Grove and access road to Cathkin School.</p>	
	106	<p>The Loaningdale School Company</p>	<p>2.18</p>	<p>Given the new opportunities for the South Lanarkshire Council area, as a result of the Glasgow City Deal, we are disappointed that the Council only identified 12 out of the 118 sites submitted as being potential additions to the land supply for residential development or industrial development. The MIR reflects the Council's Housing Land Supply targets as set out within the proposed Clydeplan 2. However, we draw the Council's attention to the Reporter's recommendations in respect of Clydeplan 2 and in particular the proposed application of a 15% Generosity Margin to all tenures and subjects. This is not reflected within the MIR and it is disappointing given the quantity of well located, sustainable and developable</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				site put forward to the Call for Sites. The land under the ownership of The Loaningdale School Company at Biggar is an ideal housing site which has market interest and we consider that it is deliverable within the time period of the SLLDP 2.	to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
	107	The Loaningdale School Company	4.2	Broadly support the proposed Spatial Strategy of SLLDP2 which directs development to sustainable locations and seeks to ensure an adequate and flexible supply of land for housing. We are therefore disappointed that site reference CL04/003 was not allocated for a new housing site, given its location in Biggar and proximity to a very popular new housing site to the immediate south.	Support for spatial strategy noted. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
	108	The Loaningdale School Company	4.3	Given what the Reporter recommended in respect of the proposed Clydeplan 2 and a Generosity Margin of 15% against the proposed 10% housing generosity margin set out within the MIR of the SLLDP2, we believe that the Council could have more generous and allocated additional land for housing which supports their preferred Spatial Strategy and encourages sustainable economic growth across both rural and urban settlements which provide a range of choices for people and supports towns where people would wish to live.	See response to No 106
	109	The Loaningdale School Company	4.19	The MIR of the SLLDP2 in our opinion does not offer sufficient support to the private house builders who are looking to develop in attractive areas in Scotland but are given no	See response to No 106

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				encouragement with a distinct lack of opportunities for housing sites of 50 - 100 units. The Spatial Strategy does very little to support smaller more rural towns which need to attract new people and the substantial investment associated with private sector housing development.	
	110	The Loaningdale School Company	4.31	Comments on site assessment of CL04/003 in Technical Report 2 Call for Sites Assessment. In particular, questions the Green Network designation on the site.	The site was designated as green network in the adopted LDP to ensure that a buffer remained between the housing site at Edinburgh Road and the Loaningdale School. The Council is content that this designation is correct.
Elaine Anderson	111	GVA Grimley	4.31	Requests that an additional site south of Waterfoot Row south of Birch House Thorntonhall is considered as an alternative housing site.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Philip Graham	112	Savills	4.31	Requests that a site north of Law is considered for immediate (9.1ha) and longer term residential development (10.6ha)	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Mrs Curran	113		4.31	Requests that a site at Mounthilly Road Chapelton be considered for change of use to housing in the local development plan review.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Stewart Milne Homes	114		4.31	Requests a site is considered for development at Newhouses Farm Strathaven.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Turner Brothers	115		4.31	Requests that land at Skellyton Farm	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Larkhall is considered as an appropriate strategic development location for residential development.	to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
D.W. Leggat	116		4.31	Requests land at Old Glasgow Road Nerston is considered as an alternative to sites included in the MIR	The site at Old Glasgow Road Nerston has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy
Gladman Developments	117		4.31	Requests that a site at Station Road, Carluke should be allocated for housing in the emerging LDP.	The site at Station Road Carluke has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy
Barratt	118	Barratt Homes	4.31	Requests that land at Airdrie Road, Carluke is allocated within the emerging South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan (LDP) as a residential development site.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Hugh Steel	119		4.31	Requests the allocation of land at Kibblestone Place Strathaven for housing development in the Local Development Plan 2	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Mark McConechy	121		4.31	Seeks inclusion of a 5.75 ha (14.2 acre) greenfield site bound by Laignlands Road to the west, the East Kilbride Expressway to the south and the M74 to the east. The site lies within the currently designated Greenbelt, directly adjacent to the Bothwell settlement boundary	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Loch Homes Ltd	122	Loch Homes Ltd	4.31	Resubmission of call for sites submission EK02/002 Midshawton Farm Chapelton. The site has been substantially reduced in size and is now of a scale and form which is more proportionate to and in keeping with	This site has been reassessed with the new area and does not conform to the LDP2 strategy.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				the existing village.	
Jackton Estates Ltd	123		4.31	Resubmission of call for sites ref. EK04/010 O'Cathian Farm, East Kilbride with reduced site area in order to address the issues raised in the Call for Change site assessments.	This site has been reassessed with the new area and does not conform to the LDP2 strategy.
Jackton Estates Ltd	124	Jackton Estates Ltd	4.31	Resubmission of call for sites ref. EK01/002 Mid Crosshill, Auldhouse with reduced site area in order to address the issues raised in the Call for Change site assessments.	This site has been reassessed with the new area and does not conform to the LDP2 strategy.
Sally Wilson	125	Mrs Sally Wilson and Family	4.31	Requests that a site at Crossbasket Castle be considered in the proposed LDP for a small-scale development of holiday lodges or for a small residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Rachael Edmunds	126	Banks Developments	4.31	The Banks Group welcome the retention of Wellburn Farm, Lesmahagow as a Development Framework Site. We believe that the area allocated in the adopted LDP should be extended further north to the Teiglum Burn.	This site has been reassessed with the new area and does not conform to the LDP2 strategy.
Greg and Jim Lambert	127		4.31	Requests that site at Crutherland Farm East Kilbride be included in the settlement boundary and allocated for residential development, to include up to 30% affordable housing.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Margo Wilson	128		4.31	Site Reference CLO1/001 The accompanying site map with this site reference combines the site in my ownership with an adjacent site, Glengonnar, which is not in my ownership. No reason is given for this and the sites are quite different from	The original 'call for sites' submission to the Council had a boundary that included both sites. This site has been reassessed with the reduced area and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				each other. Request that my site be re-assessed for its suitability for residential development on its own merits, rather than in combination with another site. The present consultation is not the sole driver of my proposal; the timber of Colebrooke Plantation on my site is reaching maturity for extraction, so the future use of that part of my site requires consideration in any case.	
Susan Hamilton	129		4.31	Requests that a site at Old Bridgend Lanark be allocated for residential development in proposed LDP.	Following Stage 2 assessment the Council is not promoting this site since there are issues with access and the roads network at this location.
Merchant Homes Partnership Ltd	130	Merchant Homes Partnership	4.31	Resubmission of Call for Sites CL38/001 and CL38/005 at Stanmore Road/Jerviswood, Lanark as an extension to the settlement of Lanark for future residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Blossom Investments Ltd	131		4.31	In response to Question 13 we are of the view that alternative housing sites should be considered for housing development. North of Hayhill Road/South of Peel Road East Kilbride should form part of the sites to be considered as an alternative housing site.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Jason Wallace	132	Wallace Land Investments	4.5	Wallace Land Investment recommends the proposal for East Kilbride North is included as a Development Framework Site in the Proposed LDP 2. Allocation of the site would better align the Council's spatial strategy with the positive outcomes of the Glasgow City Region City Deal. The site would be effective and capable of delivering around 690 homes within the period of LDP 2	The site at East Kilbride north has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Taylor Wimpey	133	Taylor Wimpey	4.31	This representation is being submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey to promote land at Quarryhall, Strathaven for allocation as a residential development site within the new South Lanarkshire LDP. The Quarryhall site has potential capacity for approximately 165 houses, to include 25% affordable provision, and is a natural extension and rounding-off of the Strathaven West Residential Masterplan site.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
CS Homes	134	CS Homes	4.31	Requests that a site at 'Lot 5' north of the A71 be included within the settlement boundary of Stonehouse and allocated for residential development and a nursery/crèche, a soft play area, a teen area, a café and toilet provision which will complement proposals for enhancing and developing Memorial Park.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Leadhills Trust	135	Leadhills Trust	4.15	A site that is currently in use for employment/industrial use in Leadhills should be formally identified as employment land in the LDP rather than general urban in order to encourage future development.	The Council considers there is no need to change the designation as the light industrial/business use on this site is appropriate in a general urban area.
Theo Philip	137	3R Energy Solutions Ltd	4.3	In terms of the Strategic Economic Investment Locations (SEILs), 3R Energy would propose an amendment to the existing Poniel SEIL boundary to include the M74 Heat & Power Park is currently subject of Planning Application	Noted – this proposal will be further considered when drafting the proposed plan and amendments made as required.
Stonehouse Ahead	138		4.3	Resubmission of Call for Sites HM11/003 Stonehouse North with a reduced site area as a proposed Development Framework Site.	This site has been reassessed with the reduced area and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Hallam Land Management	139	Hallam Land Management	4.31	Requests that a site at Newhouse Farm, Cambuslang be allocated for residential development in the emerging Local Development Plan.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Jim Aitchison	140	Aitchison Architects	4.31	Requests that a site at East Farm, East Kilbride Road, Rutherglen (Site 2 - 3.96ha) be allocated for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Jim Aitchison	141	Aitchison Architects	4.31	Requests that a site at East Farm, East Kilbride Road, Rutherglen (Site 1 - 4.79ha) be allocated for residential development.	See response to No 140
Jim Aitchison	142	Aitchison Architects	4.31	Requests that a site at East Farm, East Kilbride Road, Rutherglen (Site 3 - 0.82ha) be allocated for residential development.	See response to No 140
Heron Property	143	Heron Property	4.15	Requests that the Council considers redesignation of a site at 41 Duchess Road Rutherglen from core industrial area to "General Urban" to allow a more flexible approach to development at this site.	Noted: Consideration will be given to the most appropriate way of representing the various development proposals within Clyde Gateway on the Cambuslang/Rutherglen settlement map which is issued with the Proposed Plan. This could form a more detailed inset to the LDP proposals map
Alex Galbraith	144		4.7	Objects to the proposed residential development site at Peel Road Thorntonhall due to its location, scale and impact on traffic and local roads.	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
Fraser Thomson	145		4.7	Objects to the proposed residential development site at Peel Road Thorntonhall due to its location, scale and impact on traffic and local roads.	See response to No 144
Harry Murray	146		4.7	Objects to the proposed residential development site at Peel Road Thorntonhall due to its location, scale and impact on traffic and local roads and wildlife.	See response to No 144
Jahag Ltd	147	Jahag Ltd	4.7	Objects to the proposed residential development site at Peel Road Thorntonhall due to its location, scale, landscape impact and implications for local roads infrastructure.	See response to No 144
Jahag Ltd	148	Jahag Ltd	4.31	Object to the inclusion of site EK04/003 for housing development in the review of the LDP due to loss of industrial land, access issues, flood risk and potential noise impacts.	See response to No 144
Eric Smith	149		4.7	Objects to the proposed residential development site at Peel Road Thorntonhall due to its location, scale and impact on local roads and infrastructure.	See response to No 144
Janis Orr	150		4.31	Objects to further housing development at Hallside since this will impact on the already stretched infrastructure in the Drumsagard area.	The Council remains confident that there is no need to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas outlined in the MIR. The extension to the site at Hallside East was considered by the Council to partly accord with strategy and the Council invited the developer to submit Stage 2 documentation outlining how the site could be made effective and be progressed to the next stage in the

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					process. The necessary information was not submitted and the extension to Hallside East will not be promoted in the proposed plan. The original Hallside East site was promoted in a previous local plan and has been on the housing land audit for a number of years.
David Thomson	151	Cambuslang Community Council	4.2	Recommend rewording the Vision Statement to make it clear that the aim of continued growth and regeneration applies to all parts of South Lanarkshire. The focus on growth in South Lanarkshire is centred on the main centres – East Kilbride, Hamilton and Lanark. The regeneration of other centres, notably Cambuslang, appears to have a much lower priority.	The vision is a general statement which promotes the continued growth and regeneration of South Lanarkshire as a whole. The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy policy in the proposed plan to set out more detail for the various local areas of South Lanarkshire.
David Thomson	152	Cambuslang Community Council	4.3	Disagree with Spatial Strategy as it is too focussed on identifying new opportunities for development rather than the regeneration of existing centres such as Cambuslang.	Noted - The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy policy in the proposed plan. These comments will be considered and amendments made if appropriate.
David Thomson	153	Cambuslang Community Council	4.9	The LDP Green Belt and Rural Area policy is not being applied in Cambuslang as successive housing developments have eroded the Green Belt. We recommend that LDP2 contains a statement that no further infringement of the Green Belt around Cambuslang will be accepted.	The Green Belt and Rural Area policy is applied consistently across South Lanarkshire. It would not be appropriate to make a statement referring to Cambuslang only in the LDP.
David Thomson	154	Cambuslang Community Council	Table 4.1	Recommend amendment of Policy 8 to align it with Scottish Government policy, including a commitment to implementing the priorities of the 2011 regeneration strategy and Town Centre Action Plan. Request the development of a long-term vision for Cambuslang, developed in partnership with the local community, its integration into wider	The Council do not consider that there is a need to expand Policy 8 since further guidance on Health Checks is included in Supplementary Guidance 6 – Town Centres and Retailing. The SG's will be updated and subject to further consultation in due course. As regards bullet point 2 the statement in paragraph 4.15 of the 2015 LDP specifically relates to retail impact assessments. Retail impact assessments have been

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>SLC economic strategies, and the tailoring of interventions and alignment of funding to meet the specific needs and priorities of Cambuslang.</p> <p>SLC has not undertaken the promised 'Health Check' or sought consultation with local stakeholders to discuss this;</p> <p>SLC has not fulfilled its commitment to assess development proposals in terms of their impact on the "role and function" of Cambuslang;</p> <p>Cambuslang is the only settlement of a significant size to be excluded from the application of the Place Standards Tool</p>	<p>submitted for any relevant retail developments over 1000m2.</p> <p>The Place Standards Tool was used at public consultation events and completed by members of the public who attended. No members of the public or the community council attended the events in their area therefore there is no data available to analyse and include in the report for Cambuslang.</p>
David Thomson	155	Cambuslang Community Council	Table 4.1	<p>Recommend that SLC makes representations to its local authority partners and Scottish Government: (a) to extend the eastern boundary of Clyde Gateway eastwards on both sides of the river Clyde to include the datazones noted above; and (b) to provide Clyde Gateway with additional resources to address the long-term regeneration problems of Cambuslang. We recommend that SLC develops an alternative regeneration strategy for Cambuslang.</p>	<p>This has been discussed with representatives of Clyde Gateway and it is not possible to change the boundary of the designated Clyde Gateway project at this stage.</p>
David Thomson	156	Cambuslang Community Council	4.5	<p>Supports statement in MIR that there is currently no requirement to provide further land for residential development across South Lanarkshire..</p>	<p>Noted</p>
David Thomson	157	Cambuslang Community Council	4.5	<p>Support the proposed development framework at Bridge Street/Somervell Street Cambuslang however retail uses that compete with Main Street should be ruled</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				out. A park and ride for Cambuslang railway station is essential.	
David Thomson	158	Cambuslang Community Council	4.14	Recommend that the new LDP recognises the planned development of Clyde Cycle Park on the site to the north of the former Hoover site, and bounded by the river, Bogleshole Road and Dale Avenue. The site, owned by Scottish Enterprise and known as 'Site 22', is intended to be developed as an amenity/leisure/sports facility for road-race cycling and related sports activities, as well as an active travel hub.	It is not considered that this proposal is sufficiently advanced to warrant a change of LDP designation at this time.
David Thomson	159	Cambuslang Community Council	4.13	Settlement boundary of Cambuslang should be fixed and no further infringement or erosion of greenspace and the green network should be permitted.	The Councils policy is to consider the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the first instance and if no appropriate sites are available to look at other areas within settlement boundaries. If no sites are forthcoming and a shortfall in housing land has been identified then the Council looks to the edge of settlements for possible expansion sites. It is therefore not possible to commit to no further changes to the settlement boundary. In the past the Council has successfully defended sites from release along the south of Cambuslang where there has been consistent pressure from developers. With regard to the green network and greenspace the Council's priority is to preserve such sites – if development is proposed that affects these sites then this is assessed against Policy 14 of the LDP.
David Thomson	160	Cambuslang Community Council	4.13	Object strongly to Sites CR02/001, CR02/002, CR02/003 and CR02/004 from Call for sites report if these were to be considered for development. Object strongly to CR02/006 Blairbeth Golf Course identified as proposal in MIR. Development of this site would further erode	These sites CR02/001, CR02/002, CR02/003 and CR02/004 were assessed and found not to accord with the LDP strategy and shall not be included in the Proposed Plan The development framework proposal for Blairbeth golf course will include two small areas of housing, with the majority of the site being retained as green space/green

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				the green belt and increase traffic congestion on local roads. The disposal of the former golf club would provide an opportunity to extend Cathkin Braes Park and provide additional publicly accessible green space	network.
David Thomson	161	Cambuslang Community Council	4.1	Recommend strengthening the protection for existing greenspace in the Cambuslang area, and specifically to include the following green spaces as part of the green network. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Douglas Park (at the corner of Stewarton Drive and Douglas Drive); • Cambuslang Golf Club. 	It is agreed that this area at Douglas Park should be included in the green network and accordingly a technical amendment shall be made to the Cambuslang/Rutherglen settlement map. Cambuslang Golf Course is already covered by priority greenspace and green network designations
David Thomson	162	Cambuslang Community Council	Table 4.1	There is no specific question in the LDP2 consultation regarding Green Networks. However, recommend that SLC consider developing a new Strategic Network Area that seeks to protect, enhance and link up greenspaces in the area Rutherglen-Burnside-Cambuslang-Halfway. The north of this area is bounded by the River Clyde green corridor and the south by Cathkin Braes, while the centre has a string of parks running west to east from Richmond Park, through Overtoun Park, Holmhill Wood Community Park, Cambuslang Park to Halfway Park (as well as a number of other informal greenspaces). With judicious management, new street planting and signposting, these areas could be linked together creating a new strategic green network area.	The Strategic Green Network described in SG 8 relates to areas of countryside surrounding various towns and villages rather than the green network within the urban area. The sites referred to in this representation are urban sites and already have priority greenspace and green network designations through the LDP. We recognise that LNRs form part of Strategic Green Network. Strategic Green Networks will be considered in the development of the forthcoming Open Space Strategy.
David	163	Cambuslang	4.36	Support the proposed designation of part of	Noted, we will consider the proposed boundary expansion.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Thomson		Community Council		Holmhills Wood Community Park as a Local Nature Reserve. Recommend that the boundary of the LNR is extended to include other parts of the park, and specifically the woodland area at Langlea Grove which is not included in the map on p.40 of the draft LDP - as proposed by Friends of Holmhills Wood Community Park. We also support the LNR designation for the site at Westburn Road.	
David Thomson	164	Cambuslang Community Council	4.38	Recommend strongly that SLC transport planning accelerates plans for the development of a park-and-ride facility at Cambuslang Station to relieve increasing pressure on local parking	The Council are aware of this issue and are endeavouring to find a solution by providing further park and ride facilities.
Grant Law	165	W3st	4.7	Objects to EK10/002 East Overton Strathaven extension: It would create significant traffic issues relating to both the construction phase and the use of the new sports facility. The proposal will be detrimental to the new sports facility located at Strathaven Rugby Club	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
RW and DJ Brown	166		4.7	Objects to EK10/002 and EK10/001 due to impact on roads and services and wildlife	See response to No 165
Dennis Jones	167		4.7	Objects to EK10/002 and EK10/001 Strathaven as there is no need for further housing in Strathaven and it will impact on roads and services and detract from the character and quality of the conservation	See response to No 165

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				town	
W S Turner	168		4.7	Objects to EK10/002 and EK10/001 Strathaven as it will cause further unnecessary encroachment of the green belt land and it will impact on roads and services and detract from the character and quality of the conservation town	See response to No 165
Mervyn Gunn	169		4.7	Objects to EK10/002 and EK10/001 Strathaven as there is no need for further housing in Strathaven and it will impact on roads and services. Why is an additional 10 hectares of land need for housing that is already approved?	See response to No 165
Jennifer Jones	170		4.7	Objects to EK10/002 and EK10/001 Strathaven as there is no need for further housing in Strathaven and it will impact on roads and services.	See response to No 165
Ross Jones	171		4.7	Objects to EK10/002 and EK10/001 Strathaven as there is no need for further housing in Strathaven and it will impact on roads and services.	See response to No 165
W McKinlay	172		4.7	Objects to EK10/002 and EK10/001 Strathaven as there is no need for further housing in Strathaven and it will impact on roads and services.	See response to No 165
Mairi Millar	173		4.7	Objects to EK10/001 and EK10/002 Cumulative Impact that additional residential housing will have on amenity and character of Strathaven as a whole Further loss of agricultural green belt land	See response to No 165
George	174		4.7	Objects to EK10/002 East Overton extension	See response to No 165

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Markac				due to unsuitable road infrastructure and insufficient utilities, medical provision, schooling and local community facilities.	
William Park	175		4.7	Objects to any further release of land for housing in Strathaven due to impact on roads and traffic and local services.	See response to No 165
Julie MacAulay	176		4.7	Objects to the proposed housing on site EK10/002 Walkerdyke. This site is currently Greenbelt land with access via a narrow country lane. An additional 200 houses would put significant pressure on the infrastructure in this area	See response to No 165
Leadhills Trust	177	Leadhills Trust	4.14	The LDP must adopt a positive development in the countryside economic policy that supports appropriate scale development in rural locations to support local services and facilities.	Noted: The LDP strategy wording as set out in the MIR includes supporting rural business opportunities and redevelopment of appropriate brownfield sites
Elizabeth Mackay	178	Strathclyde Partnership for Transport	4.2	SPT supports the Preferred Option outlined as it concentrates development to the main urban centres, the established Community Growth areas and the recognised regeneration areas. There are particular challenges in providing even limited bus for areas which do not already have one and so it is very important that new housing development connect suitably to areas is directed to existing bus corridors. While the commitment to promoting the provision and improvement of strategic transport infrastructure in support of CGA is noted - the need to develop layouts and provide funding towards to support bus service provision and in these areas is also	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				required.	
Elizabeth Mackay	179	Strathclyde Partnership for Transport	4.5	Agree with the approach to development framework sites and residential masterplan sites set out in the preferred option. This will ensure that the plan is reflective of changing circumstances. It is essential that there is the requirement to consider sustainable travel behaviour in a meaningful way as part of the development frameworks.	Noted - this can be considered in the Development Framework and Masterplan requirement however further clarification is required as to what is meant by 'sustainable travel behaviour' and whether this can be addressed through the Local Development Plan
Elizabeth Mackay	180	Strathclyde Partnership for Transport	4.31	SPT agrees with the approach to site assessment being undertaken by the Council in relation to the potential to include sites in the Housing Land Supply. While we welcome the consideration given to public transport accessibility as part of the assessment of sites submitted in the call for sites, we note that that this does not take account of the frequency or hours of operation of services which call at bus stops. SPT would welcome the opportunity to input into the second stage of assessment to provide further feedback on service frequency and hours of operations.	Noted. The Council would welcome SPT's input to the Stage 2 sites.
Elizabeth Mackay	181	Strathclyde Partnership for Transport	4.39	A STAG Assessment of transport issues in the Clydesdale area is currently being undertaken, and that these sites are being reserved so as not to prohibit progress of any potential options which may emerge from this assessment. It is considered appropriate to reserve the areas of land at both Law and Symington until the outcome of STAG process has emerged.	Noted
Elizabeth	182	Strathclyde	2.21	SPT welcomes and supports the approach	Noted – further discussion with Roads and Transportation

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Mackay		Partnership for Transport		taken transport appraisal, but suggest that further consideration could be given to the role of bus as a key transport mode in meeting sustainable travel requirements	will take place to consider how this can be addressed in the proposed plan.
Scott Mackay	183	East Kilbride Community Trust	Table 2.3	Land to South and East of Hurlawcrook Road East Kilbride Objects to the wording in Appendix 2 Table 2.3 that the site will revert to core industrial and business use should the community stadium proposal not be implemented	It is not considered that this site is suitable for uses other than community stadium or industrial/business therefore the LDP makes provision for the site to revert back to industrial uses should the current proposal not be implemented.
Mark Falder	184		4.31	Objects to EK10/002 East Overton extension due to unsuitable road infrastructure and insufficient utilities, medical provision, schooling and local community facilities	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
	185	CVO Ltd	Table 2.3	Supports inclusion of his site - Land to the North of St James Avenue East Kilbride- as a Development Framework Site but considers that description in Appendix 2 should include residential use.	Comments noted. Detailed mix of land uses will be dealt with as the plan progresses.
Clare Haughey	186	MSP Rutherglen Scottish Parliament	4.2	The Spatial Strategy should ensure that where further significant housing developments are planned that adequate provision is made for Health, leisure, retail and community facilities. Little if any regard has been paid to any of these issues in the	Comments noted – any new development sites require to meet a number of service standards and must be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				past. Adequate road infrastructure with traffic management modelling also needs to be prioritised in areas where development is proposed. Current roads are not adequate for the proposed developments. Serious consideration must be given to the provision of a secondary school in the Halfway area as a matter of priority	
Clare Haughey	187	MSP Rutherglen Scottish Parliament	4.3	<p>The Town Centre First Principle puts the health of town centres at the heart of decision making and encourages vibrancy, equality and diversity. Whilst the LDP refers to the Town Centre First principle, the reality on the ground is that many Town Centres. Are struggling and need a stronger focus within the Plan. Cambuslang and Blantyre, in particular, have experienced major degradation in retail provision and footfall, which has seriously impacted businesses and community confidence.</p> <p>In considering enhancement to this element of the plan, urgent consideration should be given to traffic management issues on major arterial roads, with particular emphasis given to planning priorities and initiatives that will reduce peak time congestion and contribute urgently to the improvement of air quality within town centres.</p>	Noted - The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy policy in the proposed plan. These comments will be considered and amendments made if appropriate.
Clare Haughey	188	MSP Rutherglen Scottish Parliament	4.5	Concerns have been raised around several of the Development Framework sites outlined in the MIR. In Rutherglen it would be hoped that the Council will look at uses for the land at Blairbeth Golf Club which do not include further housing development but	The proposals for Blairbeth include a small element of residential but the majority of the site is to be retained as greenspace and enhanced as parkland/greenspace. Comments relating to the University of the West of Scotland proposals have been passed to the relevant development management team for consideration as this is

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				would enhance community amenity provision. Whilst the land assigned at Hamilton Technology Park for the development of the new University of the West of Scotland is to be welcomed, the infringement on Community woodland there has been a concern for Blantyre Community Council. Compensatory woodland provision was promised and it would be appreciated if the location of this alternative provision could be indicated prior to work commencing.	now outwith the development plans provision since an application has already been approved for the site. Compensatory planting is part of the planning consent.
Clare Haughey	189	MSP Rutherglen Scottish Parliament	4.9	In Cambuslang the concerns around Green Belt erosion are concentrated around the south of the area, with further potential housing expansion towards East Kilbride. I would urge the Council to make a strong commitment against further Green Belt erosion for housing development, concentrating instead on re-designating brown field sites.	The Councils policy is to consider the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the first instance and if no appropriate sites are available to look at other areas within settlement boundaries. If no sites are forthcoming and a shortfall in housing land has been identified then the Council looks to the edge of settlements for possible expansion sites. The Council has successfully defended sites from release along the south of Cambuslang where there has been consistent pressure from developers.
Clare Haughey	190	MSP Rutherglen Scottish Parliament	4.33	Assurances that there will be no further sale of designated park land to individual or private developers should be implicit in the LDP. This has been a concern of residents in the Holmhill Park area of Cambuslang but should apply to all public park land. With the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act now in place the LDP should reflect the opportunities for communities to be involved in the re-designation of land use or, indeed, to acquire unused assets to develop as community projects. The Plan should ensure that provision for cycle facilities within community green space	Support noted. Issues around the sale of open space and Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act are noted. South Lanarkshire Council will continue to work with existing community groups to ensure appropriate site management, and we are keen to develop these relationships through the LNR designation process. LNR designation helps to raise awareness of the importance of the sites with the Council Planning department as well as with developers. In addition communities are consulted in the preparation of Local Development Plans and Supplementary Guidance. Provision for cycle facilities is referred to the Council's Access Officers for consideration in the forthcoming

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				can be facilitated.	Outdoor Access Strategy
Les Hoggan	191	Strathaven and Glassford Community Council	4.19	<p>Housing Development Models - The lack of a mixed model in terms of the development of individual sites. Every application has seemed to concentrate on building larger houses, and we feel this creates an imbalance in terms of available housing. In particular it does not help where a family has a need to downsize rather than move into a larger house.</p> <p>The lack of affordable or social housing. This is still a major issue and will remain so until some action is taken to encourage developments along those lines.</p> <p>The failure of planning gain money for sites being built in Strathaven actually being used within Strathaven. Our view is that given the scale of development there is scope for committing any planning gain to the Strathaven and Glassford communities.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The LDP does have a policy which encourages a mix of house types and sizes but as you rightly say in many cases this does not happen. The push from the Scottish Government for more affordable housing, particularly social rented should go someway to redressing this balance. In the meantime planning will continue to encourage a mix of house types and sizes to be considered on larger sites.</p> <p>As regards planning gain money, as far as possible this is used within the locality but in some cases it is used across a particular area and if for example money is urgently needed in east Kilbride and some is available from Strathaven then it will be used because the same housing market area is involved. This can be frustrating for local communities but the Council try to make the best use of the limited resources available.</p>
Les Hoggan	192	Strathaven and Glassford Community Council	4.38	<p>Traffic flow within Strathaven is already a major issue with the existing level of homes, businesses and cars. There are also issues in respect of pedestrian movement and for cyclists. It is also our view that all new proposed developments should be considered in the wider context not only in terms of planning regulations but on the wider impact on the road network around Strathaven and Glassford. With the current level of public transportation, it is likely that all new housing developments, either already approved or being considered as part of the MIR, will result in a significant</p>	<p>Noted. Roads and transportation are assessing the situation in Strathaven and Glassford.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				increase in car use. Need a fundamental review of transportation options, both within the towns and villages and for wider travel, including all options, e.g. bus, light rail, improved links to local railway stations, etc.	
Les Hoggan	193	Strathaven and Glassford Community Council	3.1	Adding the sites in Strathaven proposed for housing in the MIR will exacerbate current problems with school capacities and the ability of Health centres, dental services and pharmacies to cope with the significant expansion in population. We need to ensure that the new developments form part of the community and that transport and traffic management, as well as parking facilities, are adequate to ensure new residents integrate into the community and do not simply become commuters.	A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
Kevin Murphy	194	Persimmon Homes West Scotland	4.2	The preferred spatial strategy is, in general, supported. The residential housing and commercial development markets are however still recovering from the recession and ensuring that a development is viable is essential to whether or not it will take place. It is suggested that the sixth bullet point on page 14 is amended to incorporate a reference to viability.	Viability of individual sites is considered when assessing the effectiveness of a site. It has been shown that areas considered viable by developers are different from those that are actually built. It would be inappropriate for the Council to consider one area to be more viable than another
Les Hoggan	195	Strathaven and Glassford Community Council	4.7	Concern about three of the sites proposed for development in MIR: Glassford Road beside Berebriggs Road - capacity and suitability of Berebriggs Road East Overton (Extension) - scale of development, impact on roads, relationship with existing East Overton site Glassford, below the Primary School -	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				greenbelt land, not related to local need within Glassford.	pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
Les Hoggan	196	Strathaven and Glassford Community Council	4.46	Note a reference to South Lanarkshire having potential reserves of onshore oil and gas. Given the current moratorium while the national view across Scotland is assessed, reference should be made to this in the MIR to ensure any change in the national approach to fracking is a core part of the document.	The Scottish Government has not banned unconventional oil and gas extraction. There is therefore potential for unconventional oil and gas extraction within the lifetime of the plan and therefore the minerals policy and SG are required to address any future applications.
Les Hoggan	197	Strathaven and Glassford Community Council	4.7	Our view remains that managed expansion of Strathaven is good, based on a consolidated traffic, transport and education plan. However we cannot emphasise enough our concerns in respect of the reliance on Berebriggs Road as a main route from the new estate at East Overton with the current phases of development, let alone two additional developments at the north end of the existing site and to the south of Glassford Road. This road is entirely impractical for significant vehicle use, and is simply going to result in increased volumes through Flemington and potentially Glassford, with bottlenecks forming at peak times into Strathaven, onto Hamilton Road and through Glassford. It is our opinion that Berebriggs Road is reconsidered for development as a two way road to deal with what we see as a major issue. Finally, there were suggestions of alternatives to	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>Berebriggs Road at the time East Overton was proposed and to date we have not received a response on the feasibility of creating an alternative from Glassford Road to the A71.</p> <p>CC still has concerns about Strathaven West the development was not seen as a whole, with access to the Cala development not combined with that for the other two developments. The increase in traffic on Lethame Road, already a bottleneck, will be significant and this should have been a factor in planning consent. We also have concerns about the impact on the A71, the design and layout of the new roundabout and the junction at Quarry Ha'.</p>	
Kevin Murphy	198	Persimmon Homes West Scotland	4.31	<p>It is paramount that SLC identify sufficient effective sites to address the all tenure Housing Land Requirement, especially when the 15% Generosity Margin means that land for 1,200 new homes will have to be identified and built between 2012 and 2029.</p> <p>At present there are a number of large allocations, such as the Community Growth Areas (CGAs) that are ineffective. Until these sites begin to deliver homes sites of circa 200 units will have to be identified to address short-term demand.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position.</p> <p>To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan.</p> <p>All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					outlined in the MIR.
Kevin Murphy	199	Persimmon Homes West Scotland	4.38	Support the principle of enhancing connectivity to the rural areas of South Lanarkshire through the reservation of potential sites for railways at both Symington and Law. The promotion and delivery of sustainable travel modes to these settlements will enhance access to the Clydesdale area and make this part of South Lanarkshire more attractive to developers	Noted
Vicki Turkington	200	Scottish Power Renewables	3.1	Support overall vision but LDP should include a presumption in favour of sustainable development to include a range of technologies including onshore wind	It is not considered that the LDP vision requires to be amended to include this suggestion. The LDP vision is a general statement and detailed consideration of sustainable development will be addressed elsewhere in the LDP in the Spatial Strategy, Climate Change and Renewable Energy chapters.
Vicki Turkington	201	Scottish Power Renewables	4.2	Recommend that spatial strategy is reworded to provide a presumption in favour of development proposals which stimulate innovation and enterprise in new energy and renewable technologies and industries that ensure Scotland is well placed in the context of a wider global shift to a low carbon global economy as well as promoting the reconfiguration and diversification of the energy system needed to achieve this. This would support the planning outcomes in SPP and the Scottish Government's draft Climate Change Plan.	Noted. Consideration is being given to rewording the Spatial Strategy in the Proposed Plan to provide more detail on the various elements which comprise the Strategy based on the bullet points in paragraph 4.2 of the MIR. It would be appropriate for renewable energy to be included in this list.
Vicki Turkington	202	Scottish Power Renewables	4.4	The promotion of new development, particularly development which supports the reconfiguration of our energy system with view to achieving a low carbon future, should	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				be supported within the context of LDP2. LDP2 and its' polices should focus on achieving the right balance between the promotion of low carbon renewable technologies, which in themselves combat the effects of climate change and its associated environmental impacts, and an overly precautionary approach to environmental protection and acknowledge that each development proposal should be considered on its own merits, applying significant weight to a development's contribution to achieving a low carbon economy in arriving at a planning decision.	
Vicki Turkington	203	Scottish Power Renewables	4.41	Further consideration is to be given to a policy approach to repowering as part of SG10 update and the scope of this update should be widened to include a comprehensive review of recent Scottish Government policy developments	Noted – the Renewable Energy policy in the Proposed Plan will be consistent with current Scottish Government policy.
Vicki Turkington	204	Scottish Power Renewables	4.1	Recommend that existing LDP Policy 2 and its context including the supporting SG1 be reviewed to take account of Scottish Government's Draft Climate Change Plan - the draft Third Report on Policies and Proposals 2017-2032. The Scottish Government has also announced that it will bring forward a new Climate Change Bill including a new 2020 target of reducing actual Scottish emissions by more than 50%. LDP 2 Policy 2 and SG should recognise this new target and promote and support the measures outlined to achieve this. LDP 2 should also reference to the new Energy	Noted this will be addressed at proposed plan and review of SG stages.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Strategy by the Scottish Government.	
Margaret Ferrier	205		4.5	Pleased to see the inclusion of East Whitlawburn. Over 300 local residents took part in consultation last year with 80% of residents in favour	Support noted.
Margaret Ferrier	206		4.14	Agree that Bouverie Street Rutherglen should be redesignated for general urban use as proposed. Amongst other things, with the relocation of Veitchi Group last year after 50 years in Bouverie St it is reasonable that steps are taken to alter the land use for future developments. I am particularly encouraged that this area could potentially be used for affordable housing.	Support noted.
Margaret Ferrier	207		4.18	Agree that the boundary of the Fernhill Neighbourhood Centre should be redesignated in order to ensure that it includes the local community centre.	Support noted.
Margaret Ferrier	208		4.31	As regards the proposal to designate Hallside East for housing development I suggest any move to develop this site should be treated with caution. This should only be taken forward with full consultation and involvement of the community and development should not be to the detriment of existing residents. The impact of the development on infrastructure and social services must be fully assessed.	The Council remains confident that there is no need to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas outlined in the MIR. The extension to the site at Hallside East was considered by the Council to partly accord with strategy and the Council invited the developer to submit Stage 2 documentation outlining how the site could be made effective and be progressed to the next stage in the process. The necessary information was not submitted to the Council and the extension to Hallside East will not be promoted in the proposed plan. The original Hallside East site was promoted in a previous local plan and has been on the housing land audit for a number of years.
Margaret	209		4.33	Policy should be changed to make provision	Support noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Ferrier				for the future identification of local nature conservation sites. This will allow flexibility in taking action to protect our areas rich biodiversity and habitat.	
Margaret Ferrier	210		4.36	Supports the proposals for Local Nature reserves in Holmhill, Cambuslang; Millheugh and Greenhall in Blantyre and Earnock in Hamilton. There is scope for the local authority to work in conjunction with existing local conservation groups to establish these LNR.	Support noted. The council works closely with groups on many of the proposed LNRs and will continue to assist as required. We are keen to continue with and expand on this partnership working.
Alison Brown	211	Clyde Gateway	2.25	Clyde Gateway would welcome policy which would support low carbon initiatives. A number of proposals are currently being explored for the Shawfield (and Dalmarnock) area(s).	Noted this will be addressed in the review of the SG's
Alison Brown	212	Clyde Gateway	3.4	Clyde Gateway supports the identification of 'Clyde Gateway (Shawfield)' as a Strategic Economic Investment Location	Support noted
Alison Brown	213	Clyde Gateway	4.14	Policy 7 - Employment - It is suggested that there would be merit in re-designating the Sanmex site in Farme Cross from 'employment' land use to 'general urban' use to reflect the current planning consent for leisure and restaurant use.	Noted: Consideration will be given to the most appropriate way of representing the various development proposals within Clyde Gateway on the Cambuslang/Rutherglen settlement map which is issued with the Proposed Plan. This could form a more detailed inset to the LDP proposals map
Alison Brown	214	Clyde Gateway	4.33	Policy 15 – Natural and Historic Environment - Clyde Gateway supports the policy which makes provision for the future identification of Local Nature Conservation Sites. Such a site could be Cuningar Loop Woodland Park which has been transformed following £4.5m investment by Forestry Commission	Support noted. We will consider Cuningar Loop Woodland Park as a potential LNCS.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Scotland and Clyde Gateway.	
Alison Brown	215	Clyde Gateway	4.38	<p>Policy 16 – Cognisance should be taken of Clyde Gateway’s Strategic Roads Assessment which has specific recommendations for the road network including proposals for Shawfield and Rutherglen.</p> <p>Transport Appraisal - Reference has been made to a preliminary Transport Appraisal for the MIR. Has cognisance been taken of Clyde Gateway’s Strategic Roads Assessment which identifies a number of recommendations within the Shawfield/Rutherglen areas</p>	Noted. This will be reflected in the updated Transport Appraisal for the proposed plan.
Alison Brown	216	Clyde Gateway	4.48	<p>Other Issues – Simplified Planning Zones for Town Centres – In line with potential simplified planning zones for town centres, Clyde Gateway request consideration be given to relaxing planning controls within Shawfield in the context of the approved masterplan.</p>	Noted. Intend to approach Clyde Gateway in a different way with an inset plan and assess development opportunities using a criteria based approach. Further discussion will take place with Clyde Gateway to ensure that all the points raised are covered by the proposed plan.
Mr Kevin Grady	217		4.31	<p>Objects to release of further housing sites in Strathaven Site (Reference EK10/002, and Strathaven Site Reference EK10/001) until a proper assessment of the impact of the current LDP housing developments, in consultation with local residents, is undertaken.</p>	<p>Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s).</p> <p>A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Grant and Debbie Law	218		4.31	Objects to EK10/002 East Overton extension due to unsuitable road infrastructure and insufficient utilities, medical provision, schooling and local community facilities and loss of green belt.	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.
Mr and Mrs Stephen and Patricia Hulance	219		4.31	Objects to EK10/002 East Overton extension due to unsuitable road infrastructure and insufficient utilities, medical provision, schooling and local community facilities and loss of Green Belt.	See response to No 218
Mr & Mrs W Clark	220		4.31	Objects to EK10/002 East Overton extension due to unsuitable road infrastructure and insufficient utilities, medical provision, schooling and local community facilities.	See response to No 218
Mr and Mrs J Toal	221		4.31	Objects to EK10/002 East Overton extension due to unsuitable road infrastructure and insufficient utilities, medical provision, schooling and local community facilities and loss of Green Belt.	See response to No 218
Mr Jim Thomson	222		4.31	<u>Transport Appraisal</u> The two proposed developments in East Overton are in addition to existing development work on the north side of Glassford Road. Despite these large increases in residential housing in East Overton, the South Lanarkshire Local	Noted – the representation will be taken into account as part of the Stage 2 assessment of the site(s). A further technical assessment is being carried out on the sites that are identified within the MIR as potential development opportunities. As part of this process detailed information has been submitted. This data is being assessed to ensure that any sites which go forward into the

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>Development Plan 2017 Technical Report 3 Transport Appraisal (p.17) states there are to be no road improvements.</p> <p>For some time, however, traffic at the junction between Hamilton Road and Commercial Road has been tricky for local residents. In particular, there has been an increase in traffic between Strathaven and Hamilton, which means it has become difficult (in fact, dangerous) to exit onto Hamilton Road from Staneholm Road and Ravenswood Road. The proposed new developments will exacerbate this issue. This is because:</p> <p>Traffic from central Strathaven can turn onto Hamilton Road at speed from Commercial Road. The junction with Staneholm Road is only some 50 yards from Commercial Road, so traffic from Commercial Road appears blind and suddenly to vehicles attempting to leave Staneholm Road.</p> <p>Traffic exiting from Ravenswood Road is faced with vehicles approaching from the Commercial Road/Hamilton Road junction over a blind summit.</p> <p>These current difficulties will become worse with the proposed new developments. Improved traffic control arrangements should be installed at the junction between Commercial Rd/Hamilton Rd.</p>	<p>proposed plan can be adequately serviced without due pressure on existing infrastructure including the local road network. If a capacity issue is identified then it is expected that this will be addressed by any prospective developer before any development is allowed to proceed.</p>
Stewart Milne	223	Stewart Milne Holdings Ltd	4.31	Supports the proposed designation in MIR of site West of Redwood Drive for residential development.	Support noted.
Ian	224		3	Supports the continued allocation of Larkhall	Support noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Harvey				Community Growth Area in the MIR	
Philipshill Retirement Village Ltd	225		4.19	Supports the continued designation in LDP of Philipshill as a housing site.	Support noted
	226	CVO Ltd	4.19	Supports the continued designation of Balgray Road Lesmahagow as a housing site	Support noted.
	227	CVO Ltd	4.17	Supports the designation change suggested in Technical Report 1 for land at St James Centre East Kilbride to reflect consented site for retail development.	Support noted.
Forest Group	228		4.19	The proposal to identify Bridge Street/Somervell Street, Cambuslang as a 'Development Framework Site' is noted. Planning permission has previously been granted for retail and business use on the site but the proposals as envisaged are no longer achievable and a new, co-ordinated approach to its redevelopment is appropriate. Forrest Group therefore agrees that there would be merit in this proposal being added to the list of projects in Table 3.1 of the LDP. The requirements for any redevelopment of the site as set out in Appendix 2 are noted. At this stage it is not possible to say precisely what form such redevelopment might take but the reference to 'mixed use development' is supported.	Support noted
James Cameron	229		4.31	Supports the non-inclusion of the site at Loaningdale (call for sites CL04/003) in the LDP. The land is currently designated Green	Support noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Network and forms a very important landscape buffer between Loaningdale House and new housing currently being constructed on the Story Homes site immediately to the south.	
David Bryson	230	Burnhead Group	4.31	Supports the identification of the site at Glassford Road Strathaven as a proposed new residential masterplan site.	Support noted.
Janet Moxley	231		4.2	Spatial Strategy - happy with the strategy, and its designation of Market Rd, Biggar as a Development Framework Site, and the deletion of Edinburgh Rd, Biggar as a Residential Masterplan Site because of construction now being underway there. I have no objection to the redesignation of Kaimend, Carnwath as a settlement, but would be concerned if the designation were to be extended beyond the area shown on your map to the Kersewell area which is much more rural and can only be accessed by a single track road, which struggles to cope with existing levels of traffic.	Support noted
Janet Moxley	232		4.31	Agrees with the Council that the three sites proposed in the Call for Sites exercise (CL04/001 Boghall Road, CL04/003 Loaningdale House and CL68/002 Causeway End Biggar) do not meet the objectives of the plan.	Support noted
Janet Moxley	233		4.38	Transport - Strongly support the proposal to reserve land at Symington for a station, and hope that SLC are able use their influence to encourage the re-opening of Symington station. Better long distance public transport	Support noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				links are essential for the sustainable development of this area.	
Janet Moxley	234		4.41	Renewables - Renewable energy is an important, and growing part of South Lanarkshire's economy. I agree with the proposals in Table 4.4 and Figure 4.1 for the spatial framework governing windfarm development, with the exact positioning and layout of turbines within sites governed by planning considerations, including cumulative effects.	Support noted. Table 4.4 and Figure 4.1 sets out the spatial framework for onshore wind in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy (SPP).
Janet Moxley	235		4.44	Minerals Development - Minerals Policy should include reference to unconventional gas extraction, but feel this reference must be much bolder than the statement in the LDP which suggests that the adverse impacts of these developments should be weighed against potential economic benefits. Any new extraction of any fossil fuels is completely incompatible with sustainable development. The Minerals Policy should to be very clear that aggregate extraction in areas of high flood risk will not be allowed because of the risk to the environment and to staff and equipment on site.	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position. Flooding policy is an intrinsic part of the plan.
Janet Moxley Biggar and District Civic Society	236	Biggar and District Civic Society	3.1	Spatial Strategy - Agree with the spatial strategy, and its designation of Market Rd, Biggar as a Development Framework Site, and the deletion of Edinburgh Rd, Biggar as a Residential Masterplan Site because of construction now being underway there. Agree with the redesignation of Kaimend, Carnwath as a settlement, and note that the	Support noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				designated settlement area does not include the Kersewell area where the single track access road and largely rural setting mitigates against further development.	
Janet Moxley Biggar and District Civic Society	237	Biggar and District Civic Society	4.31	Agrees with the Council that the four sites proposed in the Call for Sites exercise (CL04/001 Boghall Road, CL04/002 Leaffield Road, CL04/003 Loaningdale House and CL68/002 Causeway End Biggar) do not meet the objectives of the plan.	Support noted.
Janet Moxley Biggar and District Civic Society	238	Biggar and District Civic Society	4.36	Local Nature Reserves - Plan does not include any local nature reserves in the Biggar area and suggest that Little Mitchelwood Community Woodland (on Lindsaylands Rd, immediately west of Knocklea) or Session Parks (an area of wetland adjacent to the north of Biggar Golf Clubhouse) should be designated local nature reserves.	Support noted. Sites currently selected as potential LNRs are under council ownership and close to larger centres of population, so we would not consider these proposed additional sites just now. Sites can be added to the list of potential Local Nature Conservation Sites.
Janet Moxley Biggar and District Civic Society	239	Biggar and District Civic Society	4.32	Conservation Areas - SLC has an obligation to survey designated conservation areas to ensure that planning requirements are being met, has such a survey been carried out for the Biggar Conservation Area, and if not when a survey will be done.	Noted. A survey has not yet been carried out for Biggar. Preparation of Conservation Appraisals will be carried out across South Lanarkshire as resources allow.
Janet Moxley Biggar and District Civic Society	240	Biggar and District Civic Society	4.38	Transport - Support the proposal to reserve land at Symington for a station.	Support noted
Janet Moxley Biggar and District Civic Society	241	Biggar and District Civic Society	4.44	Minerals Development - Minerals Policy should include reference to unconventional gas extraction, but feel this reference must	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position. Flooding policy is an intrinsic part of the plan.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Society				be much bolder than the statement in the LDP which suggests that the adverse impacts of these developments should be weighed against potential economic benefits. Any new extraction of any fossil fuels is completely incompatible with sustainable development. The Minerals Policy should be very clear that aggregate extraction in areas of high flood risk will not be allowed because of the risk to the environment and to staff and equipment on site.	
Janet Moxley Biggar and District Civic Society	242	Biggar and District Civic Society	4.38	Access to New Lanark - Welcome the proposal to improve access to the New Lanark World Heritage Site. We would particularly welcome improved bus links between Lanark station and the site and between Biggar and the site. Support measures to improve road access to the site, which is currently through a residential area along Braxfield Rd.	Noted
Dennis Walker	243		4.4	Para 4.4 Alternative Option 1 In my view spending £85m on road widening schemes is the wrong approach and only encourages further car use. This money would be better spent on Active Travel i.e. walking and cycling measures thus helping to alleviate the health problems we have now and in future in South Lanarkshire. See list of potential cycle projects identified in SLC Transport Strategy - no. 1 £3m to make the whole of East Kilbride cycle/walking friendly.	Noted – comments will be passed to Roads and Transportation since these relate to the Local Transport Strategy
Dennis Walker	244		4.34	Agree with the Councils proposed LNCS. Pleased to see Bothwell Nature Trail	Support noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				included in the LNCS/LNR. Hopefully this will help to protect the area from unwanted development.	
Toby Wilson	245		4.2	There should be a slight rephrasing of the wording of the Spatial Strategy, to separate the protection and enhancement of the natural and historic environment from the green network, so that it reads: - Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment; - Promoting the green network.	Noted - The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy policy in the proposed plan and this amendment is considered reasonable
Toby Wilson	246		4.31	Q 14) No comments on the specific sites, new housing and other developments should seek to enhance development sites and make provision for wildlife, for example, planting of native tree species, incorporating features such as nesting boxes for swifts etc. This would not only benefit biodiversity but enhance the quality of life of residents and workers.	Noted
Toby Wilson	247		4.33	Q 15) Wish to see the provision for the potential identification of LNCS in the revised LDP and that the identification and designation of them be progressed with some urgency. As far as we are aware, South Lanarkshire is currently unique amongst Scottish local authorities in having no planning protection for non-statutory wildlife sites i.e. sites designated as being of local to regional importance but not SSSIs or Natura sites.	Noted. We are working on setting site assessment criteria and defining a list of potential LNCS to progress designation.
Toby Wilson	248		4.34	Q17) Supports of the designation of new Local Nature Reserves and commend the	Support noted. Sites currently selected as potential LNRs are under council ownership and close to centres of

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Council in suggesting these sites. We would also suggest Blacklaw Moss, near Carnwath and owned by Forestry Commission Scotland be considered for designation.	population, so we would not consider Blacklaw Moss just now.
Toby Wilson	249		4.41	Q20) RSPB's 2050 Energy Vision project spatially analysed the potential for key renewable energy technologies to be deployed in the UK in harmony with nature, and we are happy to provide the spatial data produced as part of the project to local authorities. You can use the data to form the basis of your own maps of the renewable energy potential in your area; since they were produced using only data that was available at the UK scale, recommend augmenting them with local information on physical, policy and ecological constraints, adapting the methodology set out in the Energy Vision technical report.	Comments noted. This data would be useful when we review and update Supplementary Guidance 10 Renewable Energy and we will contact you regarding this.
Toby Wilson	250		4.46	RSPB recommends that the council take a precautionary approach to all unconventional gas development including extraction of shale gas and coal bed methane, given the potential for adverse impacts on climate, habitats and the water environment. SPP has removed the presumption in favour of unconventional gas.	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position.
Toby Wilson	251		4.44	RSPB Scotland believes that further expansion of the open-cast coal industry is incompatible with the Scottish Government's climate change targets and legislation. Any new minerals policy must make reference to the need for proper restoration of existing mineral extraction sites, as well as for any	The Scottish Government's energy statement does not preclude the use of fossil fuels and therefore there is still potential for their use. As such a robust policy on their extraction is still required. Coal is a national asset and therefore its extraction cannot be precluded unless stated by either the Scottish or UK Governments. The Minerals policy will have robust restoration and financial guarantee

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				new sites. The collapse of the opencast coal industry in Scotland in 2013 has left South Lanarkshire with a number of sites where it is unlikely that the original restoration plans will be delivered. For new mineral sites, restoration to high value wildlife sites should be considered a priority.	policies. South Lanarkshire has a strict monitoring and regulatory regime for minerals and unlike the example Authority, regulatory failure was therefore not an issue.
Toby Wilson	252		4.44	Financial Guarantees - The collapse of the opencast coal industry in Scotland demonstrated the importance of securing appropriate financial guarantees for the restoration and aftercare of sites with significant long-term liabilities. Whilst this is particularly required for opencast coal sites, this is also a relevant issue for other industries including landfill, onshore wind and, potentially, unconventional gas development.	Minerals policy will have robust restoration and financial guarantee policies. South Lanarkshire has a strict monitoring and regulatory regime for minerals and unlike the example Authority, regulatory failure was therefore not an issue.
Toby Wilson	253		4.48	Peat - RSPB Scotland would welcome the development of strong policies to ensure the protection of important peatland resources in line with SPP. New development should be sited to avoid areas of deep peat (over 0.5m). There should be a presumption against any new sites being developed for commercial peat extraction. Strongly support a policy to ensure an assessment of the carbon implications is undertaken for all development types on peat.	Noted – consideration shall be given to these suggested policy amendments/new policies and they will be included in relevant guidance if appropriate. Further discussion will take place with SNH/RSPB to ensure appropriate wording.
Toby Wilson	254		4.48	Green Infrastructure - Welcome the development of a policy that allows contributions from new developments to include offsite biodiversity enhancements to help strengthen and develop the green	Issue of developer contributions for biodiversity enhancement is noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				network.	
Jim O'Donnell	255	Zoom Developments Ltd	4.31	Submission of Flatts Farm East Kilbride as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage EK04/001)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Jim O'Donnell	256	Zoom Developments Ltd	4.31	Submission of West Mains Farm Stonehouse as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage HM11/005 Kittymuir Farm)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
The John and Elizabeth Brown Fund	257		4.31	Submission of East Greenlees Farm as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage CR02/002)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Alison Park	258	Friends of Holmhills Wood	4.36	Requests that the Council make extensions to the proposed LNR boundary at Holmhills to take in addition areas of interest in order to strengthen the case for providing appropriate management and protection for the areas of the park that have valuable wildlife interest.	Noted, we will consider the proposed boundary expansion.
Mr Donald Gunn	259		4.31	Submission of South Hillhead Farm Carluke as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage CL/10/002 and CL10/004)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Eilidh Shaw	260	Bellway Homes	4.31	Submission of Colvilles Road East Kilbride as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage EK04/009 former freescale site)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Stewart Milne Homes	261	Stewart Milne Holdings	4.31	Submission of South Hill of Dripps East Kilbride as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage EK11/004)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Ian Harvey	262		4.31	Submission of Land at Ferniegair as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage HM03/001 and HM03/002)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
David Torrance	263	Transport Scotland	4.39	I note the suggestion of land to be safeguarded at Law and Symington within Policy 16 Travel and Transport for new rail stations subject to the conclusions and recommendations of the Clydesdale Area STAG.	Noted
David Torrance	264	Transport Scotland	2.12	In relation to the Glasgow City Region Deal, Transport Scotland's interests in relation to trunk road mitigation in East Kilbride as a result of the CGA have been satisfactorily considered at this stage and delivery and funding of dualling of Stewartfield Way will not compromise this. You may wish to clarify details of the proposed £62m investment in the CGA locations, specifically East Kilbride and that this investment is separate to the delivery of dualling Stewartfield Way.	Noted – proposed plan will include more details about the projects highlighted in this representation.
Michael Walker	265	SSE Renewables	4.42	Have some concerns regarding the wording in Policy 19, and would request that this is revisited in order to encourage further low carbon development especially for the possibility of future repowering and its associated economic benefits. SSE would raise concern at the wording of this proposed policy in that a wind farm proposal 'must' comply with the Spatial Framework for Wind Turbines set out in Table 4.4 and Figure 4.1. SPP wording allows that a proposed development may not comply with the spatial framework but still be	Support noted and welcomed. Taking into consideration the comments made Policy 19 of the LDP has been revised to ensure that the appropriate weight is given to the spatial framework and the considerations set out in SPP paragraph 169. The majority of turbines within Clyde Wind Farm and its extension are located in Group 3 Areas with potential for wind energy development as shown in Figure 4.1. There are a low number of turbines located within Group 2 area. Primarily these are within the areas of the 2km buffer around settlements. SG 10 sets out guidance for

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>considered acceptable and appropriate to grant development consent. We therefore suggest that each application be judged on its individual planning merits and associated economic benefits and that the policy is reworded to reflect this.</p> <p>The maps within the chapter show that SSE's operational Clyde Wind Farm and Clyde Extension Wind Farm which are located within areas identified as Group 2: Areas of Significant Protection SSE would welcome clarification with regard to how potential proposals for extensions or repowering of these wind farms would be assessed against this Group 2 constraint.</p>	<p>community separation for consideration of visual impact. Any future repowering or extension proposals for Clyde Wind Farm and its extension will be considered against the relevant policy at that time. If proposals for repowering were to come forward at this current time, they would be assessed in accordance with the LDP and SG10.</p>
Cala Homes	266	CALA Homes (West)	4.31	Submission of Braehead Road Thorntonhall as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage EK11/006)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Hallam Land Management	267	Hallam Land Management	4.31	Submission of Jackton Road East Kilbride as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage EK04/004)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Gillian Kyle	268	SportScotland	4.31	<p>We have reviewed the site allocations and made best endeavours to pick up all relevant sites but if any have been overlooked we reiterate that the provisions of the SPP in relation to the loss of outdoor sports facilities would require consideration. We have identified 2 sites as having a sporting use:</p> <p><i>Blairbeth Golf Course, Rutherglen</i> - The site comprises a golf course which I note is now closed.</p> <p><i>EK04/014 – Westwoodhill Recreation Area, East Kilbride – 65 units</i> – This site contains 2 full size blaes pitches. sport scotland</p>	<p>Blairbeth – the proposal is for limited housing development and the majority of the former golf course being maintained and managed as a priority greenspace providing links to the Cathkin Braes Country Park. This is considered to accord with the principles of SPP.</p> <p>Westwoodhill – it is the Councils view that the sports pitches are not fit for purpose and modern multi use facilities are available in the neighbourhood.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				previously responded to consultation on this site. The Council advised that replacement pitches have been provided at Duncanrig Secondary School. Should there be an evidenced link between the disuse of the Westwood hill pitches and new provision at the school,	
Gladman Developments	269		4.31	Submission of Boghall Road Biggar as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage CL04/001)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Gillian Kyle	270	SportScotland	4.1	Policy 14 – We note there is a proposed amendment to the current policy wording around compensatory provision for loss of greenspace. It is not clear what the nature of this change would be. SPP seeks to protect outdoor sports facilities, as previously noted. A number of these are identified as priority areas to be protected through the Council's SG 'Green Network and Greenspace'. SPP provisions apply to all outdoor sports facilities as defined by the Development Management Regulations, not only those identified, and would seek that any policy amendment reflects SPP provisions in terms of the need for compensation.	Noted this will be addressed at proposed plan and review of SG stages.
Philip Graham	271	Savills	4.31	Submission of East Kilbride Road Cambuslang as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage CR02/001)	Site was assessed as part of the initial call for sites and found not to accord with strategy
Barratt	272	Barratt Homes	4.31	Submission of Kirkhill Golf Club Cambuslang as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage CR02/004)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Theo Philip	273	3R Energy Solutions Ltd	4.42	Requests that the re-worded LDP2 Policy 19 include further wording that allows for the consideration of applications to increase the yield from consented (but unbuilt) onshore wind projects, reflecting the change in economic circumstances for onshore wind in the UK since the previous LDP was prepared. This approach would be consistent with the Scottish Government's continued support for onshore wind deployment and build on the collaborative work being done by the industry and the Scottish Government to ensure that onshore wind projects can remain viable and can continue to deliver the carbon reduction and local economic benefits which flow from such projects.	It is recognised that Scottish Government is committed to renewable energy sector and this is set out their Draft Scottish Energy Strategy. The focus of the planning system is on providing guidance on the locations where particular renewables are most likely to be appropriate as well as shaping criteria to be taken in to account in the determination of applications. It is considered that LDP Policy 19 does not preclude consideration of applications to increase the yield through revised tip heights or layouts. Each case requires to be considered on its own merits. The greater tips heights of 130m plus will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the updated SG10. It is proposed that this SG is updated and issued for consultation alongside the Proposed Plan.
Robertson Homes	274	Robertson Homes	4.31	Submission of Peel Road Thorntonhall as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage EK11/005 and EK11/003)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
CSK Land Ltd	275		4.31	Submission of Westend Farm East Kilbride as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage EK04/011)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
John Young	276	South Lanarkshire Against Unconventional Gas	4.47	Objects to inclusion of reference to extraction of coal bed methane or shale gas in policy 20. Strongly object to 'unconventional gas extraction' including fracking in South Lanarkshire.	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position.
Rubicon Land Limited	277	Rubicon Land Limited	4.15	Submission of Dalmarnock Road Farme Cross as reallocation from Core Industrial Business Area to white land or commercial land. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites	Noted: Consideration will be given to the most appropriate way of representing the various development proposals within Clyde Gateway on the Cambuslang/Rutherglen settlement map which is issued with the Proposed Plan.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				stage CR01/001)	This could form a more detailed inset to the LDP proposals map
Glengeith Trust	278	C/O PPCA	4.31	Submission of Former Electricity Sub-station at Elvanfoot as an alternative housing site/or business use. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage CL28/001)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Ewan Bachel	279		4.32	The Clyde and Avon Valley Landscape Partnership would like to propose that the sites identified in the 2015 report produced by the British Geological Survey on behalf of the Clyde and Avon Valley Landscape Partnership to be considered for Local Geodiversity Site designation. This would provide these sites with a formal level of protection and recognition, and would help to underpin Supplementary Guidance 9.	Noted. As stated in the MIR the identification of LNCS is being taken forward through the preparation of the South Lanarkshire Local Biodiversity Strategy. All suggestions for potential LNCS made through the consultation on the MIR shall be passed to the Council's Countryside and Greenspace Team for consideration. In the meantime, policy NHE21 in Supplementary Guidance 9 Natural and Historic Environment requires that development proposals should have no significant adverse impact on geodiversity and soils, and makes provision for local geodiversity features to be retained in situ where feasible We do not currently have a system in place for the identification and designation of sites of local geodiversity importance, but the Council aims to work with external partners to progress this
William McGregor & Son	280		4.31	Submission of Mauldslie Road Luggie Road Carluke as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage CL10/008)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Wallace Land	281		4.31	Submission of Shott Farm Blantyre as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage HM05/001)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Taylor Wimpey Homes	282		4.31	Submission of Auldhouse Road/Shields Road East Kilbride as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				stage EK01/001)	
Margaret Greene	283	Strathclyde Geoconservation Group	4.33	Suggests that future identification of LNCS should include geological LNCS.	We do not currently have a system in place for the identification and designation of sites of local geodiversity importance, but the Council aims to work with external partners to progress this.
J Orr	284		4.31	Submission of Hyndford Bridge Lanark as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage CL33/001)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Rory Doherty	285		4.31	Submission of Muirkirk Road Strathaven as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage EK10/005)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
D.W. Leggat	286		4.31	Submission of Broomelton Road Larkhall as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage HM12/003)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Ashfield Land (Glasgow) Ltd	287		4.31	Submission of Jerviswood Lanark as an alternative housing site. (Previously submitted at Call for Sites stage CL38/005)	Site was assessed as part of initial Call for Sites and found not to accord with strategy.
Alistair Stewart	288	Jackton and Thorntonhall Community Council	4.31	Objects to further housing being added to the land supply and sites which are not coming forward should be removed from the land audit.	Comments noted. The Council removes sites from that audit that are unlikely ever to be developed. However if a site has consent or is a long term development opportunity these remain in the audit.
INEOS Upstream Ltd	289		4.47	INEOS supports the preferred option and believes that a separate minerals policy is necessary but believes that there should also be a separate policy dealing with onshore Oil and Gas, including Coal Bed Methane and Shale Gas. The issue is sufficiently distinct and complicated to warrant its own SG, which is the approach adopted by other planning authorities across the U.K.	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				There needs also to be recognition that onshore hydrocarbons are different from other forms of minerals extraction. Therefore, this representation seeks to have a separate policy to cover onshore hydrocarbons.	
Barratt	290	Barratt Homes	4.3	The South Lanarkshire LDP MIR places an over reliance on sites that have been allocated for residential development for some time and which have not delivered housing development as had been expected. Consider that the Council must be much more realistic about their housing delivery rates, and also whether CGA sites such as Carluke will ever deliver the units anticipated of them. Indeed, rather than rely on several sites of questionable effectiveness we consider that an alternative approach is required to ensure the emerging LDP provides a generous supply of land for housing which meets the needs of the whole Council area. The new LDP must ensure that requirements are met by allocating sufficient suitable and effective sites for housing and either replacing or supplementing some of the aforementioned sites with more appropriate and market facing opportunities, such as the land at Airdrie Road, Carluke which is subject of this representation.	The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
Barratt	291	Barratt Homes	4.8	Objects to the continued over-reliance on the CGA's and also to some of the Development Framework and Residential Masterplan sites that are afforded support in the MIR, and	See Response to No 290

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>through this representation are seeking to have land at Airdrie Road, Carluke included as a Development Framework or Residential Masterplan site in addition to or instead of sites that are currently preferred.</p> <p>In terms of the Development Framework sites, object to the proposed designation of Blairbeth Golf Course for approximately 140 houses as this location is of limited housebuilder interest</p> <p>Residential Masterplan Sites, it is unclear what the rationale is for the MIR affording support for housing development on the sites at Peel Road, Thorntonhall and both Strathaven sites. We also question the effectiveness of the East Whitlawburn site. We question the effectiveness of the Glassford Road site in terms of visual and landscape impact and also development viability given the minor road that sub-divides the site.</p> <p>Although not specified, the two Strathaven sites could have potential for approximately 300-400 houses (East Overton extension) and 100 houses (Glassford Road) and we are firmly of the view that these cannot be relied on to deliver the housing that might be expected over the Plan period,</p>	
Barratt	292	Barratt Homes	4.12	<p>Would urge the Council to ensure that settlement boundaries are altered in all circumstances to reflect any variation between the definition of a site in the adopted LDP and the precise boundaries of any planning permission that has been granted for that same site.</p>	<p>The Council monitors the detailed boundary of the green belt around settlements to take account of consents that have been granted for developments on the edge of settlements. The boundary changes are made to the proposals maps during the preparation of the LDP and presented in a Technical Report for public consultation.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Barratt	293	Barratt Homes	4.31	Table 4.3 of the MIR then sets out the picture on land supply as defined within the 2015 Housing Land Audit. Non-Effective Land Supply is dominated by the Community Growth Areas and whilst these will deliver a number of new homes up to 2029, they will also likely continue to be developed beyond 2029. Non-Effective Land Supply also includes some large brownfield sites that have so far failed to come forward into development for over 10 years. 3 sites for up to a total of 295 new homes are identified as possible additional sites for inclusion within the local development plan. Therefore, before any adjustments to take into account the necessary amendments to Clydeplan 2 are made, land for up to 300 homes is still needed which then suggests that the emerging plan needs to actually release land for up to 1,500 new homes that is effective of capable of becoming effective up to 2024.	See Response to No 290
Mr Robert Freel	294		3.1	The vision statement does not go far enough and does not mention urban or rural areas concentrating on the larger populated areas and towns of South Lanarkshire. Within the Spatial Strategy table 3.1 there should have been an area for urban or rural growth areas with this being further defined.	This will be considered further when redrafting policies and text in the proposed plan.
Mr Robert Freel	295		4.3	Comments on Spatial Strategy: No definition of major developments - should be related to local circumstances. Why does a balance between sustainable economic development and environmental issues require to be made when this was	Comments noted. The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy policy in the proposed plan to set out more detail for the various local areas of South Lanarkshire. The strategy sets the overall policy direction for the LDP and this includes a balance between economic development and environmental issues, but individual

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>ignored for Dovesdale? Does reference in Strategy mean that only brownfield sites will be examined in rural areas? Account should also be taken within the strategy of areas of land where planning has been provided for housing or development, where planning has been granted and has been sitting undeveloped for more that 6-8 years</p>	<p>development proposals must be determined on their merits against development plan policy and other material considerations Further guidance on appropriate development opportunities in the Green Belt and rural area is contained in SG 2. As regards housing land sites are assessed on an annual basis and the Housing Land Audit amended according. Sites do get removed if appropriate but in many case sites are subject to planning applications which have not been implemented and as such cannot be removed from the audit. If a site has been in the audit for a number of years and no progress is made the site is designated non-effective and does not contribute to the effective land supply.</p>
Robert Freel	296		4.4	<p>Question 2 Alternative Options The council should encourage all suitable types of development in consultation with local communities /stakeholders. These all should be explored.</p>	Noted
Robert Freel	297		4.7	<p>Preferred option – Insufficient detail is being provided on these new sites. More information should have been included in the MIR Consideration should be given to Stonehouse site next to Baratt estate and to re-examine the village boundary in relation to village growth. The Avon river is a natural boundary line as opposed to using the old railway line and is more natural to the landscape. The site references HM11/003 and HM/005 should be considered as areas to round the village of following the natural boundary of the river Avon.</p>	<p>The Call for Sites document contains more detail on the sites submitted for consideration in the MIR as development framework sites and residential masterplan sites. The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
Robert Freel	298		4.12	Question 7 Consideration should be given to extending the boundary of Stonehouse beyond the old railway line which was earmarked for the Stonehouse Bypass.	The Council does not consider that a settlement boundary amendment to include this site is required. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP strategy. <i>This site was considered at the Examination of LDP1 and was rejected by the Reporter. With regard to the settlement boundary the Reporter concluded that the A71 Strathaven Road corridor provides a logical and strong settlement boundary. This by-pass marks the northern edge of the existing and proposed built-up area of Stonehouse over the plan period. I find that the proposal for a major new release of land to the north-west of this trunk road, would be a substantial and illogical breaching of that boundary into the surrounding green belt land that extends into the wider countryside.</i> The council considers that the local circumstances and the planning reasoning with regard to this site have not changed significantly in the intervening period.
Robert Freel	299		4.13	Question 8 Disagree with the alternative option that no modifications should be made to settlement boundaries. The site references HM11/003 and HM/005	The Council does not consider that a settlement boundary amendment to include these sites is required. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. The sites have been assessed and do not accord

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				should be considered as areas to round the village of following the natural boundary of the river Avon	with the LDP strategy. <i>Site HM11/003 was considered at the Examination of LDP1 and was rejected by the Reporter. With regard to the settlement boundary the Reporter concluded that the A71 Strathaven Road corridor provides a logical and strong settlement boundary. This by-pass marks the northern edge of the existing and proposed built-up area of Stonehouse over the plan period. I find that the proposal for a major new release of land to the north-west of this trunk road, would be a substantial and illogical breaching of that boundary into the surrounding green belt land that extends into the wider countryside.</i> The council considers that the local circumstances and the planning reasoning with regard to this site have not changed significantly in the intervening period and that the same arguments apply to HM11/005
Robert Freel	300		4.16	Land and business Property Review The report that was commissioned by the council should have been made available as part of the local plan process and included in the MIR. This may have given a better insight into the thinking behind some of the policies. This should be issued to those submitting comments to establish if it affects their submission.	The report was commissioned by another Council Service for their use and was not specifically prepared as a background paper for the MIR. Therefore it was not issued for public consultation alongside the MIR.
Robert Freel	301		4.18	Preferred option –Disagree with the removal of all four areas highlighted on the map within Stonehouse. The areas shown for deletion should not be deleted as this may deter small local business from seeking to develop in these areas. The Coop, Post office, Chinese Takeaway and barbers are all being excluded from the boundary if this proceeds.	Noted, however a more detailed map shows that everything except the barbers is still included within the village centre. The barber's outwith the village centre is an acceptable use in a general urban area.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				No explanation behind the re-designation of the boundary, it would be useful to understand why this is being proposed as it looks as though its just being shrunk and moving north to south.	
Robert Freel	302		4.18	Question 12 No the village centre should not be reduced per the proposed option although the addition to the boundary should be included. Open to alternative options being put forward.	Noted
Robert Freel	303		4.31	Question 13 - Preferred option - No these sites should not be designated as housing as the council does not follow the same criteria for assessing all sites. CR02/002 Hallside East is outwith the boundary, is green belt and therefore should not be allowed. EK04/014 Westwoodhill is a recreational playing field and the council should not be proposing to build in these areas. This land also acts as a green boundary EK04/003 west of Redwood drive. Outwith the natural boundary.	The Council has developed a standard methodology for assessing proposed development sites. This includes consideration of their location, relationship to settlement pattern and landscape impact.
Robert Freel	304		4.31	Question 14 Each site brought forward requires to be judged on its merit and the requirements and supply within the immediate environs, therefore the alternative option should also be rejected	Noted
Robert Freel	305		4.33	Question 15 Yes, the policy should be changed to incorporate LNC sites	Support noted.
Robert	306		4.33	Question 16 We disagree that the policy	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Freel				remains unchanged and does not make provision for LNCS.	
Robert Freel	307		4.36	<p>Question 17 Yes we agree the identification and designation of areas as local nature reserves , however council should ensure that it can assist local groups in developing these areas as providing support and making funding available to enhance these areas.</p> <p>With regards to Stonehouse why is the full park area not included as well as the area to the south east of station park and the area that runs to the horse pool which is a right of way and could link up with the park and provide a natural linkage.</p>	Noted, we will consider the proposed boundary expansion. The council works closely with groups on many of the proposed LNRs and will continue to assist as required.
Robert Freel	308		4.36	<p>Question 18 We disagree with the alternative option that all sites brought forward should be rejected</p>	Noted
Robert Freel	309		4.39	<p>Question 19 Yes we agree that these sites should be reserved as potential sites for railway stations however why only Clydesdale. With Larkhall being a success, extensions to Argyll line could consider other sites south of Hamilton.</p>	Noted, However this would be a long term project that would require major infrastructure funding outwith the remit of this plan.
Robert Freel	310		4.42	<p>Question 20 Preferred option - Yes these should be included in the plan Figure 4.1 should be amended to at least provide place or recognisable landmarks in the map. Table 4.4 the Spatial Framework for onshore wind farms should be amended as follows: Group 1 Areas where wind farms will not be acceptable: In addition to National Parks and National Scenic areas, world heritage sites,</p>	<p>Figure 4.1 in MIR is illustrative of more detailed mapping which accompanies SG 10 Renewable Energy. It is recommended that the SG maps are used in conjunction with this strategy map when considering wind energy proposals.</p> <p>These categories are defined and set by Scottish Government through SPP and cannot be changed at the local level. World Heritage Sites and SSSIs are included</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				and SSSI should be added. Community separation or identifiable edge should be clearly marked in the plan and not left to be determined by the planning authority.	within Group 2 in accordance with the requirements set out in SPP. Noted: SG 10 paras 4.19 – 4.24 contains an explanation of how the Council deals with community separation in relation to wind energy applications. It is not considered necessary to go into this level of detail in the LDP. SG10 was adopted in March 2017. It is proposed that this SG is updated and issued for consultation alongside the Proposed Plan
Robert Freel	311		4.42	Question 20 - Alternative Options Whilst it is a statutory requirement to include in the plan does that mean the council has a statutory obligation to ensure it happens Council did not provide an option to suggest alternative options therefore the Council could have intimated that they adopt a policy of a) No further inshore wind farms or single turbines within South Lanarkshire for the duration of the next plan.	National Planning Framework 3 (NPF3) June 2014 sets out the long term vision for the development of Scotland and SPP aligns itself with NPF3. SPP sets out national planning policies which states that development plans should seek to ensure an area's full potential for electricity and heat from renewable sources is achieved in line with national climate change targets, giving due regard to relevant environmental, community and cumulative impact considerations. SPP states at paragraph 166 that moratoria on onshore wind development are not appropriate. Given that Government policy strongly supports renewable energy it is not considered reasonable to present the suggested wording as an alternative option.
Robert Freel	312		4.47	Question 21 - Preferred option – Yes it is agreed that a new policy should be incorporated into the plan and that the MLDP should be amalgamated into LDP2 A Spatial framework for minerals development should also be drawn up that provides areas for potential development and that these be identified as a) Coal bed methane b) Shale gas. Applications should have regard to those areas detailed on page 49 which outlines	Comments noted. A separate policy volume will be prepared which will deal with all aspects of mineral development. Any applications for minerals development will be assessed against the appropriate policies and guidance. All of the policies produced will take account of stakeholder input.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>areas where development will not be acceptable and areas where more scrutiny is required.</p> <p>The reference to council balancing the economic benefits from any such development against potential impacts on the environment and local communities requires to be re-worded in that it requires to take account of stakeholder input and any health impacts on local communities.</p>	
Robert Freel	313		4.47	<p>Minerals Development - Alternative Option No - should not be retained as a separate document, if it's contained in one area it's easier to access by members of the public.</p>	Noted
Robert Freel	314		4.47	<p>Question 22 Alternative option - No - Perhaps mention should be made to the Scottish Government consultation exercise on Un-conventional extraction and resulting findings as this could have an impact on any policy agreed.</p>	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position.
Robert Freel	315		4.48	<p>Other Issues - Appendix 2 Potential Development Framework sites; The site references HM11/003 and HM/005 should be considered as areas to round the village of following the natural boundary of the river Avon.</p> <p>Technical Report 3 page 9 indicates no significant issues regards Stonehouse, I would disagree with this statement as parking and traffic management on new street is an issue indicates.</p> <p>Places Standards report does not reflect care and maintenance or public transport</p>	<p>The Council does not consider that a settlement boundary amendment to include this site is required. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP strategy.</p> <p>The table in Technical Report 3 relates to significant road capacity issues and was based on information from SLC Roads and Transportation.</p> <p>The Place Standards model takes account of these issues. The low scores for public transport and streets and spaces from Stonehouse consultees have been reflected in the diagram on page 14.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>issues. Monitoring Report records the loss of the public hall but not 4-5 the cross or the public Institute. The loss due to fire and the derelict building should also be brought into consideration on cleaning up the village centre</p> <p>Housing - Areas where planning consent has been provided but no development has started or taken place should be incorporated into the local plan. These should include the original date of the planning permission and number of allowed extensions.</p>	<p>The data in the Monitoring Report is based on analysis of planning applications so does not record changes that were outwith this process. The LDP proposals maps which are prepared at Proposed Plan stage will include the current sites recorded in the annual Housing Land Audit.</p>
Robert Freel	316	Stonehouse Community Council	3.1	<p>The vision statement does not go far enough and does not mention urban or rural areas concentrating on the larger populated areas and towns of South Lanarkshire.. Somewhere within the Spatial Strategy table 3.1 there should have been an area for urban or rural growth areas with this being further defined.</p>	<p>This will be considered further when redrafting policies and text in the proposed plan.</p>
Robert Freel	317	Stonehouse Community Council	4.3	<p>Comments on Spatial Strategy: no definition of major developments - should be related to local circumstances. Why does a balance between sustainable economic development and environmental issues require to be made when this was ignored for Dovesdale? Does reference in Strategy mean that only brownfield sites will be examined in rural areas? Account should also be taken within the strategy of areas of land where planning has</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy policy in the proposed plan to set out more detail for the various local areas of South Lanarkshire. The strategy sets the overall policy direction for the LDP and this includes a balance between economic development and environmental issues, but individual development proposals must be determined on their merits against development plan policy and other material considerations Further guidance on appropriate development opportunities in the Green Belt and rural area is contained in SG 2.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				been provided for housing or development, where planning has been granted and has been sitting undeveloped for more than 6-8 years	As regards housing land sites are assessed on an annual basis and the Housing Land Audit amended accordingly. Sites do get removed if appropriate but in many cases sites are subject to planning applications which have not been implemented and as such cannot be removed from the audit. If a site has been in the audit for a number of years and no progress is made the site is designated non-effective and does not contribute to the effective land supply.
Robert Freel	318	Stonehouse Community Council	4.4	Question 2 Alternative Options The council should encourage all suitable types of development in consultation with local communities /stakeholders. These all should be explored.	Noted
Robert Freel	319	Stonehouse Community Council	4.7	Preferred option –Insufficient detail is being provided on these new sites. More information should have been included in the MIR Consideration should be given to Stonehouse site next to Baratt estate and to re-examine the village boundary in relation to village growth. The Avon river is a natural boundary line as opposed to using the old railway line and is more natural to the landscape. The site references HM11/003 and HM/005 should be considered as areas to round the village of following the natural boundary of the river Avon.	The Call for Sites document contains more detail on the sites submitted for consideration in the MIR as development framework sites and residential masterplan sites. The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
Robert Freel	320	Stonehouse Community Council	4.12	Question 7 Consideration should be given to extending the boundary of Stonehouse beyond the old railway line which was earmarked for the Stonehouse Bypass.	<p>The Council does not consider that a settlement boundary amendment to include this site is required. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. The site has been assessed and do not accord with the LDP strategy.</p> <p><i>This site was considered at the Examination of LDP1 and was rejected by the Reporter. With regard to the settlement boundary the Reporter concluded that the A71 Strathaven Road corridor provides a logical and strong settlement boundary. This by-pass marks the northern edge of the existing and proposed built-up area of Stonehouse over the plan period. I find that the proposal for a major new release of land to the north-west of this trunk road, would be a substantial and illogical breaching of that boundary into the surrounding green belt land that extends into the wider countryside.</i></p> <p>The council considers that the local circumstances and the planning reasoning with regard to this site have not changed significantly in the intervening period.</p>
Robert Freel	321	Stonehouse Community Council	4.13	Question 8 Disagree with the alternative option that no modifications should be made to settlement boundaries. The site references HM11/003 and HM/005 should be considered as areas to round the village of following the natural boundary of the river Avon	<p>The Council does not consider that a settlement boundary amendment to include these sites is required. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. The sites have been assessed and do not accord with the LDP strategy.</p> <p><i>Site HM11/003 was considered at the Examination of LDP1 and was rejected by the Reporter. With regard to the settlement boundary the Reporter concluded that the A71 Strathaven Road corridor provides a logical and strong</i></p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					<p><i>settlement boundary. This by-pass marks the northern edge of the existing and proposed built-up area of Stonehouse over the plan period. I find that the proposal for a major new release of land to the north-west of this trunk road, would be a substantial and illogical breaching of that boundary into the surrounding green belt land that extends into the wider countryside.</i></p> <p>The council considers that the local circumstances and the planning reasoning with regard to this site have not changed significantly in the intervening period and that the same arguments apply to HM11/005</p>
Robert Freel	322	Stonehouse Community Council	4.16	<p>Land and business Property Review The report that was commissioned by the council should have been made available as part of the local plan process and included in the MIR. This may have given a better insight into the thinking behind some of the policies. This should be issued to those submitting comments to establish if it affects their submission</p>	<p>The report was commissioned by another Council Service for their use and was not specifically prepared as a background paper for the MIR. Therefore it was not issued for public consultation alongside the MIR.</p>
Robert Freel	323	Stonehouse Community Council	4.18	<p>Preferred option –Disagree with the removal of all four areas highlighted on the map within Stonehouse . The areas shown for deletion should not be deleted as this may deter small local business from seeking to develop in these areas. The Coop, Post office, Chinese Takeaway and barbers are all being excluded from the boundary if this proceeds.</p> <p>No explanation behind the re-designation of the boundary, it would be useful to understand why this is being proposed as it looks as though its just being shrunk and moving north to south.</p>	<p>Noted, however a more detailed map shows that everything except the barbers is still included within the village centre. The barber's outwith the village centre is an acceptable use in a general urban area.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Robert Freel	324	Stonehouse Community Council	4.31	<p>Question 13 - Preferred option - No these sites should not be designated as housing as the council does not follow the same criteria for assessing all sites. CR02/002 Hallside East is outwith the boundary, is green belt and therefore should not be allowed. EK04/014 Westwoodhill is a recreational playing field and the council should not be proposing to build in these areas. This land also acts as a green boundary EK04/003 west of Redwood drive. Outwith the natural boundary. Alternative site to these is Stonehouse north</p>	The Council has developed a standard methodology for assessing proposed development sites. This includes consideration of their location, relationship to settlement pattern and landscape impact.
Robert Freel	325	Stonehouse Community Council	4.18	<p>Question 12 Alternative option - No the village centre should not be reduced per the proposed option although the addition to the boundary should be included. Open to alternative options being put forward</p>	Noted
Robert Freel	326	Stonehouse Community Council	4.31	<p>Question 14 Alternative option - Each site brought forward requires to be judged on its merits and the requirements and supply within the immediate environs, therefore the alternative option should also be rejected.</p>	noted
Robert Freel	327	Stonehouse Community Council	4.33	<p>Question 16 Alternative option - We disagree that the policy remains unchanged and does not make provision for LNCS.</p>	Noted
Robert Freel	328	Stonehouse Community Council	4.33	<p>Question 15 Preferred option - Yes, the policy should be changed to incorporate LNC sites</p>	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Robert Freel	329	Stonehouse Community Council	4.36	<p>Question 17 Preferred option Yes we agree the identification and designation of areas as local nature reserves , however council should ensure that it can assist local groups in developing these areas as providing support and making funding available to enhance these areas. With regards to Stonehouse why is the full park area not included as well as the area to the south east of station park and the area that runs to the horse pool which is a right of way and could link up with the park and provide a natural linkage</p>	Noted, we will consider the proposed boundary expansion. The council works closely with groups on many of the proposed LNRs and will continue to assist as required.
Robert Freel	330	Stonehouse Community Council	4.37	<p>Question 18 Alternative option We disagree with the alternative option that all sites brought forward should be rejected.</p>	Noted
Robert Freel	331	Stonehouse Community Council	4.39	<p>Question 19 Preferred option – Travel and Transport Yes we agree that these sites should be reserved as potential sites for railway stations however why only Clydesdale. With Larkhall being a success, extensions to Argyll line south of Hamilton could be considered.</p>	Noted, However this would be a long term project that would require major infrastructure funding outwith the remit of this plan.
Robert Freel	332	Stonehouse Community Council	4.42	<p>Question 20 Preferred option - Yes these should be included in the plan however Figure 4.1 should be amended to at least provide place or recognisable landmarks in the map. Table 4.4 which outlines the Spatial Framework for onshore wind farms should be amended as follows: Group 1 Areas where wind farms will not be acceptable: In addition to National Parks and National Scenic areas, world heritage sites,</p>	<p>See Rep 310 Figure 4.1 in MIR is illustrative of more detailed mapping which accompanies SG 10 Renewable Energy. It is recommended that the SG maps are used in conjunction with this strategy map when considering wind energy proposals. These categories are defined and set by Scottish Government through SPP and cannot be changed at the local level. World Heritage Sites and SSSIs are included within Group 2 in accordance with the requirements set out</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				and SSSI should be added. Community separation or identifiable edge should be clearly marked in the plan and not left to be determined by the planning authority.	in SPP. Noted: SG 10 paras 4.19 – 4.24 contains an explanation of how the Council deals with community separation in relation to wind energy applications. It is not considered necessary to go into this level of detail in the LDP.
Robert Freel	333	Stonehouse Community Council	4.42	Question 20 - Alternative Options Whilst it is a statutory requirement to include in the plan does that mean the council has a statutory obligation to ensure it happens Council did not provide an option to suggest alternative options therefore the Council could have intimated that they adopt a policy of a) No further inshore wind farms or single turbines within South Lanarkshire for the duration of the next plan.	National Planning Framework 3 (NPF3) June 2014 sets out the long term vision for the development of Scotland and SPP aligns itself with NPF3. SPP sets out national planning polices which states that development plans should seek to ensure an area's full potential for electricity and heat from renewable sources is achieved in line with national climate change targets, giving due regard to relevant environmental, community and cumulative impact considerations. SPP states at paragraph 166 that moratoria on onshore wind development are not appropriate. Given that Government policy strongly supports renewable energy it is not considered reasonable to present the suggested wording as an alternative option
Robert Freel	334	Stonehouse Community Council	4.47	Question 21 - Preferred option Yes it is agreed that a new policy should be incorporated into the plan and that the MLDP should be amalgamated into LDP2 A Spatial framework for minerals development should also be drawn up that provides areas for potential development and that these be identified as a) Coal bed methane b) Shale gas. Applications should have regard to those areas detailed on page 49 which outlines areas where development will not be acceptable and areas where more scrutiny is required. Perhaps these should be included	Comments noted. Any applications for minerals development will be assessed against the appropriate policies and guidance. All of the policies produced will take account of stakeholder input.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>within the plan.</p> <p>The reference to council balancing the economic benefits from any such development against potential impacts on the environment and local communities requires to be re-worded in that it requires to take account of stakeholder input and any health impacts on local communities.</p>	
Robert Freel	335	Stonehouse Community Council	4.47	<p>Alternative Option Minerals Development</p> <p>No - should not be retained as a separate document, if it's contained in one area it's easier to access by members of the public.</p>	Noted
Robert Freel	336	Stonehouse Community Council	4.47	<p>Question 22 Alternative option No. - Perhaps mention should be made to the Scottish Government consultation exercise on Un-conventional extraction and resulting findings as this could have an impact on any policy agreed.</p>	This will be removed from the plan given the Scottish Governments current position.
Robert Freel	337	Stonehouse Community Council	4.48	<p>Other Issues Technical report 3 indicates no significant issues within Stonehouse however this is in the opinion of the author of the report, who did they consult with. Parking and traffic flow is an issue on new street. Continuation of the Stonehouse bypass is another issue. Place standards does not pick up on care and maintenance or public transport.</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Areas where planning consent has been provided but no development has started or taken place should be incorporated into the local plan. These should include the original date of the planning permission and number of allowed extensions.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider that a settlement boundary amendment to include this site is required. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP strategy.</p> <p>The table in Technical Report 3 relates to significant road capacity issues and was based on information from SLC Roads and Transportation.</p> <p>The Place Standards model takes account of these issues. The low scores for public transport and streets and spaces from Stonehouse consultees have been reflected in the diagram on page 14.</p> <p>The data in the Monitoring Report is based on analysis of planning applications so does not record changes that were outwith this process.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					The LDP proposals maps which are prepared at Proposed Plan stage will include the current sites recorded in the annual Housing Land Audit.
Gladman Developments	338		4.31	<p>Gladman wishes to raise a concern that the housing figures, which form the basis of the MIR, have clear discrepancies regarding past completion rates when comparing figures in the Monitoring Statement, current and past Housing Land Audits (HLA) and also the Scottish Government records for new build housing completions in South Lanarkshire.</p> <p>Prior to the development and publication of the Proposed Plan, South Lanarkshire should publish an up to date housing land audit that clearly highlights past completions with detailed information and evidence as to where the figures were obtained from and calculated.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position.</p> <p>To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan.</p> <p>All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.</p>
Gladman Developments	339		4.2	<p>The Preferred Spatial Strategy encourages sustainable development, however by limiting growth to only certain areas within South Lanarkshire, the remaining settlements may be susceptible to greater growth disparities.</p> <p>Potential housing allocations should demonstrate they are located in appropriate and marketable areas supported by the Spatial Strategy.</p>	See response to No 338
Gladman	340		4.4	Question 2 – Alternative Options	The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Developments				<p>The two alternative options show two extremes and are worded in a way that is essentially all or nothing. There is no reasonable alternative spatial strategy which incorporates the potential for small-medium scale developments in some settlements that have not been identified previously. From the two alternatives it is obvious the spatial strategy has been developed as a compromise between the two alternatives, however, it is clear that the spatial strategy is tailored more towards limiting growth. As with the response to question 1, the strategy should do more to encourage development that can be proven to be beneficial and effective with the positive significantly outweighing any potential negative impacts.</p>	<p>policy in the proposed plan to set out more detail for the various local areas of South Lanarkshire. The preferred spatial strategy takes into account the anticipated requirement for land for different types of development over the plan period. The aim is to balance development against environmental protection rather than limiting growth as suggested.</p>
Gladman Developments	341		4.7	<p>The Council's site selection is limited and additional, deliverable sites with capacity for development should be included. Gladman is promoting a site at Station Road, Carluke for residential development and should be considered due to its suitability and effectiveness. Developing a masterplan for the site can allow for key landscape features to be included in proposals and allow for the site to be further integrated into both the existing settlement and also the neighbouring landscape. The attached vision document supports the inclusion of the site in the Proposed Plan.</p>	<p>See response to No 338</p>
Gladman Developments	342		4.8	<p>Question 6 – Alternative Option – Gladman disagrees with the alternative option. Sites should be added as</p>	<p>See response to No 338</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				development framework sites or residential masterplan sites if they can be considered as suitable alternatives or housing sites. No additional sites will be detrimental to the economy and the sustainable growth of communities and South Lanarkshire as a whole.	
Gladman Developments	343		4.12	Question 7 – Preferred Option Alter the settlement boundary to the west of Carluke to include the land at Station Road as per Gladman's development proposal. There are existing physical features that could be incorporated into providing a strong and robust settlement edge, unlike the current format of the settlement boundary.	The Council does not consider that a settlement boundary amendment to include this site is required. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. The site has been assessed through the Supplementary Consultation and does not accord with the LDP strategy. The Council considers that the West Coast railway line provides a robust and defensible western boundary for the settlement of Carluke.
Gladman Developments	344		4.12	Question 8 – Alternative Option Gladman disagrees with the alternative option. The Council should look to alter settlement boundaries to incorporate and facilitate sustainable growth on the edge/adjointing existing settlements.	The Council does not consider that further settlement boundary amendments are required in addition to those identified in MIR. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit.
Gladman Developments	345		4.19	The Council is failing to provide sufficient housing land to meet the needs of South Lanarkshire. Given the modifications sought by the Reporter during the Examination Report of SDP2, the 15% increase in generosity on all tenures results in a housing shortfall, this shortfall is something that has not been addressed in the MIR.	See response to No 338
Gladman Developments	346		4.31	Question 14 – Alternative Option Gladman does not agree with the alternative	See response to No 338

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				option. South Lanarkshire Council should have a wide range of housing sites allocated and rejecting all the sites submitted through the call for sites process would be restrictive of growth and would not result in a flexible housing land supply. A range of new allocations would allow for a flexible supply and help contribute to the housing shortfall, compared to the previous LDP.	
Coal Authority	347		Table 4.1	The Coal Authority notes that no major changes are proposed to Policy 4 – Development Management and Placemaking, but that it is proposed to add additional criterion to protect mineral resources.	Noted
Coal Authority	348		4.4	Support – The Coal Authority is pleased to see that the whole Council area for South Lanarkshire has been identified as an ‘Area of Search’ for minerals, including coal. The Coal Authority supports the acknowledgement that no PEDL’s have been awarded in South Lanarkshire but that unconventional hydrocarbons are found throughout the area and these may be a source of potential future mineral activity	Support noted
Coal Authority	349		4.47	The Coal Authority supports the inclusion of Policy 20 Minerals Development as part of LDP2 and support the preferred option of introducing a new policy for minerals into the plan, alongside providing supplementary guidance on minerals as an accompaniment to the plan which considers this area in more detail. The Coal Authority consider that it is	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				appropriate to make reference to the extraction of hydrocarbons in this policy in order to provide a framework for consideration of such applications should these come forward	
Everris Limited	350	Everiss	4.44	<p>The wording of Policy 20 is not acceptable and does not accord with SPP. SG's do not have the same scrutiny as LDP's and a stand alone policy for peat should be included in the LDP. The following wording is proposed:</p> <p><i>" Proposals for peat extraction or continued extraction will be permitted in the following circumstances:</i></p> <p><i>1. the deposit has previously been or is currently being worked and is capable of restoration to peatland;</i></p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p><i>2. the deposit: * has been damaged by human activity; * is of low conservation value; * can be restored to peatland." .</i></p>	SPP Para 241 states that peat extraction should only be permitted in areas suffering historic, significant damage through human activity and where the conservations value is low and restoration is impossible. Peat should only be allowed where these terms can be met. It is considered that new peat extraction sites in South Lanarkshire are limited if available at all. It is therefore considered that peat extraction can comfortably sit within an SG and should not be assessed like minerals where the economic benefits are assessed against any disbenefits.
David Kelly	351	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.2	<p>Question 1: Preferred option</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1 of the MIR, policies in the LDP may be subject to minor changes of wording to improve their clarity. Where existing policies include the phrase "no significant impacts...on biodiversity (including Natura 2000 sites and protected species)..." or similar, suggest that clarity could be improved by specifically referencing the need for there to be no adverse effects on the integrity of Natura sites. For example, the wording of criterion iii in existing LDP Policy 18 could be amended to read:</p>	Comments noted the proposed wording changes will be included in the revised policy(s) in the proposed plan.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>"The development will have no significant impact on any natural or built heritage features, including the green belt, agricultural land, landscape and landscape character, habitats or species, and no adverse impact on the integrity of any Natura 2000 site."</p> <p>Question 2: Alternative options – Spatial Strategy Option 1 –, it is not possible to comment on how realistic or achievable this option would be in the context of other plan objectives.</p> <p>Option 2 -, this would not be in line with the Planning Outcomes of SPP</p>	
David Kelly	352	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.5	<p>Question 5: Preferred option – Development Framework Sites and Residential Masterplan Sites</p> <p>There appears to be an appropriate surplus of housing land allocated to meet the Housing Need & Demand Assessment (HNDA) and SPP requirements. The allocation of additional land in LDP2 would appear to add to the generosity of housing land and we suggest that if you intend to allocate further land consideration should be given to the alignment of this allocation with the proposed SDP2 'compact city model' strategy, which has been agreed by member authorities.</p>	Noted
David Kelly	353	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.5	<p>Development Framework Sites</p> <p>We broadly agree with the preferred option. However, a large part of the former Blairbeth Golf Course golf course has recently been awarded funding through our Green</p>	Noted – discussions will take place to ensure all concerns are addressed.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>Infrastructure Strategic Intervention programme to establish open space. We are unclear where the 7 hectares proposed for residential development on this site are located in relation to the proposed open space. There is potential to deliver improved access for walking and cycling to the new open space and wider Cathkin Braes from Fernhill Road, through the delivery of off-site improvements to the remnant avenue that runs along the edge of Tormusk Road and connects to the former club house.</p>	
David Kelly	354	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.6	<p>Residential Masterplan Sites Of the proposed new RMS, we are of the view that the East Overton extension and Glassford Road sites would give rise to significant and adverse impacts on local landscape character and on the setting of Strathaven.</p> <p>Around Thorntonhall and in adjoining areas of East Renfrewshire the massing, materials and strong urban form of recent development and highlight the potential for further erosion of and change to the strong rural landscape character through further development. In our view, the site at Peel Road East would require further consideration to be given to landscape capacity, siting, design and mitigation measures to ensure the landscape setting and strong rural character of the approach to Thorntonhall along Peel Road from the north east is not eroded.</p> <p>Suggest that if the council are minded to allocate more land for development in these</p>	<p>Comments noted .Further discussion will take place as stage 2 sites progress and any masterplans are prepared. The list of requirements for each site can be expanded in Appendix 2 to take account of the various issues.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				areas, whilst also meeting the ambition to 'direct development to the most sustainable locations' that any further allocations should be based on a more detailed study of landscape capacity. This will help to establish a longer-term growth strategy.	
David Kelly	355	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.11	Balgray Road, Lesmahagow: As access to the site would appear to be easiest from the road on the western edge of the site, we suggest that developer requirements should include an appropriate landscape edge/buffer along the minor road on the south-eastern edge of the site. This could incorporate the retention of the existing hedgerow.	Noted – the potential new development requirements for this site outlined in MIR Appendix 2 already contain a requirement for a landscape buffer to provide a robust settlement boundary. The wording shall be amended to incorporate the suggested requirements.
David Kelly	356	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.31	Question 13: Preferred option The proposed additions to the housing land audit would be required to meet the criteria of a more stringent Stage 2 assessment before being released Of the three sites identified, all have the potential for adverse impacts on the natural heritage and of people's ability to access and enjoy natural heritage. In particular suggest that further assessment of landscape and visual impacts is required for site EK04/003. CR02/007 - Hallside East, Newton – 80 units This site straddles Hallside Road. It consists of open arable fields, on elevated ground. It adjoins existing LDP1 allocations to the west and south, and an existing woodland landscape framework to the north and east. If the council are minded to allocate this site, further consideration should be given to	Noted – Further discussions shall be undertaken with SNH to ensure that a satisfactory landscape solution to these sites can be achieved.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>necessary siting, design and mitigation measures with requirements being set out in the LDP. These might include the use of muted colours for the building material and the use of the woodland edge to define the settlement edge.</p> <p>EK04/014 - Westwoodhill Recreation Area, East Kilbride – 65 units The open space appears to be used for informal and formal recreation. It includes established planting and forms part of a larger series of linked open spaces, which together form a green network.</p> <p>EK04/003 – West of Redwood Drive, East Kilbride - 150 units This site is bounded by the A726, Redwood drive and the railway line. It provides a landscape edge to the A726 and contributes positively to the wider landscape setting of East Kilbride. The site is physically and perceptually detached from existing development. Development would, in our view, have an adverse impact on local landscape character and on the landscape setting of the existing settlement and the A726.</p>	
David Kelly	357	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.33	Question 15: Preferred option – Local Nature Conservation Sites We support amending the wording of Policy 15 to make provision for the future identification of Local Nature Conservation Sites (LNCS).	Support noted
David Kelly	359	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.42	Question 20: Preferred option - Renewable Energy We agree in principle to the revised wording of Policy 19, inclusion of Table 4.4 and Figure 4.1.	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
David Kelly	360	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.44	Question 21: Preferred option We consider that the Policy should include reference to coal bed methane and shale gas. We understand that no PEDL licenses have been granted in South Lanarkshire and we recommend that reference is made to this in the text of the Plan. In the event that a licence was to be granted prior to the production of the Proposed Plan or final plan, to accord with paragraph 240 of SPP any area covered by a PEDL licence should be identified in the Plan	Noted, reference will be made to PEDL in text of Minerals SG. With regards a PEDL map, it would be considered if licences were granted prior to the publication of the plan.
David Kelly	361	Scottish Natural Heritage	4.48	Other Issues: Local Landscape Designations We would support this approach and would be happy to assist if required.	Support noted
Stonehouse Ahead	362		4.2	SDAL has a number of concerns regarding the proposed spatial strategy, primarily related to a failure to provide clear support for the provision of the amenities, community facilities and economic opportunities required to meet population needs and let communities flourish across South Lanarkshire, in particular within rural towns such as Stonehouse.	The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy policy in the proposed plan to set out more detail for the various local areas of South Lanarkshire. The specific comments relating to the proposed Development framework site for Stonehouse is considered under representation No 138.
Stonehouse Ahead	363		4.4	Question 2 - Alternative options SDAL considers that neither of the suggested alternative spatial strategy options are credible, as the MIR makes clear that both options would fail to provide an appropriate balance between economic development and environmental protection.	The Council is considering rewording the Spatial Strategy policy in the proposed plan to set out more detail for the various local areas of South Lanarkshire. The preferred spatial strategy takes into account the anticipated requirement for land for different types of development over the plan period. The aim is to balance development against environmental protection and it is not proposed to make substantive direction changes to the preferred strategy.
Rachael	364	Banks	4.2	Object to the preferred option for the spatial	Noted. Consideration is being given to rewording the

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Edmunds		Developments		strategy. Despite setting out in the preferred option that the plan should "...move towards a low carbon economy..." there is no reference to renewable energy in the preferred spatial strategy. To address this, and ensure that the Scottish Governments new target that by 2030 the equivalent of 50% of Scotland's heat, transport and electricity consumption is supplied from renewable sources is reflected in the spatial strategy, the following should be added to the strategy – <i>Supporting renewable energy development opportunities.</i>	Spatial Strategy in the Proposed Plan to provide more detail on the various elements which comprise the Strategy based on the bullet points in paragraph 4.2 of the MIR. It would be appropriate for renewable energy to be included in this list.
Stonehouse Ahead	365		4.7	Question 5 - Preferred option SDAL has no comments to make regarding the individual candidate Development Framework and Residential Masterplan Sites identified within the MIR. However, it must be noted that a number of these sites comprise land within recreational use and/or within the South Lanarkshire Green Belt, in particular the Residential Masterplan sites proposed for Strathaven.	The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
Stonehouse	366		4.8	Question 6 - Alternative option –	See response to No 365

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Ahead				Development Framework Sites and Residential Masterplan Sites As set out in response to question 5, SDAL support the allocation of Development Framework and Residential Masterplan Sites in appropriate locations and believe that the Stonehouse Ahead site should be allocated as a Development Framework Site.	
Stonehouse Ahead	367		4.12	Question 7 - Preferred option – Settlement Boundaries SDAL objects to the proposed retention of adopted LDP Policy 3 – Green Belt and Rural Area in its current form and to the limited proposed changes to settlement boundaries, The proposed approach is also flawed as it would fail to deliver the range of development required to meet community needs and sustain vibrant populations in rural towns, including Stonehouse. Before progressing to prepare the South Lanarkshire LDP2 Proposed Plan a full Green Belt review should be undertaken The land between the Avon and the existing Stonehouse settlement boundary should be allocated as a Development Framework Site to provide for the sustainable expansion of the town and the Stonehouse settlement boundary should be expanded according	The Council does not consider that further settlement boundary amendments are required in addition to those identified in MIR. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. It is not proposed to undertake a Green Belt review for this LDP as there are no significant releases of land from the Green Belt anticipated
Rachael Edmunds	368	Banks Developments	4.42	To ensure compliance with paragraph 163 of SPP, no additional constraints, such as landscape capacity should be added to the spatial framework.	Comments noted. The Spatial Framework shown in the MIR is consistent with the guidance given in SPP. Landscape capacity is a development management consideration and is addressed in SG 10: Renewable Energy
Stonehouse	369		4.13	Question 8 - Alternative option – Settlement	It is not proposed to undertake a Green Belt review for this

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Ahead				boundaries. The alternative option for settlement boundaries is not considered to be credible, as a review of Green Belt boundaries is required for the LDP2 to be in conformity with both the SPP at paragraphs 48 – 51 and Proposed Policy 14 within the Clydeplan	LDP as there are no significant releases of land from the Green Belt anticipated.
Stonehouse Ahead	370		4.18	Question 11 - Preferred option – Village/Neighbourhood Centres - SDAL objects to the proposals to downgrade and shrink the size of the designated Neighbourhood Centre within Stonehouse. It is recommended that the South Lanarkshire LDP2 should retain the existing Neighbourhood Centre designation within Stonehouse and set out a positive and ambitious strategy to regenerate the settlement, focused upon providing amenities, new housing and employment opportunities to meet community needs.	The changes proposed to the village centre reflect the existing pattern of retail development. At present it is considered that the peripheral areas proposed to be deleted from the centre are more likely to be developed for uses compatible with a 'general urban' designation. Should economic circumstances change in the future and demand for additional local retail development in Stonehouse emerge, then consideration will be given to appropriate boundary changes to reflect this. The change referred to is a change to the village centre boundary. There are no changes proposed to the settlement boundary of Stonehouse. The Council does not consider that a settlement boundary amendment to include this site is required. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit.
Stonehouse Ahead	371		4.18	Question 12 - Alternative option - Village/Neighbourhood Centres For the reasons detailed in response to MIR question 11, the preferred option for changes to the Neighbourhood Centre and settlement boundary in Stonehouse should be resisted. Instead, it is recommended that the Stonehouse settlement boundary be extended to the south west to include the Stonehouse Ahead candidate Development	See response to No 370

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Framework Site.	
Stonehouse Ahead	372		4.19	SDAL does not agree with the statement in paragraph 4.19 of the MIR that no changes are required to adopted LDP Policy 12 – Housing Land. It is submitted that substantial modifications are required through the development of a new housing land policy, and allocation of additional effective housing sites to implement national and city-regional planning policy requirements in relation to housing.	<p>The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position.</p> <p>To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan.</p> <p>All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.</p>
Blossom Investments Ltd	373		4.2	<p>Agree with the preferred Spatial Strategy with specific regard to:</p> <p>Directing development to sustainable locations, with major developments directed to the main urban settlements of East Kilbride;</p> <p>Provide regeneration and development opportunities through revision of settlement boundaries and, where appropriate, the consolidation of small groups of houses into defined settlement areas; and Ensuring an adequate and flexible supply of land for housing, in appropriate locations.</p>	See response to No 372

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				It is considered that the allocation of a site at Hayhill Road East Kilbride site for residential purposes would accord with the preferred strategy	
Stonehouse Ahead	374		4.19	<p>Question 13 Response</p> <p>The housing land strategy proposed within the MIR would fail to meet these requirements as the MIR proposes to allocate insufficient total and effective (or expected to become effective) housing land within LDP2. SDAL does not agree with the proposal tested in question 13 to only "redesignate" sites identified within the HLA 2015 and allocate 3 additional housing sites. Rather, there is a need to allocate a significantly increased amount of effective housing land and to review the effectiveness of all sites allocated within the adopted South Lanarkshire LDP (2015). SDAL fundamentally disagrees with the conclusion in the MIR that LDP2 does not need to allocate additional housing sites.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position.</p> <p>To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan.</p> <p>All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.</p>
Stonehouse Ahead	375		4.19	<p>Question 14 - Alternative option - Proposed Housing Sites</p> <p>As demonstrated in response to question 13, LDP2 needs to allocate a significant amount of demonstrably effective housing land in order to meet relevant HLRs and to demonstrably maintain a five-year effective housing land supply at all times. Consequently, SDAL do not agree with the 'alternative option' of not allocating any new</p>	See response to No 374

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				housing sites.	
Blossom Investments Ltd	376		4.5	Do not agree with the development framework sites and residential masterplan sites as proposed. The site at Hayhill Road East Kilbride does not require to be a 'Residential Masterplan Site' given its scale, but it should be identified as a residential land use allocation.	Objection noted. The site at Hayhill Road East Kilbride has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Stonehouse Ahead	377		4.33	Question 15 - Preferred option - Local Nature Conservation Sites In principle SDAL support the identification of LNCS and Local Nature Reserves in appropriate locations. SDAL therefore wish to offer the eastern bank of the River Avon and adjacent land where a new Country Park is proposed, as an additional candidate LNCS or LNR.	Support noted. The area noted will be assessed for potential as a LNCS or LNR.
Stonehouse Ahead	378		4.33	Question 16 - Given that SDAL supports the allocations of LNCS and LNR in appropriate locations, the alternative option of not making any allocations is not supported	Support noted
Blossom Investments Ltd	379		4.9	Question 7 –Disagree with the preferred option which only extends two settlements at Nerston and Lesmahagow. The East Kilbride settlement boundary should be extended to include Hayhill Road as a logical extension to the settlement boundary. The MIR highlights that there is potential to round off some settlements with the inclusion of land within the settlement boundary. We agree with this approach in that it is sensible and obvious in many cases. This part of Hayhill Road is different to the neighbouring parts of Hayhill Road in that	The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				there is an established pattern of development with the existing housing. In addition, the settlement boundary as existing, already extends to Peel Road which is directly adjacent to our site.	has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
Stonehouse Ahead	380		4.34	Question 17 - Preferred option - Local Nature Reserves In principle SDAL support the identification of LNCS and Local Nature Reserves in appropriate locations. SDAL therefore wish to offer the eastern bank of the River Avon and adjacent land where a new Country Park is proposed, as an additional candidate LNCS or LNR.	Support noted. The area noted will be assessed for potential as a LNCS or LNR.
Stonehouse Ahead	381		4.34	Question 18 - Alternative option - Local Nature Reserves Given that SDAL supports the allocations of LNCS and LNR in appropriate locations, the alternative option of not making any allocations is not supported.	Noted
Stonehouse Ahead	382		4.48	Review of Local Landscape Designations The MIR at paragraph 4.48 states that adopted LDP Policy 9 and Supplementary Guidance may require amendment to accord with draft guidance on Special Landscape Areas (SLA) recently published by Scottish Natural Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland. SDAL agree and consider that substantial modifications are also required to ensure that LDP2 accords with national planning policies, specifically SPP in respect of any SLAs which are designated therein.	Noted. This will depend on what recommendations are in the final version of the SNH report. It is unlikely to involved changes to the actual areas designated as local landscape areas in South Lanarkshire. The Local landscape designations (SLA) in SLLDP are considered to accord with SPP and do not require substantial modification as suggested. They may need to be renamed as Local Landscape Areas (LLAs) rather than Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) in future LDPS. The Validating Local Landscape Designations report provides the justification for designating the SLAs in South Lanarkshire. Clyde Middle Valley is based on the long established Clyde and Avon Valley AGLV thus the

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					<p>landscape quality of this area has been recognised for a considerable time. As noted in the Validating Local Landscape Designations report, 'the boundaries of the area are relatively well defined by the edges of the incised landform but also include some of the surrounding farmland which provides a setting for the valleys'.</p>
Stonehouse Ahead	383		4.39	<p>Question 19 - SDAL does not wish to comment specifically on proposals to reserve sites for railway stations at Symington and Law.</p> <p>It is noted from Technical Report 3: Transport Appraisal which supports the MIR that the Council intends to continue safeguarding the linear disused railway cutting west of Stonehouse for a potential A71 Stonehouse Bypass Extension, but that if developed, this must be privately funded.</p> <p>Detailed analysis of this bypass proposal and a Link Road, as proposed by SDAL, are provided within the attached Development Framework Report. In short, the proposed Stonehouse Ahead Development Framework Site would: provide a Stonehouse Link Road through the site and a number of secondary vehicular and non-vehicular access routes. This would enhance connectivity around Stonehouse, reduce peak through-traffic traffic flows along the A71 through Stonehouse and provide accessibility to new development areas within the Stonehouse Ahead site; and, provide enabling infrastructure and continue to safeguard the linear disused railway cutting for potential future provision of transport interventions by SLC.</p>	<p>Noted. However further development at this site does not accord with the strategy of the Local Development Plan and will not be included in the proposed plan as a potential development opportunity.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Jason Wallace	384	Wallace Land Investments	4.2	<p>The Council's Preferred Option for its spatial strategy is generally agreed with. However, Wallace Land Investments considers that the strategy should also acknowledge the role that greenfield sites for housing will inevitably have to play to meet the housing land requirement of the emerging Clydeplan Strategic Development Plan (SDP).</p> <p>The Council's Alternative 1 would not provide an appropriate balance between sustainable economic development and environmental issues. While the Council's Alternative 2 is negatively worded to appear as an extreme option, the Glasgow City Region City Deal will give the City Region a permanent uplift in its Gross Value Added (GVA) of £2.2bn per annum and help unlock £3.3bn of private sector investment. The scale of this investment and its knock-on impact on unlocking the development potential of development sites should be better reflected in the spatial strategy.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position.</p> <p>To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan.</p> <p>All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.</p>
Stonehouse Ahead	385		Table 4.1	<p>Policy 5 - Community Infrastructure Assessment</p> <p>SDAL wishes to make clear its support for the retention of adopted LDP Policy 5 – Community Infrastructure Assessment without modifications within the South Lanarkshire LDP2. The adopted policy is well written and clearly aligned with national planning policy requirements set out within the SPP (2014) and Scottish Government Planning Circular 3/2012</p>	<p>Comments noted. - With regard to Stonehouse bypass the Local Transport Strategy (page 60) makes clear that whilst the Council would support the development and implementation of Stonehouse link/relief road the completion of the Stonehouse bypass in its proposed form would not provide a significantly high benefit for users when compared against capital costs. Any future development in the area could lead to the need for a link road but this would need to be developer led and the Council would not promote the scheme independently. The land will continue to be protected but will only be developed if private funding were forthcoming and a need was</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					identified.
Scott McCauley	386	Chief Executive New Lanark Trust	3.1	General comments relating to issues around New Lanark: Designation of Local Nature Conservation Site and amendments to various environmental designations relating to New Lanark and its buffer zone.	Noted
Jason Wallace	387	Wallace Land Investments	4.10	Wallace Land Investments support the position adopted by Homes for Scotland in their representation in relation to the Council's Housing Land. Based on the Housing Supply Targets set out in the emerging Clydeplan SDP and that a higher generosity margin of 15% should be applied than is currently the case across all tenures, it is likely that sites for up to at east a further 1,200 new homes (in addition to the potential 295 new homes noted) should be brought forward in the emerging LDP2.	The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
Jason Wallace	388	Wallace Land Investments	4.31	Wallace Land Investment recommends the proposal for East Kilbride North is included as an allocation for residential development in the Proposed LDP 2.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Kemp	389	Paterson's of	4.47	Questions 21 and 22 Do not consider that	Comments noted. Circular 6 – 2013 Development Planning

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Lindsey		Greenoakhill Ltd		<p>the simple reference to aggregates in the intended Policy 1 or the intended Policy 20 are sufficient to address the requirements of SPP or meet the requirements described in Circular 6/2013. In order for Supplementary Guidance to work, there requires to be sufficient detail and clear policy commitments to maintain a steady and adequate supply of aggregates for at least 10 years, at all times. It is essential that minerals policies are subject to full examination as part of the LDP process and not left to Supplementary Guidance. We are unclear why the Council has issued 'South Lanarkshire Non-statutory Planning Guidance Minerals, 2017'.</p>	<p>outlines how and why Councils should use Supplementary Guidance. In particular Section 138 outlines that there must be a 'hook' within the LDP. The Council is of the opinion that sufficient information will be contained within the LDP to allow for the production of a more detailed Supplementary Guidance document dealing with all aspects of minerals development. As regards the Non-statutory guidance this has been produced to cover the period between the adopted minerals plan 'falling' and production of the LDP2 – the reasons for the non-statutory guidance are set out in committee papers where the document was approved by Council. There was no statutory requirement to consult on this document but it was carried out as a courtesy. The Scottish Government have not raised any issues regarding the Non-statutory Guidance for Minerals.</p>
Hallam Land Management	390	Hallam Land Management	4.3	<p>Generally support the stated approach and principles of the spatial strategy, although a more ambitious approach is required in terms of achieving sustainable economic development. The development of new residential communities brings key benefits to the economy as well as creating attractive and sustainable new places. This needs to include appropriate green belt or green field sites where there are no significant physical or environmental constraints and where development can be integrated successfully with existing areas and connections.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					outlined in the MIR.
Jason Wallace	391	Wallace Land Investments	1.4	Technical Report 2 – Call for Change Site Assessments Wallace Land Investments is promoting the allocation of East Kilbride North in the emerging LDP 2. As the proposed site was not submitted to the Council for consideration at the Call for Sites stage, a Site Assessment of the proposal has not been undertaken by the Council.	The site at East Kilbride North has been assessed as part of the second wave of sites submitted to the Council. For transparency all of the sites submitted have been assessed in exactly the same way and the results of the assessment have been subject to public consultation. The Council is satisfied that the method used for assessing the sites is fair and robust since it has been used in previous local plans and found by the Reporters to be an acceptable method of assessment.
Hallam Land Management	392	Hallam Land Management	4.3	Question 2 - Alternative options – Spatial Strategy No, neither of the alternative options is supported.	Noted.
Hallam Land Management	393	Hallam Land Management	4.7	Suggest that the strategy is amended to include land at Newhouse Farm as a residential allocation, which offers large scale development potential which could come forward with appropriate phasing over the lifetime of the next two LDPs It is our opinion that this site should be released for development and allocated for residential development (or as a Residential Masterplan site) within the emerging LDP, with an indicative site capacity of up to 750 units.	The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Hallam Land Management	394	Hallam Land Management	4.7	The site at Newhouse Farm Newton should be released for development and allocation for residential development within the emerging LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 90 units.	See response to No 393
Hallam Land Management	395	Hallam Land Management	4.13	Do not agree with the settlement boundary changes as proposed and request that the site at Newhouse Farm be removed from the green belt and included within the settlement boundary. As stated above, the site sits adjacent to the services at Newton, close to an existing railway station (with park and ride facility) and easy access to the existing roads network and other public transport services. The most logical growth strategy for Newton / Cambuslang is to focus development to the south east of the railway line.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Newhouse Farm has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy
Hallam Land Management	396	Hallam Land Management	4.31	The MIR makes it clear that the sites selected have been chosen on the basis that they allow for additional generosity in the land supply, as a way to enable development or as a logical and acceptable amendment to a settlement boundary. Even if these sites are redesignated for housing development, the scale of the potential shortfall in the land supply is such that further sites are needed. Accordingly, we propose that the site at Newhouse Farm is identified as a housing site / Residential Masterplan site within the emerging LDP as it presents the opportunity for delivery of a sustainable large scale site within a strong market area, where the track record of	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				delivery is greater.	
Hallam Land Management	397	Hallam Land Management	4.31	Clearly the preferred option is unacceptable and despite the Council's assertion that a continuous five year effective housing land supply has been in place since the current LDP was adopted, there is a need for the housing supply target to remain both realistic and ambitious, seeking to deliver housing growth. This is particularly important in light of the recent shortfalls in housing delivery / completions in meeting the identified targets. As such, additional sites should be allocated.	The Council is satisfied that the numbers used for assessing levels of housing required in the Local Development Plan 2 are sound and based on an up-to-date and robust set of figures. The arguments that the numbers are flawed and that there is a requirement to release further sites are based on outdated figures and do not reflect the current position. To clarify this and for the avoidance of doubt a housing technical background paper will be prepared and issued alongside the proposed plan. All of the sites submitted for proposed residential development through the Call for sites and the MIR have been assessed. Where appropriate a Stage 2 assessment has been requested. This is to confirm whether the sites that have been found to conform to the LDP2 strategy (with mitigation) are capable of being implemented and effective. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR.
Taylor Wimpey	398	Taylor Wimpey	4.5	The MIR places an over reliance on sites that have been allocated for residential development for some time and which have not delivered housing development as had been expected. The MIR proposes that the new LDP will rely on several sites of questionable effectiveness, and an alternative approach is required in order to ensure that the LDP provides a generous supply of land for housing which meets the needs of the whole Council area. It is our understanding that the East Kilbride and Hamilton CGAs have not delivered new	See response No 397

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				homes as had been expected, and not in line with what had been anticipated over the current Plan period. The Carluke and Larkhall CGAs have also only delivered a fraction of the new homes which were programmed.	
Taylor Wimpey	399	Taylor Wimpey	4.5	<p>Taylor Wimpey have concerns about the continued over- reliance on CGA's, and this concern further extends to some of the Development Framework and Residential Masterplan sites that are afforded support in the MIR. Through this representation Taylor Wimpey are seeking to have the site at Quarryhall included as an extension of the existing Strathaven West Residential Masterplan site, in addition to or instead of sites that are currently preferred.</p> <p>Given that the MIR does afford support for residential development on two new additional sites at Strathaven, it is clear that the Council considers that the settlement of Strathaven can and should accommodate further additional housing development, and with that in mind the Quarryhall site should be added to the preferred sites in the Proposed LDP.</p>	See response No 397
Taylor Wimpey	400	Taylor Wimpey	4.9	<p>Taylor Wimpey has no objection to the maintenance of the Green Belt policy that is currently in place in the adopted LDP, subject to the Quarryhall site being extracted from the green belt, instead allocating it as either a Residential Masterplan Site or a Housing Site, and within a realigned settlement boundary. No objection to the</p>	See response No 397

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				<p>amendments to settlement boundaries that are being suggested in the MIR but we would urge the Council to ensure that settlement boundaries are altered in all circumstances to reflect any variation between the definition of a site in the adopted LDP and the precise boundaries of any planning permission that has been granted for that same site. Recommend that the Strathaven West site, which is currently under development by Robertson Homes and Stewart Milne Homes, including the remaining undeveloped part that is under the control of Taylor Wimpey, should be removed from the greenbelt in line with the site that is defined by the relevant associated Robertson/Stewart Milne planning permission.</p>	
CS Homes	401	CS Homes	4.3	<p>Question 1 it is contended that;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The Spatial Strategy does not form a sound basis on which to prepare policies and proposals in SLLDP2 as it does not make provision for development opportunities in smaller towns like Stonehouse where there is a local need. 2.The Spatial Strategy is not sound as it has not removed sites that are non effective from the LDP and thus the housing supply is not effective as required by Government Policy. This is particularly applicable to Stonehouse. 3.Accordingly it is recommended that non effective sites should be removed and these sites should be replaced with sites that are effective and available. This applies to the site subject to this submission at Manse 	See response No 397

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Road which is in the ownership of a local builder and is immediately available for development.	
Taylor Wimpey	402	Taylor Wimpey	4.28	It is noted that the MIR reflects the Housing Land Supply targets as set out in proposed Clydeplan 2 and also includes a private tenure housing Generosity Margin of 10% as also set out within the proposed Clydeplan 2. Whilst we would note that Clydeplan 2 is not yet approved, the Council will be aware of the Reporter's recommendations in respect of Clydeplan 2 and in particular the proposed application of a 15% Generosity Margin to all tenures. By our estimates, and as supported by Homes for Scotland, if the generosity allowance was applied at 15% rather than 10% that would create a requirement for additional land to be allocated in the new South Lanarkshire LDP for at least a further 1,200 houses.	See response No 397
CS Homes	403	CS Homes	4.12	In relation to Question 7 which is set out in paragraph 4.12 within the MIR there are only minor changes being proposed to settlement boundaries within the preferred option to reflect physical changes that have happened since 2012. In Stonehouse there is no proposed extension to the settlement boundary envisaged and all proposals to do so have been rejected within the MIR as being contrary to strategy. Given the constraints on the existing sites within the settlement boundary of Stonehouse and the fact these sites are ineffective in terms of Scottish Government	The Council does not consider that further settlement boundary amendments are required in addition to those identified in MIR. As stated in the MIR there is a surplus in housing land across South Lanarkshire and no need to add sites to the Housing Land audit. As regards 'ineffective' sites in Stonehouse, many of these have planning consent and as such remain in the housing land audit albeit as non-effective sites. In Stonehouse the priority should be bringing forward these sites before considering any further releases. This will inject some much needed life back into the village and tackle the problems of vacant sites which are scattered throughout the heart of the village.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Policy, this approach is unreasonable and will lead to the stagnation or decline of the town.	
William McGregor & Son	404		4.19	Objects to the housing land supply used in the MIR	See response No 397
Sally Wilson	405	Sally Wilson and Family	4.3	Agree with the vision for the LDP2 that the sustainable growth of the visitor economy should be a key consideration. LDP2 should allocate appropriate sites for sustainable tourism proposals to encourage growth of the visitor economy and ensure a flexible and generous supply of housing land is allocated	See response No 397.
Sally Wilson	406	Sally Wilson and Family	4.9	Objects to the designation of the site at Crossbasket as green belt and suggest that this site should be allocated as a development site in the proposed LDP for a tourist accommodation or residential development to accommodate 23 holiday lodges or 9 residential units.	The site adjacent to Crossbaskets has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Sally Wilson	407	Sally Wilson and Family	4.31	In response to MIR question 13, we propose that the site at Crossbasket Castle should be considered as a small-scale residential development opportunity for approximately 9 units.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Scott McCauley	408	New Lanark Trust	4.48	The Trust would strongly request that the remaining section of the Beeches access road to New Lanark is restored as a firm proposal in the LDP. The feasibility plans can be provided to show the route.	It would be premature to include the remaining section of the Beeches access road to New Lanark as a proposal in the LDP in advance of it being identified in the Local Transport Strategy. The LTS is the Council's overall policy document for roads and transportation in South Lanarkshire and sets out the proposals for new transport

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					infrastructure investments over a ten year period. This proposal does not form part of the Council's LTS at this time.
Scott McCauley	409	New Lanark Trust	4.33	Consideration should be given to designation of a Local Nature Conservation Site (LNCS) under SNH guidelines for the geomorphological interest across the tract of fluvio glacial depositional landforms stretching from Lanark racecourse to Lawhead on the other side of the Clyde gorge	Noted. As stated in the MIR the identification of LNCS is being taken forward through the preparation of the South Lanarkshire Local Biodiversity Strategy. All suggestions for potential LNCS made through the consultation on the MIR shall be passed to the Council's Countryside and Greenspace Team for consideration. In the meantime, policy NHE21 in Supplementary Guidance 9 Natural and Historic Environment requires that development proposals should have no significant adverse impact on geodiversity and soils, and makes provision for local geodiversity features to be retained in situ where feasible.
Scott McCauley	410	New Lanark Trust	4.32	Consider the extension of the New Lanark and Falls of Clyde Conservation area to coincide with the designed landscape, especially to include the boundary wall of Bonnington estate and the Drove road to Tulliford.	It is considered that there are sufficient existing designations covering New Lanark without the need to extend the Conservation Area. Policy NHE1 in SG 9 Natural and Historic Environment, together with other designation-specific policies in the SG, provides a comprehensive list of criteria for the assessment of development proposals within the WHS site and its buffer zone and setting. Historic Environment Scotland were content with the wording of these policies.
Scott McCauley	411	New Lanark Trust	4.48	There should be a commitment to the extension of the Clyde Walkway on the Bonington bank to connect with Tulliford and Drove road and a review of core paths to create a system of walks for the increasing number of visitors who seek a full day out experience at New Lanark and the Falls of Clyde	Noted. This comment shall be passed to the Council's Countryside and Greenspace Team who prepare the Council's Core Paths Plan.
Scott	412	New Lanark	4.48	There should be a set of criteria for the use	It is considered that Policy NHE1 in SG 9 Natural and

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
McCauley		Trust		of Heritage Impact Assessment for any significant planning applications which arise in the area	Historic Environment, together with other designation-specific policies in the SG, provides a comprehensive list of criteria for the assessment of development proposals within the WHS site and its buffer zone and setting. Historic Environment Scotland were content with the wording of these policies.
Scott McCauley	413	New Lanark Trust	4.32	The UNESCO criteria for a Buffer Zone relates not only to the immediate setting and visual relationship with the WHS but also relates to the functional relationship. In the case of the Falls of Clyde and the adjacent designed landscapes, this supports the OUV of the WHS	It is considered that Policy NHE1 New Lanark World Heritage Site and its supporting text in SG 9 Natural and Historic Environment and its supporting text is appropriate. The wording of NHE 1 was agreed with HES.
Douglas Hamilton	414	Douglas Hamilton D Share	4.13	Requests that site at Ashgillhead be included in Proposed Plan	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Ashgillhead Ashgill has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
Stuart MacGarvie	416	S MacGarvie and Co	4.7	Supports the designation of site EK11/001-003 as a residential masterplan site (Thorntonhall)	Support noted
Stuart MacGarvie	417	S MacGarvie and Co	4.7	Supports the designation of site EK10/002 at Walkedyke Strathaven as a residential masterplan site.	Support noted
Maureen Potter	418	Friends of Langlands Moss	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 124 EK01/002 Auldhouse for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Auldhouse East Kilbride has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Vickie and Barrie Sword	419		4.31	Objects to further development in East Kilbride in particular the sites listed in the Supplementary Consultation.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. These sites will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Lindsay Fitzpatrick	420		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 124 EK01/002 Auldhouse for residential development.	See response to No 418
Gordon Assur	421		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 124 EK01/002 Auldhouse for residential development.	See response to No 418
Guy McDaid	422		4.31	Objects to further development in East Kilbride in particular the sites listed in the Supplementary Consultation.	See response to No 419
Rhona Baillie	423		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR119, Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Kibblestane Place Strathaven has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Craig Nicolson	424		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR119, Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Rebecca Hay	425		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 124 EK01/002 Auldhouse for residential development.	See response to No 418
Janis Orr	426		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				development	allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Newhouse Farm has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan.
Mhairi McGaulley	427		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
William Trainer	428		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Rachel Lauder	429		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
John Cole	430		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Michelle Guenser	432		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Scott Affleck	433		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Linda McDowall	434		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Fivos Scholarios	435		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stuart	436		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Mallan				Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	
Julie McPhee	437		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Derek Madden	438		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Nairn McIntosh	439		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Debbie Matthews	440		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Nadine Neary	441		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Allison Orr	442		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stacy Steven	443		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
George Taylor	444		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Christine Tim Pool	445		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Graham McEwan	446		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
David Towill	447		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development and any further building in the Newton/Halfway/Cambuslang area.	See response to No 426
Danela McFadyen	448		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Leanne Whiteford	449		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alison Kennedy	450		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Deborah Taylor	451		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Graeme Taylor	452		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Martin Rooney	453		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Carolyn Rooney	455		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Derek Allan	456		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				development	
Claire Rennie	457		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Laura Hodge	458		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Dawn Ritchie	459		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Suzanne Arkinson	460		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Gordon Drennan	461		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Ashley Bruce	462		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Louise Mairs	463		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Lynne James-McGonigle	464		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Lisa Yip	465		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Scott	466		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Quin				Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	
Linda Farmer	467		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Hazel Grant	468		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Ross Bingham	469		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alanis Hunt	470		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stephanie Stewart	471		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Andrew Grant	472		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Ruairidh Nicoll	473		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
James Wilson	474		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Shirley Davison	475		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Dr J Gibson	476		4.31	Objects to proposed sites MIR114 (Newhouses Farm) and MIR133 (Quarryhall) Strathaven for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The sites have been assessed and do not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Yvonne McWilliams	477		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Andrew Dunlop	478		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestone Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Nadina Brown	479		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stephen Burns	480		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Emma Burns	481		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Angela Dixon	482		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alan Franklin	483	Friends of Langlands Moss	4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Maureen Potter	484	Friends of Langlands	4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for	See response to No 418

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
		Moss		residential development.	
Gordon Kay	485		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 131 Hayhill Road East Kilbride for residential development	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Hayhill Road East Kilbride has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Gavin Orr	486		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Louise Elswailer	487		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 131 Hayhill Road East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 485
Louise Elswailer	488		4.31	Objects to the revised site at O'Cathian Farm East Kilbride for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. This site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan.
Angela McMenemy	489		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Hazel Laird	490		4.31	Objects to further sites at Strathaven South either side of the Muirkirk Road for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. This site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan.
Gary Ferguson	491		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				development	
Fairlie Gordon	492		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
James Docherty	493		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 131 Hayhill Road East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 485
Mary Park	494		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Jacqui Gibson	495		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Mr Ralph Barker	496	Clydesdale Rail Action Group	4.31	<p>MIR 128 Abington - this site can be little other than ribbon development along the dual purpose road.</p> <p>MIR 117 Carluke - This site proposal is probably the only example of a housing development in accord with environmental public transport (Carluke Railway Station) principles as opposed to being completely dependent on increased road traffic.</p> <p>Concern for breaching the railway. There could be an issue with the narrow rural roads south west of the site.</p> <p>MIR 112 Law. This site is a very large housing development with no environmentally acceptable public transport. The site should be rejected unless Law railway station can be re-opened.</p> <p>MIR 129 Lanark This site appears geotechnically extremely difficult, visually</p>	<p>Abington – Noted however the Council are not promoting this as a residential development opportunity.</p> <p>Carluke - Noted however the Council are not promoting this as a residential development opportunity.</p> <p>Law - Noted however the Council are not promoting this as a residential development opportunity.</p> <p>Lanark – following Stage 2 assessment the Council is not promoting this site since there are issues with access and the roads network at this location.</p>

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				intruding on the Clyde Valley, very difficult for the already very difficult to operate safely Kirkfieldbank Brae A72 main road but above all, because of the topography, could only result in ribbon development along the A73 main road.	
W Gilmour	497	Strathaven Community Council	4.31	Objects to sites MIR 114, MIR 133, MIR 120 AND MIR 119 Strathaven for residential development	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Kibblestane Place Strathaven has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Tony Woods	498		4.31	Objects to MIR 131 1. Accessed from Hayhill Road - no street lighting or pavement access 2. No local bus routes within a mile 3. Site is less than 50m from Motorway 4. The area is known as flood risk area . 5. Potential developments should be assessed by Scottish Water 6. There is a natural spring within this land 7. A septic tank which services 6 homes lies in the middle of the land. 8. View restricted from the rear of property. 9. There is no existing drainage at the rear of our property and all rainwater runs into existing land.	The council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow for limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Hayhill Road East Kilbride has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan.
Nadine Neary	499		4.31	Objections to Site CR/02/007 – Hallside East, Newton	The Council remains confident that there is no need to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas outlined in the MIR. The extension to the site at Hallside East was considered by the Council to partly accord with strategy

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					and the Council invited the developer to submit Stage 2 documentation outlining how the site could be made effective and be progressed to the next stage in the process. The necessary information was not submitted to the Council and the extension to Hallside East will not be promoted in the proposed plan. The original Hallside East site was promoted in a previous local plan and has been on the housing land audit for a number of years.
Margery Brownlee	500		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Lorraine McMillan	501		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
William and Carole Campbell	502		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestone Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Stephen Towill	503		2.1	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stephen Towill	504		2.1	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Lorraine McMillan	505		2.1	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Anne McCallum	506		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
William	507		4.31	Objects to the proposed sites MIR114	See response to No 476

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Park				Newhouses Farm Strathaven and MIR 133 Quarryhall Strathaven for residential development	
Iain Cairns	508		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Brian and Lorraine Greene	509		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
James Watt	510		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Craig Nimmo	511		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Michael Hilferty	512		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Marisa Maley	513		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Martin and Mairi Queen	514		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Martin and Mairi Queen	515		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Rod McPherson	516		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Serena Fraser	517		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Mrs Denise O'Connor	518		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Wallace Land	519		4.31	Objects to the Councils assessment of the site MIR132 East Kilbride North in the Supplementary Consultation.	The Council is confident that its assessment of the site is appropriate and that the site will not be promoted as a proposed residential development since it does not accord with the strategy of the emerging LDP2.
AED and IA Poad	520		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
David Gray	521		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Dana Murray	522		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Dana Murray	523		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Anthony McElroy	524		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426.
Hughes Iain	525		4.31	Objects to proposed sites MIR123 (part of EK04/010), MIR131, MIR132 and MIR127 for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. These sites will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					proposed plan.
Mark Cannon	526		4.31	Objects to the proposed site at Strathaven South West Farm for residential development.	Assume this refers to sites MIR114 and MIR133. The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. These sites will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan.
Sharleen Cannon	527		4.31	Objects to the proposed site at Strathaven South West Farm for residential development.	See response to No 526
Lesleyanne Gibson	528		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alex Sawers	529		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Angela Sawers	530		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Isla Sawers	531		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Kirsten Sawers	532		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Stephen Manzor	533		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 137 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Crutherland Farm East

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					Kilbride has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Ellen Shearer	534		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 137 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
K M Scott	535		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 137 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
J and I Little	536		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Robert Ewart	537		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Douglas Hamilton	538	Douglas Hamilton D Share	4.31	Objects to the assessment and subsequent rejection of the site at Ashgillhead Road Ashgill MIR 114	The Council is confident that its assessment of the site is appropriate and that the site will not be promoted as a proposed residential development since it does not accord with the strategy of the emerging LDP2.
Barrie Wilson	539		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 137 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
Hugh Steel	540		4.31	Objects to the assessment and subsequent rejection of the site at Kibblestane Place Strathaven MIR 119	See response to No 423
Gordon Smith	541		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Helen Macaulay	542		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 137 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
Caroline Scott	543		4.31	Objects to the proposed site at Strathaven South and West for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Crutherland Farm East Kilbride has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. These sites will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Susan Bassett	544		4.31	Objects to the proposed site at Strathaven South and West for residential development.	See response to No 543
Mr Alastair Campbell	545	Auldhouse and Chapelton CC	4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Martin Bassett	546		4.31	Objects to the proposed site at Strathaven South and West for residential development.	See response to No 543
Claire McCanney	547		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Kirsten Robb	548		4.31	Objects to proposed sites MIR123 (part of EK04/010), MIR131, MIR132 and MIR127 for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. These sites will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Brendan McWilliams	549	East Kilbride Angling Club	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 137 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential	See response No 533

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
James Wallace	550		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Hallam Land Management	551	Hallam Land Management	4.31	Objects to the assessment and subsequent rejection of the site at Newhouse Farm Newton MIR 139	See response to No 426
Brian Finlay	552		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Mrs Rebecca Hay	553		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Kenneth Hay	554		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Mr Les Hoggan	555	Strathaven and Glassford Community Council	4.31	Objects to proposed sites MIR 114 MIR 119 and MIR 133 for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Kibblestane Place Strathaven has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Robert Scott	556		4.31	Objects to the proposed site at Strathaven South and West for residential development.	See response to No 543
Gordon Wicklow	557		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Christine Smith	558		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for	See response to No 418

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				residential development.	
Mitchell Kinnen	559		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
April Kinnen	560		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Lorraine Kinnen	561		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
William Gray	562		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Jean Gray	563		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Mitchell Kinnen	564		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
April Kinnen	565		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Lorraine Kinnen	566		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
William Gray	567		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Jean	568		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Gray				Hallside East Newton for residential development	
Franziska Rommel	569		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Joanna Assur	570		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Rona Curran	571		4.31	Objects to the assessment and non-inclusion of MIR 113 as a residential development opportunity.	The Council is confident that its assessment of the site is appropriate and that the site will not be promoted as a proposed residential development since it does not accord with the strategy of the emerging LDP2.
Hazel Smillie	572		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 137 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential	See response No 533
Stephen Cavanagh	573		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Rachel Wicklow	574		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Tricia Crighton	575		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Gladman Developments	576		4.31	Objects to the Councils assessment and non-inclusion of a site at Quarryhall Strathaven as a residential development opportunity.	See response to No 476
Heron Property	577	Heron Property	4.31	Supports the Councils assessment and proposed designation of Duchess Place	Noted

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Rutherglen	
John Anderson	578		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 137 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites See response No 533
Ann Wallace	579	Auldhouse Parent Council	4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Ann Wallace	580		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Ian Bushnell	581		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
David Owens	582		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 137 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
David Buchanan	583		4.31	Objects to the proposed site at Strathaven South and West and Glassford Road for residential development.	See response to No 543
Louise Steel	584		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
Nik Harries	585		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Michelle Jenkins	586		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
Ellen	587		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 132 North	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Shearer				of Stewartfield Way East Kilbride for residential development	to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site North of Stewartfield Way East Kilbride has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Ellen Shearer	588		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR125 Crossbasket Castle Estate for residential development	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Crossbasket Castle Estate has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Ellen Shearer	589		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Benthall East Kilbride has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
John Walker	590		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Karen Beattie	591		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
James Reilly	592	DM Hall/Baird Lumsden	4.31	Objects to site MIR 129 Old Bridgend Lanark the site promoted by Sava Estates at Bellefield Road should be put in instead.	Following Stage 2 assessment the Council is not promoting this site since there are issues with access and the roads network at this location.
Donna	593	Chair Of	4.31	Objects to MIR114 Newhouse Farm,	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Brooks		Society Avondale Civic Society		MIR119 Kibblestane Place and MIR133 Quarryhall Strathaven for residential development	to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Kibblestane Place Strathaven has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Taylor Wimpey	594		4.31	Objects to the Councils assessment of the site at Quarryhall Strathaven and the non-inclusion of the site as a potential development proposal in the forthcoming LDP2	The Council is confident that its assessment of the site is appropriate and that the site will not be promoted as a proposed residential development since it does not accord with the strategy of the emerging LDP2.
Blossom Investments Ltd	595		4.31	Objects to the councils assessment of the site for land North of Hayhill Road East Kilbride as a potential residential development opportunity.	The Council is confident that its assessment of the site is appropriate and that the site will not be promoted as a proposed residential development since it does not accord with the strategy of the emerging LDP2.
James Taggart	596		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Margaret Taggart	597		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Heather Howarth	598		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Norman Paterson	599		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Isabel Paterson	600		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
J. Ian McLean	601		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Lynda McLean	602		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Cliff Godley	603		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Jane Godley	604		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Paul Howarth	605		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Graham Carson	606		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Angela Carson	607		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Eric Carlisle	608		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Jennifer Paterson	609		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Mike Veitch	610		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Jean Veitch	611		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Anne Dougan	612		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
D N Dougan	613		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Joan Keenan	614		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Gerard Keenan	615		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
James Begg	616		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Mary Lambert	617		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Ken Mackie	618		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Rosemary Brooke	619		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Nigel Brooke	620		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
M Magowan	621		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Virginia Bell	622		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Tom Berriman	623		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Juliana Berriman	624		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Jean McGugan	625		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Jim McGugan	626		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Majellia Purceli	627		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Jim Mearns	628		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Stuart Smeaton	629		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Renee Anderson	630		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Steven McMullan	631		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Claire Carmichael	632		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Peter Mathieson	633		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Callum Fergus	634		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Corinne Burnett	635		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Douglas Beard	636	Halfway Community Council	4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Lynsey Winkler	637		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Lynn Cowan	638		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Kirsteen Reid	639		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
James Cowan	640		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Emma Cowan	641		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Danuta Clark	642		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Andrew Fergus	643		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Charlotte Patton	644		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Jack Patton	645		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Adam Patton	646		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
David Patton	647		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Carol Patton	648		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Don Sinclair	649		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Douglas Matteo	650		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Stacy McFarland	651		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
John Clark	652		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Conor McGlinchey	653		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Shona Glaister	654		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Patrick McGlinchey	655		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
A Hannah	656		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Eleanor Moss	657		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
James Adam	658		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Jeanette Adam	659		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Andrew Grant	660		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
D Smith	661		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Marie-Claire Coyle	662		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Nicola Morrow	663		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Agnes Orr	664		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Stephen Baldwin	665		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Derek Lang	666		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Maureen Corbett	667		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Alan Hepworth	668		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Helen Scammell	669		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Andrew Munro	670		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
D Deans	671		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Donna McArthur	672		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Yvonne Reilly	673		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Martin Duffy	674		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Alex Johns	675		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Leisa Martin	676		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Kirsty Allan	677		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Martin McFlanerty	678		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Liisa Hepworth	679	Halfway Community Council	4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Deborah Kelly	680		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Mr Kelly	681		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Gordon McNeil	682		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Helen Thompson	683		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Sharon Dixon	684		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Richard Tullett	685		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Douglas Beard	686	Halfway Community Council	4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Gillian Fergus	687		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Joe Crossan	688		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Scott Collins	689		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Kirsty Muir	690		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Anthony McBride	691		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Christopher Dyer	692		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Margaret Ferrier	693		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Catherine McBride	694		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
C Machlan	695		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Stuart Orr	696		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
John Lockhart	697		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR119, Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 499
Ronnie Irvine	698		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Susan Irvine	699		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Alisdair Brown	700		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Declan Brown	701		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Marie Brown	702		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Sandra Lockhart	703		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR119, Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
J Evans	704		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Unity Hazlett	705		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR119, Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Katie Rose Dixon	706		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Robert Lambert	707		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR119, Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Alec Dixon	708		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Sandra Mackie	709		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR119, Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Dorothy Janet Beard	710		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
G Queen	711		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Tracey McDonald	712		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Lynn Frame	713		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Kieran Evans	714		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
William Barclay	715		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Nicola Evans	716		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Karen Hutton	717		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Shannon Johns	718		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Megan Orr	719		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Clair Stewart	720		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Susan Duffy	721		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Anne Myles	722		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Dean Ladds	723		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential	See response No 533
Valerie Park	724		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Robert and Susan Potter	725		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Anita Farrell	726		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Daniel Shearer	727		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential	See response No 533
Susan LLoyd	728		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Elizabeth Mills	729		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Kevin Hodges	730		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Joseph Mills	731		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Christine Smillie	732		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential	See response No 533
Julie- Ann Mooney	733		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Robert Scott	734		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Megan Liddell	735		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Amber Stibbs	736		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Clare Smith	737		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Jemina McCarthy	738		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Sharon Brown	739		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Gary Hardy	740		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Joseph McCartney	741		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Elizabeth McDonald	742		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Maria Lamond	743		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
D Thompson	744		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Lynsey Allan	745		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Gary Allan	746		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Khalid Hussain	747		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Colette Fury	748		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Kevin Fury	749		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
James Sneddon	750		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Nicola Rhodie	751		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
James Brown	752		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Andrew Dixon	753		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Erin McGlinchey	754		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Laura Mitchell	755		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Gregg White	756			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Annie Manzor	757		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential	See response No 533
Louise Haggerty	758			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Sarah Wilson	759		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Cara Diamond	760			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Hamish Kinnon	761		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestone Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Caroline Robertson	762			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Kay Watson	763			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
E Shearer	764	Calderglen Heritage	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR125 Crossbasket Castle Estate for residential development	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site at Crossbasket Castle Estate has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The site will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Scott Kelly	765			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Hazel Grant	766			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Frederick Fraser	767			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Chris Ladds	768	Calderglen and Calderwood Castle History	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR125 Crossbasket Castle Estate for residential development	See response to No 764
Ms	769			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Aileen Wilson				Hallside East Newton for residential development	
Carol Scott	770		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Ms Carolyn Greer	771			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Martin Hilley	772		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Mr Goldie	773			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Myra Hilley	774		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Mr Neil Cunningham	775			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Scott Riddell	776		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Ms Gillian Cunningham	777			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Angela Lowe	778		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Mr James Foster	779			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Mr W Docherty	780			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Gill Harries	781		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Mr L Docherty	782			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Ian Ferguson	783		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Mr Carl Griffiths	784			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499.
Sarah Page	785		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Ms Fiona Brown	786			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Clare Scudto	787		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Mr Marv Stewart	788			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Danielle Blair	789		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Ms Stacey Steven	790			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Erin Hancock	791		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Mr Shaun Day	792			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Carla Granger	793		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Mr Scott Campbell	794			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Shellie Donnelly	795		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Mr J Campbell	796			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Sarah Riddell	797		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Pamela Hancock	798		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Anne Simmons	799			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Dawn McCorkindale	800		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Jacquelyn McCabe	801			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Daniel McCabe	802			Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Alison Muntz	803		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Eleanor Gourley	804		4.31	Objects to site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Hilary Paton	805		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Megan Orr	806		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential	See response to No 426
John Horne	807		4.31	Objects to proposed sites MIR123 MIR131 MIR 132 and MIR127 for residential development	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. These sites will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Chris Ladds	808	Calderglen and Calderwood	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for	See response No 533

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
		Castle History		residential development	
Chris Ladds	809	Calderglen and Calderwood Castle History	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
John Anderson	810		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
John Boyd	811		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Robbie Gibson	812		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Kelly Armstrong	813		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
E Shearer	814	Calderglen Heritage	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 132 North of Stewartfield Way East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 587
Jennifer Crosbie	815		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 124 EK01/002 Auldhouse for residential development.	See response to No 418
James Thomson	816		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Brian Stevenson	817		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
M B	818		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119	See response to No 423

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Craig				Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	
Margaret McNay	819		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Linsey Allan	820		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Chris Allan	821		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Stuart and Barbara MacDonald	822		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
A Marshall	823		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
M W MacFarlane	824		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Fiona McKay	825		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
James McKay	826		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Karon MacKay	827		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
M Harty	828		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
F MacFarlane	829		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
J R Oattes	830		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
J Slater	831		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Jan Allan	832		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Caroline Campbell	833		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
Allison Watson	834		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response No 533
Steven Brown	835		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Steven Brown	836		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alan Ross	837		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Alan Ross	838		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
A R Wade	839		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Gemma Kirk	840		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Dorothy Chittick	841		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Graham Crombie	842		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Patricia McMahon	843		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stephen Edgar	844		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Carol Murray	845		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Liz Dawson	846		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Carole Morris	847		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Gordon McNeil	848		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Sarah Flanerty	849		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
M Beatie	850		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
William Curley	851		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alice Curley	852		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Joan Murphy	853		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stephen Murphy	854		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
John Murphy	855		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Tracey Dalziel	856		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
J Mills	857		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Angela McMenemy	858		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Rebecca MacDonald	859		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
A R Wade	860		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Gavin Carnie	861		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Scott McNellie	862		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Caroline Mullan	863		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Colin Rundill	864		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Joann Bagan	865		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Martha Floyds	866		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Louise Wilson	867		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Leslie Love	868		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
June Hamilton	869		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Kayleigh Stewart	870		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Mr and Mrs Addies	871		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 119 Kibblestane Place Strathaven for residential development.	See response to No 423
Marie Colligan	872		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
James Brown	873		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Jim McGugan	874		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Jean McGugan	875		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Robert Freel	876	Stonehouse Community Council	4.31	No objection to sites MIR138 and MIR 134	Comments noted.
S Daly	877		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Nicola Morrow	878		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Robert Freel	879		4.31	No objection to MIR138 but objects to MIR134 on traffic grounds	Comments noted
Marie-Claire Coyle	880		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Scott Ballantyne	881		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Scott Kelly	882		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Kay Watson	883		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Cara Diamond	884		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Louise Haggerty	885		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Maureen Corbett	886		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Derek Lang	887		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Mr Kelly	888		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Deborah Kelly	889		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Kirsty Allan	890		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Caroline Robertson	891		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Leisa Martin	892			Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alex Johns	893			Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Martin Duffy	894			Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Susan Duffy	895			Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Shannon Johns	896			Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Nicola Evans	897			Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
William Barclay	898		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Kieran Evans	899		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
J Evans	900		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Marie Brown	901		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Declan Brown	902		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alisdair Brown	903		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Susan Irvine	904		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Ronnie Irvine	905		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stuart Orr	906		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Catherine McBride	907		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Mr Smith	908		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Anne Simmons	909		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
J Campbell	910		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Scott Campbell	911		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stacy Steven	912		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Mary Stewart	913		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Fiona Brown	914		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Agnes Orr	915		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Lynn Ballantyne	916		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Ms Ferrier	917		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Lynn Frame	918		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse for residential development	See response to No 426
Paul Brown	919		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Richard Tullett	920		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Liisa Hepworth	921	Halfway Community Council	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Connor Mulrooney	922		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Emma Ballantyne	923		4.31	Objects to proposed site MIR 124 (EK01/002) Auldhouse East Kilbride for residential development.	See response to No 418
Susanne Grant	924		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Jim McNally	925	Carlisle BID Ltd	4.17	LDP provision for retail in Carlisle is inconsistent with the Council's policy for housing and the granting of development which provides for a significant increase in the number of new residents without any provision for increased comparison retail in particular. The LDP appears to support the decline of retail provision.	Noted. However the Council is confident that the retail and town centre policies provide an appropriate framework for development in Carlisle Town Centre
David Grant	926		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				development	
John Anderson	927		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 132 North of Stewartfield Way East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 587
Chris Ladds	928	Calderglen and Calderwood Castle History	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 132 North of Stewartfield Way East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 587
Laura Gardener	929		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Laura McMenemy	930		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Yvonne Matthews	931		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Janis Orr	932		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
A S Bryce	933		4.31	Objects to further housing development at Strathaven South and West.	See response to No 543
Helen Hilderly	934		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Bryce Ellie	935		4.31	Objects to further housing development at Strathaven South and West.	See response to No 543
C Moohan	936		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Yvonne Bryce	937		4.31	Objects to further housing development at Strathaven South and West.	See response to No 543
M Laird	938		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Ross Laird	939		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Amanda Russell	940		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
R.M Bradley	941		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
K Laird	942		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Emma Cowan	943		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
James Cowan	944		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Lynsey Winkler	945		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Lynn Cowan	946		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Kirsteen Reid	947		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Juliana Berriman	948		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Tom Berriman	949		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Virginia Bell	950		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
M Magowan	951		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Claire Carmichael	952		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Steven McMullan	953		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Renee Anderson	954		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stuart Smeaton	955		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Corinne Burnett	956		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Susan LLOYD	957		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Joe Crossan	958		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Dorothy Janet Beard	959		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Gillian Fergus	960		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Merchant Homes Partnership Ltd	961	Merchant Homes Partnership		Objects to the Councils assessment of site MIR 130 Stanmore Road Lanark	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The site has been assessed and does not accord with the LDP2 strategy.
W Docherty	962		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Sharon Dixon	963		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Andrew Fergus	964		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Ian Bergin	965		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Callum Fergus	966		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Douglas Beard	967	Halfway Community Council	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
A W Harvie	968		4.31	Objects to sites MIR124, EK01/001 and EK12/001 for residential development	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. The sites at have been assessed and do not accord with the LDP2 strategy. The sites will not be promoted by the Council as development opportunities in the forthcoming proposed plan.
Patrick McGlinchey	969		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Colette Fury	970		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Joseph McCartney	971		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Liisa Hepworth	972	Halfway Community Council	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Gary Hardy	973		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Sharon Brown	974		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				development	
Liisa Hepworth	975	Halfway Community Council	4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Jemina McCarthy	976		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Clare Smith	977		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
David Bell	978		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 132 North of Stewartfield Way East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 587
Amber Stibbs	979		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Megan Liddell	980		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Robert Scott	981		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Julie- Ann Mooney	982		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Clare Haughey	983	Scottish Parliament	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Joseph	984		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Mills				Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	
Kevin Hodges	985		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Elizabeth Mills	986		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Lisa Cameron	987		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR124 Benthall East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 589
Anthony McBride	988		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Graham Laird	989		4.31	Objects to further sites at Strathaven South either side of the Muirkirk Road for residential development.	See response to No 490
Kirsty Muir	990		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Scott Collins	991		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Tracey McDonald	992		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Margaret Neilson	993		4.31	Objects to development sites MIR133, MIR114, MIR119 and MIR120 in Strathaven for residential development.	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as outlined in the MIR. These sites will not be promoted by

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
					the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan
Maria Lamond	994		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Elizabeth McDonald	995		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Anita Farrell	996		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Yvonne Reilly	997		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Donna McArthur	998		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
D Deans	999		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Bill Graham	1000		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 132 North of Stewartfield Way East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 587
Andrew Munro	1001		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Helen Scammell	1002		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Alec Dixon	1003		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Katie Rose Dixon	1004		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Andrew Dixon	1005		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Nicola Rhodie	1006		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
James Sneddon	1007		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Kevin Fury	1008		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Martin Flanerty	1009		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stonehouse Development Agency	1010			Objects to the Councils assessment of site MIR138 Stonehouse.	The Council is confident that its assessment of the site is appropriate and that the site will not be promoted as a proposed residential development since it does not accord with the strategy of the emerging LDP2.
Shona Glaister	1011		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Erin McGlinchey	1012		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				development	
Conor McGlinchey	1013		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Stephen Baldwin	1014		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Khalid Hussain	1015		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Gary Allan	1016		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Lynsey Allan	1017		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Keith Wright	1018		4.14	Objects to the boundaries of MIR135 including his property within a proposed industrial designation	Noted. However this site is not being included in the proposed LDP2 so no boundaries will be shown on the proposals map.
D Thompson	1019		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Christopher Dyer	1020		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Frederick Fraser	1021		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
James	1022		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Adam				Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	
Jeanette Adam	1023		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Andrew Grant	1024		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Eleanor Moss	1025		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Jim Mearns	1026		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Majellia Purceli	1027		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Carol Patton	1028		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
David Patton	1029		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Adam Patton	1030		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Jack Patton	1031		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Charlotte Patton	1032		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Michael Meldrum	1033		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 127 Crutherland Farm East Kilbride for residential development	See response to No 533
John Clark	1034		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Gregg White	1035		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Laura Mitchell	1036		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alan Hepworth	1037		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
James Foster	1038		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Gillian Cunningham	1039		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Neil Cunningham	1040		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Alison Park	1041		4.31	Objects to MIR128, MIR117, MIR129, MIR112, MIR112, MIR126, MIR139, MIR141, MIR140, MIR142, MIR124,	The Council remains confident that there is no requirement to release significant sites across South Lanarkshire but to allow limited release for flexibility in specific areas as

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				MIR127, MIR132, MIR116, MIR120, MIR111, MIR114, MIR125, MIR115, MIR138 as potential residential development opportunities because of known landscape and/or nature conservation significance.	outlined in the MIR. The site assessments have taken into account the landscape and/or nature conservation interests of these sites .These sites will not be promoted by the Council as a development opportunity in the forthcoming proposed plan since these do not accord with the strategy of the proposed LDP2
Raymond Goldie	1042		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Carolyn Greer	1043		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Aileen Wilson	1044		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Ian Bergin	1045		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Liisa Hepworth	1046	Halfway Community Council	4.2	There is a public perception in Cambuslang that the focus on growth in South Lanarkshire main centres is at East Kilbride, Hamilton and Lanark. The regeneration of other centres, such as Cambuslang, appears not to be a priority. The current spatial strategy needs to be more balanced and Cambuslang is a case in point of a town centre that needs regeneration but is not getting it.	The preferred spatial strategy in the MIR specifically sets out to support and safeguard town, neighbourhood and village centres and the identification of appropriate development opportunities. Furthermore the strategy supports urban renewal and regeneration.
A Hannah	1047		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Occupier	1048		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Liisa Hepworth	1049	Halfway Community Council	4.9	<p>The current SLC policy approach does not comply with Scottish Government policy. Recommend that SLC make a formal public statement as part of the LDP2 that no further infringement of the Green Belt or Green Space around Cambuslang will be accepted. Cambuslang is the only settlement of a significant size to be excluded from the application of the Place Standards Tool as part of the preparation of the Place Standard report and we recommend this is addressed in your new plan.</p> <p>A strong "Place Policy" to be considered and developed for Cambuslang East in order to better define and enhance the character of existing distinct communities in Flemington, Cairns, Overton, Lightburn, Westburn, Newton, Drumsagard, Hallside and Greenlees. (entrance gateways; green parks etc.)</p>	<p>The approach taken by SLC has been approved by the Scottish Government when the LDP was adopted in 2015. The same strategic approach is being carried forward into LDP2 therefore it remains in accordance with SPP. The Green Belt and Rural Area policy is applied consistently across South Lanarkshire. It would not be appropriate to make a statement referring to Cambuslang only in the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The Councils policy is to consider the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the first instance and if no appropriate sites are available to look at other areas within settlement boundaries. If no sites are forthcoming and a shortfall in housing land has been identified then the Council looks to the edge of settlements for possible expansion sites. The Council has successfully defended sites from release along the south of Cambuslang where there has been consistent pressure from developers.</p> <p>The Place Standards Tool was used at public consultation events and completed by members of the public who attended. No members of the public or the community council attended the events in their area therefore there is no data available to analyse and include in the report for Cambuslang.</p>
Occupier	1050		4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Douglas Beard	1051	Halfway Community Council	4.31	Objects to the proposed site MIR 139 Newhouse Farm Newton for residential development	See response to No 426
Liisa	1052	Halfway	Table	Policy 11 should be changed to address the	Policy 11 is applied consistently across South Lanarkshire.

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Hepworth		Community Council	4.1	long term regeneration problems of Cambuslang. Failing this an alternative regeneration strategy for Cambuslang should be produced.	It would not be appropriate to make a statement referring to Cambuslang only in the Local Development Plan.
Liisa Hepworth	1053	Halfway Community Council	4.7	There has been extensive residential development in the Cambuslang area for two decades, but with insufficient consideration given to the road infrastructure and the increase in traffic on local roads, inadequate educational facilities and a forced re-zoning of school catchment areas to other towns, lack of parking provision and safe pedestrian access at Newton train station, and pressure on other public services. There has also been insufficient investment in the town centre and local shops from people moving into the area. The successive development of new housing estates at Newton, Drumsagard/ Hallside, Gilbertfield and East Greenlees Road has created large residential areas that are increasingly remote from public transport and without shops or health services, requiring residents to travel by car for almost every purpose; It is very important for the people in this large and growing town to feel that they are part of a distinct local community and not just simply another indistinct addition to the sprawling conurbation of Glasgow.	The Councils policy is to consider the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the first instance and if no appropriate sites are available to look at other areas within settlement boundaries. If no sites are forthcoming and a shortfall in housing land has been identified then the Council looks to the edge of settlements for possible expansion sites. It is therefore not possible to commit to no further changes to the settlement boundary. In the past the Council has successfully defended sites from release along the south of Cambuslang where there has been consistent pressure from developers. With regard to the green network and greenspace the Council's priority is to preserve such sites – if development is proposed that affects these sites then this is assessed against Policy 14 of the LDP.
Liisa Hepworth	1054	Halfway Community Council	4.13	Settlement boundary of Cambuslang should be fixed and no further infringement or erosion of greenspace and the green network should be permitted. SLC should consider developing a new	The Councils policy is to consider the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the first instance and if no appropriate sites are available to look at other areas within settlement boundaries. If no sites are forthcoming and a shortfall in housing land has been identified then the Council looks to

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
				Strategic Network Area that seeks to protect, enhance and link up greenspaces in the area Rutherglen-Burnside-Cambuslang-Halfway. The north of this area is bounded by the River Clyde green corridor and the south by Cathkin Braes, while the centre has a string of parks running west to east from Richmond Park, through Overtoun Park, Holmhill Wood Community Park, Cambuslang Park to Halfway Park.	the edge of settlements for possible expansion sites. It is therefore not possible to commit to no further changes to the settlement boundary. In the past the Council has successfully defended sites from release along the south of Cambuslang where there has been consistent pressure from developers. With regard to the green network and greenspace the Council's priority is to preserve such sites – if development is proposed that affects these sites then this is assessed against Policy 14 of the LDP.
D Parker	1055		4.31	I refer to the potential development site MIR118 and bring your attention to the area in Carluke extending from the playing fields to the north of Burn Road, bounded by Airdrie Road, Heather Row and Belstane Burn which has been designated for housing since 2003/04. It appears on the Derelict Land Register. The positioning of the roundabout at Weighhouse Road/Airdrie Road continues to be the stumbling block and has an adverse effect on accesses to the various sites. The sites have also been influenced by the siting of the traffic lights at Castleknowe Gardens. There is no record of either the roundabout or traffic lights being subject to a Traffic Management plan.	Noted – passed to roads and transportation.
Thomas Bryson	1056		4.31	Supports the Council's position regarding sites that do not accord with strategy. However does not want to see any further erosion of the green belt.	Support and Comments noted
Gent Koco	1057		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499

Full Name	MIR	Organisation Details	Para	Summary	Council's response
Jennifer Koco	1058		4.31	Objects to the proposed site CR/02/007 Hallside East Newton for residential development	See response to No 499
Janet Moxley Biggar and District Civic Society	1059	Biggar and District Civic Society	4.31	SLC has an obligation to survey designated conservation areas to ensure that planning requirements are being met, has such a survey been carried out for the Bigger Conservation Area, and if not when a survey will be done.	South Lanarkshire has 30 conservation areas, and to date character appraisals have been prepared for Douglas, Leadhills, New Lanark/Falls of Clyde, Rutherglen and Strathaven. While it remains our intention to prepare character appraisals for each conservation area, taking account of the resources available to this service, the council is unable at this time to put a timescale on the preparation of a Conservation Area Appraisal for the Bigger Conservation Area.



South Lanarkshire
Local Development Plan 2

South Lanarkshire Council
Community and Enterprise Resources
Planning and Building Standards Services
Montrose House, Montrose Crescent
Hamilton ML3 6LB
www.southlanarkshire.gov.uk

If you need this information in another language or format, please contact us to discuss how we can best meet your needs, phone 0303 123 1015 or email: equalities@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

