

**APPROVED minutes Meeting 144 Cambusbarron Community Council
held via Zoom at 7:00pm on Tuesday 19 April 2022**

Members and office bearers

Janice Paterson, Acting Chair, (JP)
Keith Ratcliffe (KR) *
Jennifer Macleod, Planning (JM)*
Douglas Campbell (DC)
Scott Farmer (SF) elected rep
Mark Hill, Headteacher (MH) *
Marion McAllister (MMacA)*

Ann Finlayson, Secretary (AF)
Melissa Nelson, Treasurer (MN)
Cathie Graham (CG) *
Richard Blore (RB)
Pam King, police (PK) *
Helen Bang, minute clerk (HB)

In attendance

1. Introductions and Welcome (JP)

1.1 The acting Chair JP welcomed everyone to the meeting via Zoom.

1.2 *Apologies were received from Cathie Graham, Pam King, Keith Ratcliffe, Marion MacAllister, Mark Hill and Jennifer MacLeod.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

2.1 The minutes of the March 2022 Zoom meeting were approved with the following amendment: Paterson letter to be included as Appendix.

Proposed MN Seconded AF **ACTION HB** to AF for Stirling Council.

2.2 Conflicts of interest declared

AF on CCDT Board and Save Gillies Hill, MN Walled Garden Group, RB on Management Group. AF and MN Save Gillies Hill. JP Save Gilles Hill.

3. Matters arising

3.1 Park Improvements within Cambusbarron.

MMacA has written to Stirling Council about the broken bench. This still to be dealt with. Ongoing.

3.2 Seven Sisters Field Housing Development (AF).

Nothing new to report.

3.3 Footpath Project (MMacA)

On hold.

3.4 Quarry Road (DC)

See Appendix I. Proposed regular inspections are inadequate owing to the circumstances of embankment failure which occurred during an exceptionally heavy rainstorm. It is being looked at in good weather. When the next storm event happens, it will be washed out further. DC needs agreement from CC to take this forward.

DECISION - CC not accepting decision in Appendix I - CC agreed DC to submit letter.

ACTION DC to send letter to SF.

3.5 Bins/Litter/Dog Waste/Flytipping and Graffiti (MN/JP)

This is largely a seasonal issue. Can come off matters arising for the time being. Litter picking covered in separate section.

- 3.6 Burnside Orchard (RB)
Payment has been sent to Stirling Council for trees. RB waiting for weeds to grow - can then be treated before putting grass seed down. Trees and shrubs are ready when required for planting.
- 3.7 Fleming Trust (MMacA)
MMacA still trying to find a joiner but with no success to date. She will try some local manufacturing wood workers as some specialist equipment may be required. AF may know of a local cabinet maker - will get contact details if required.
ACTION AF.
- 3.8 Motorway Bridges (DC)
Torbex bridge issue. No response to DC's letter of 6 April. Ongoing.
- 3.9 Child First Aid courses (MN)
This went ahead on 8 April, very much appreciated. Tutor to come back on 25 April. This can now come off matters arising. To be discussed again in autumn term.
- 3.10 Touch Road benches (RB)
Ongoing. RB has cut metal for the benches.
MN - is there a timescale regarding funding? Does it need to be spent by a certain date? Received April 2021. **ACTION MN** to email Jean and ask for 6 month extension.
- 3.11 Christmas in Cambusbarron / Community Pride Dates (MN/AF/MMacA)
Prelit hanging baskets. £25 example shown - thought rather expensive, instead we could collect greenery, pinecones etc. from the woods and purchase battery packs and lights. Meeting to be held shortly. Ongoing.
- 3.12 Triangle Citizen Jaffray (MMacA)
On hold pending community consultation. DC - who is doing the work? Is it to be residents? **ACTION JP** to liaise with MMacA.
- 3.13 Bins waste meeting St Ninians (MMacA)
Report sent to Stirling Council from St Ninians, not yet available. **ACTION JP** to ask MMacA.
- 3.14 National planning Forum 4 (DC)
Form completed - now returned. Response required by 31 March. DC submitted a PDF (Appendix II) Can come off matters arising.
- 3.18 Community Council Insurance (JP)
Form completed and submitted. Need to remember to do in time for March 2023
Two aspects to insurance: Assets - hanging baskets, benches.
Public liability insurance - CC enquiries, DC asked about work in Burnside area - steps to bridge etc. and whether this is covered by public liability insurance.
DC copied email from Stephen Bly. Attached as Appendix III

- 3.19 Request for Historic Plaque (JP)
A response to this enquiry was circulated. Can now be closed.
- 3.20 Ukrainian Refugees (JP)
Housed in Callendar - now in Edinburgh. Email from organisers thanking community for their support. Can now be closed.
- 3.21 Football Park Benches (JP)
Discussed earlier - see playpark item
- 3.22 Rovers Park Project (JP)
Initial meetings on site have been held with the Rovers who feel a path would be beneficial to them and obviously will have a positive impact on the whole community. Richard has agreed to furnish an estimate and we will get a second. The application will go in to the Cambusbarron Fund at the next opening with your agreement.
There is approval to do the top part, putting a track around it. RB is to meet with the Rovers to discuss their requirements. **ACTION JP** to speak to MMacA.
- 3.23 Advert for New Community Councillors (JP)
School newsletter to attract new members. JP did this, it went out just prior to the Easter break. Ongoing.
- 3.24 School Bell Inquiry (JP)
Now closed.

4. Reports

- 4.1 Police Report. Attached as Appendix IV
MN - any response to feedback on police reports? Nothing so far.
- 4.2 **School Report [HT]**
No report this month.
- 4.3 **Murrayshall and ROMP [DC]**
Attached as Appendix V
ROMP process has still not been completed. No progress on suggested meeting with planners. DC had a discussion with Jane Brooks Burnett to discuss these issues. Concerns are mainly to do with the Polmaise Road. A road improvement scheme is under discussion with Roads Department. Getting footpath access in Bearside area is an issue.
ROMP - community is disadvantaged as, for example, monitoring of Paterson's isn't happening until the process is complete.

AF Patersons have said everything is on hold 'until they get more money.' Not doing any more work on the access road. SF has had no communication from them.

RB - no bitumen available currently as it comes from Russia.

4.4 Sequoia Group (Save Gillies Hill) (MN)

Attached as Appendix. A positive response was received from Paterson's at the end of March. We can now move ahead with informing the public, advertising walks etc. **DECISION** required - approval of microgrant application £500 to purchase a full year's Zoom licence. And for graphic design - logo. £494.40. Agreed unanimously.

4.5 Greener Cambusbarron [MMacA]

Initial plans for the season are underway and 11 Amberol "whisky" half-barrels have been ordered. It is hoped to put up all the hanging baskets this season and watering and planting volunteers have been contacted. As always new volunteers are very welcome and we would love to hear from them. Our local rep from Amberol, Jed Shields, who has visited the village and has been very supportive, contacted us to say he was retiring (as of 15th April) and we sent a card on behalf of CCC. His retiral plan is to spend lots of time visiting parts of Scotland he hasn't been to yet as he has always found Scots to be very friendly, welcoming, and proud of our country. I think that is something we should be proud of.

4.6 CCDT/CVN [AF]

Cutting of trees underway. Cut trees will be moved. Hope to have it finished end May/mid June. Volunteer Day 30 April working on clearing the paths. There is a shortage of lorries to move the trees.

JP - residents have complained that they can't walk routes. There was a discussion regarding this. AF and MN have walked with one route with young children - got all the way to the sequoias. However not all routes are available at the moment. Some land is owned by Stirling Council, not the CCDT.

DC thanked CCDT for the journals produced showing what work has been done, keeping the community informed.

Replacement for Amos? AF - this is still being looked into.

The consultation is now open. Open meeting on volunteer days. These are on 30 April and at the end of May. On 18 May there will be a meeting at the community centre. Email: woodland@ccdt.org.uk

4.7 Treasurer's report [MN]

Attached as Appendix Quiet month. Sums held in trust are the same. Current balance £2736.36

Accounts to be audited during summer break. MN will also work on grant application.

JP - Microgrants? Covered in item 4.4. **ACTION MN.**

4.8 Planning [JMCL]

No issues.

4.9 Roads (AF)

Work commencing 4 May - Nothing in the report regarding access to school - will there be any traffic management? The work is proposed to take 4 weeks.

ACTION JP.

5. Main agenda

5.1 Solar Street Furniture (AF)

To look at funding when appropriate. **ACTION AF** to circulate email again.

- 5.2 Befriending Wellbeing Scotland (MN)
Contacted by someone looking for people in the area.
- 5.3 Eco Green Communities (MN)
Cigarette butt ends. **ACTION MN** to circulate.
- 5.4 Orange Bags (MN)
Contacted by resident - Edinburgh Council have an adopt-a-street pledge. MN thinks this is a good idea and would like to run with this. **DECISION** - agreed.

6 Correspondence

- 6.1 No correspondence to discuss.

7 AOB

- 7.1 JP emailed Stephen Bly regarding MMacA's resignation. JP has offered to stand in as Chair for next two meetings until summer holidays. If anyone would like to be Chair, please advise.
- 7.2 Is anything planned for the Jubilee? No events known of.
- 7.3 Continue with face-to-face meetings or Zoom? SF - option to have hybrid meetings agreed. **ACTION AF** to ask if school is accepting bookings yet.

8 Date of next meeting

- 8.1 This will be held on Tuesday 17 May at 7pm via Zoom or in person - to be advised.

9 Decisions taken at this meeting

- 3.4 CC not accepting decision in Appendix I - CC agreed DC to submit letter.
- 4.4 Save Gillies Hill approval of microgrant application

10 Actions

- 2.1 Approved March and draft April minutes to AF and JP HB
- 3.4 Quarry Road - copy letter to SF DC
- 3.7 Cabinet maker details AF
- 3.10 Touch Rd benches email Jean and ask for 6 month extension. MN
- 3.12 Citizen Jaffray Triangle JP
- 3.13 Waste - bins St Ninians meeting JP
- 3.22 Rovers Park project JP
- 4.7 Accounts for auditor, grant applications etc. MN
- 4.9 Roads - information on diversions etc. JP
- 7.3 Is school available to book for meetings? AF

- 11 The Meeting closed at 8:40pm.

Quarry Road Embankment

At the March meeting I reported that I had written to Stirling Council via Community enquiries questioning their failure to address a repair of the embankment failure on Quarry Road.

I received a response on 6th April from CE

From the Roads Officer, "I am still of the opinion that we will do a visual check from a Roads side routinely over a set number of weeks and document with photographs, **until we see further deterioration we will not plan any designs etc.** The section that the kerb had previously moved is not the same section that the embankment slipped. The recent works was only to reseal a previous patch joint due to the wearing of the sealant not any movement of the kerb line again."

From the Team Leader of the Bridges, Floods and Drainage team (part of the same Service), "**Our original position on this still remains our position.** Our primary objective is to protect our road infrastructure, as such monitoring will continue regularly as discussed. Progression with a repair solution will happen in a timely manner and as required by the needs of any defect. Due to limited budgets and staff resource all works are undertaken on a risk based."

I do not consider that the officers have addressed the detailed arguments I raised that routine inspections over a period which doesn't include a incident of exceptional rainfall similar to that which caused the original damage cannot control the risk that the embankment will fail further during an future exceptional rain event.

It appears that this is the final word of the officers responsible and our only course of action is to formally ask for a review of the officers decisions, and I require the CC to record their decision on what action to take next.

Douglas Campbell
16th April 2022



Submitted to Draft National Planning Framework 4 Submitted on 2022-03-30 16:48:07

Questions - Part 1 – A National Spatial Strategy for Scotland 2045

1 Sustainable places. Our future net zero places will be more resilient to the impacts of climate change and support recovery of our natural environment. Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future net zero places which will be more resilient to the impacts of climate change and support recovery of our natural environment?

Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future net zero places which will be more resilient to the impacts of climate change and support recovery of our natural environment?:

Whilst the aim of net zero and sustainability are commendable this requires clear thought and consideration. It should be remembered that many of these changes are expensive and that new technology is not, as yet, fully fit for purpose. Change will be very expensive for home owners and involve physical and in some cases emotional change. It might be better, at this stage, to make easier changes such as eliminating all tree removal and therefore avoid replacement. Better and cheaper grants schemes for solar panels would be a huge benefit and should be a huge priority both for new and existing homes. At present we would reserve agreement.

2 Liveable places. Our future places, homes and neighbourhoods will be better, healthier and more vibrant places to live. Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places, homes and neighbourhoods which will be better, healthier and more vibrant places to live?

Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places, homes and neighbourhoods which will be better, healthier and more vibrant places to live?:

These are a commendable aim, changes to existing communities must be agreed with residents and fit in with the aims and ideals of the community. Homes should not be built until existing infrastructure is fit for purpose: schools, community centres, libraries and so forth. Should these not be in place residents will drive for these needed facilities and this is not acceptable. To improve the health of a community green spaces to walk must be factored in, walking within communities encouraged and made easy and as safe as possible. New developments should not be islands within communities that feel cut off and different. With attention to community views and with improved infrastructure we would agree.

3 Productive places. Our future places will attract new investment, build business confidence, stimulate entrepreneurship and facilitate future ways of working – improving economic, social and environmental wellbeing. Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places which will attract new investment, build business confidence, stimulate entrepreneurship and facilitate future ways of working – improving economic, social and environmental wellbeing?

Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places which will attract new investment, build business confidence, stimulate entrepreneurship and facilitate future ways of working – improving economic, social and environmental wellbeing?:

In order to allow for new investment and to stimulate entrepreneurship new homes must be able to facilitate home working with office space built in, quality high speed internet provision readily available regardless of geographic location. Spaces for business must be built into developments to allow business within community and not just fields of housing. If this is not considered then we extend the need for out of town business parks which require transportation to and from. At present we would withhold agreement.

4 Distinctive places. Our future places will be distinctive, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, welcoming, nature-positive and resource efficient. Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places which will be distinctive, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, welcoming, nature-positive and resource efficient?

Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places which will be distinctive, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, welcoming, nature-positive and resource efficient?:

Current building firms build the same houses, to the same design, all over and are these easily recognized. This has to change to suit the community and to reflect existing homes. Paths should be planned and integral to allow residents to walk “in the green” and to move around without the need for cars as safe as possible.

This is commendable aim but should be agreed with residents and not fit the agenda of commercial building firms to increase housing stock at any cost, only then would we be able to agree.

strategy would achieve this without clear objectives

5 Distinctive places. Our future places will be distinctive, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, welcoming, nature-positive and resource efficient. Do you agree that the spatial strategy will deliver future places that overall are sustainable, liveable, productive and distinctive?

Do you agree that the spatial strategy will deliver future places that overall are sustainable, liveable, productive and distinctive?:

This is almost a duplicate question: we are unable to agree that a spatial strategy would achieve this without clear objectives

6 Spatial principles. Do you agree that these spatial principles will enable the right choices to be made about where development should be located?



Do you agree that these spatial principles will enable the right choices to be made about where development should be located?:

Given the generality of the document and a lack of certainty we would not be able to be confident that the right choices would be made and therefore cannot agree at present

7 Spatial Strategy Action Areas. Do you agree that these spatial strategy action areas provide a strong basis to take forward regional priority actions?

Do you agree that these spatial strategy action areas provide a strong basis to take forward regional priority actions?:

This would seem to move regional policy decisions out of the control of local authority. We would consider that local authority and community councils are best suited to decide on regional priority. As such we cannot agree

8 North and west coastal innovation. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?

Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?:

These matters would be best considered by those who live and work in the area and therefore we have no comment.

9 North and west coastal innovation. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?

What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?:

These matters would be best considered by those who live and work in the area and therefore we have no comment.

10 Northern revitalisation. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?

Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?:

These matters would be best considered by those who live and work in the area and therefore we have no comment.

11 Northern revitalisation. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?

What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?:

These matters would be best considered by those who live and work in the area and therefore we have no comment.

12 North east transition. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?

Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?:

These matters would be best considered by those who live and work in the area and therefore we have no comment.

13 North east transition. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?

What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?:

These matters would be best considered by those who live and work in the area and therefore we have no comment.

14 Central urban transformation. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area? Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?:

In we would agree with the summary of the challenges, however a greater emphasis on the differing communities would be helpful, the centre of Glasgow and the Loch Lomond National Park are very different places to live, work and travel and this should be highlighted within the summary of challenge.

15 Central urban transformation. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?

What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?:

Again in general we would agree however again we need to highlight the differences between the communities. Public transport in rural areas can be problematic, as one example and therefore challenges cannot be generalised, and actions must reflect the challenges.

16 Southern sustainability. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?

Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?:

These matters would be best considered by those who live and work in the area and therefore we have no comment 17 Southern sustainability. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?



What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?:

These matters would be best considered by those who live and work in the area and therefore we have no comment

18 National Spatial Strategy. What are your overall views on this proposed national spatial strategy?

What are your overall views on this proposed national spatial strategy?:

There is much to command a general strategy but not without local and community level input. There is a fear that this is too centralised and will not reflect local need and aspiration. Many changes would have to be made to this proposition to reflect the changes communities desire

Questions - Part 2 - National developments

19 Do you think that any of the classes of development described in the statements of need should be changed or additional classes added in order to deliver the national development described?

Do you think that any of the classes of development described in the statements of need should be changed or additional classes added in order to deliver the national development described?:

No, these seem adequate

20 Is the level of information in the statements of need enough for communities, applicants and planning authorities to clearly decide when a proposal should be handled as a national development?

Is the level of information in the statements of need enough for communities, applicants and planning authorities to clearly decide when a proposal should be handled as a national development?:

These seem unclear and do not focus on community need and ensuring that developments are fit for purpose of the communities highlighted

21 Do you think there are other developments, not already considered in supporting documents, that should be considered for national development status?

Do you think there are other developments, not already considered in supporting documents, that should be considered for national development status?:

Plans should be considered for additional national parks, areas set aside for leisure and transportation – including public transport that is affordable and easily accessed.

Questions - Part 3 – National Planning Policy

22 Sustainable Places. We want our places to help us tackle the climate and nature crises and ensure Scotland adapts to thrive within the planet's sustainable limits. Do you agree that addressing climate change and nature recovery should be the primary guiding principles for all our plans and planning decisions?

Do you agree that addressing climate change and nature recovery should be the primary guiding principles for all our plans and planning decisions? :

No, this should not be the primary guiding principle although this is obviously of importance. The document states that this topic should be given "significant weight". Significant weight is fundamentally different from being the primary guiding principle

23 Policy 1: Plan-led approach to sustainable development. Do you agree with this policy approach?

Do you agree with this policy approach?:

This is nationalized land use; it does not reflect the needs and aspirations of communities to empower them. We fundamentally disagree with this approach.

Further communities must have the ability to appeal against the Reporter's decisions, that this is only permitted for developers are fundamentally wrong. The residents may have information to lead a decision that the reporter is unaware of, and as amateurs, we may not have given the aspect weight. Further a change must be made to allow community councils or other community groups to submit a matter to the ombudsman. At present this can only be done by an individual and the impact on that individual may be different from that of the whole community and not warrant as strong an argument.

24 Policy 2: Climate emergency. Do you agree that this policy will ensure the planning system takes account of the need to address the climate emergency?

Do you agree that this policy will ensure the planning system takes account of the need to address the climate emergency? :

Whilst this approach should give significant weight to the issue of climate change it does not address the positives of ensuring all new houses have solar panels and be adequately insulated with sustainable products such as sheep wool.

25 Policy 3: Nature crisis. Do you agree that this policy will ensure that the planning system takes account of the need to address the nature crisis?



Do you agree that this policy will ensure that the planning system takes account of the need to address the nature crisis? :

This community council would fully endorse this approach and commend this action: this has been a significant aspect to all planning objections made over several years and we call for an immediate ban on all woodland destruction for unsustainable developments including quarrying.

26 Policy 4: Human rights and equality. Do you agree that this policy effectively addresses the need for planning to respect, protect and fulfil human rights, seek to eliminate discrimination and promote equality?

Do you agree that this policy effectively addresses the need for planning to respect, protect and fulfil human rights, seek to eliminate discrimination and promote equality?:

This should be a wider government policy for all actions and interactions by and for all. This should not need to be specifically mentioned in this document

27 Policy 5: Community wealth building. Do you agree that planning policy should support community wealth building, and does this policy deliver this?

Do you agree that planning policy should support community wealth building, and does this policy deliver this?:

Again, a commendable ideal which should be a general national aim and to that end we agree. We do not see that this policy will, or should,

deliver this. 28 Policy 6: Design, quality and place. Do you agree that this policy will enable the planning system to promote design, quality and place?

Do you agree that this policy will enable the planning system to promote design, quality and place?:

Again, a very commendable aim, we have used these documents whilst negotiating with housing developers and highlighted the need for quality housing which fitted the needs of the community. This fell aside when the developer had a catalogue of housing types and styles which was very limited, as an example all wheelchair friendly homes were two bedroom flats with no driveways and limited gardens. This very certainly does not reflect equality or a flexible living style. We look for quality 20 minute neighborhoods and those that support the 6 qualities of successful places and would agree that this is a good policy that should benefit communities.

29 Policy 7: Local living. Do you agree that this policy sufficiently addresses the need to support local living?

Do you agree that this policy sufficiently addresses the need to support local living? :

We absolutely agree that an infrastructure first approach is fundamental and one we have looked for some time. This must include public transport and listen to local residents who understand their communities' need and residents aspirations. We agree that this is a good policy.

30 Policy 8: Infrastructure First. Do you agree that this policy ensures that we make best use of existing infrastructure and take an infrastructure-first approach to planning?

Do you agree that this policy ensures that we make best use of existing infrastructure and take an infrastructure-first approach to planning?:

We fully agree and commend this approach

31 Policy 9: Quality homes. Do you agree that this policy meets the aims of supporting the delivery of high quality, sustainable homes that meet the needs of people throughout their lives?

Do you agree that this policy meets the aims of supporting the delivery of high quality, sustainable homes that meet the needs of people throughout their lives?:

This policy would appear to support the delivery of housing, we would agree. Homes however require to be adaptable and to support individuals and families through life change: working from home, illness and disability and so forth. That a family has to leave a community that supports it in order to access suitable accommodation should no longer be a necessity.

32 Policy 10: Sustainable transport. Do you agree that this policy will reduce the need to travel unsustainably, decarbonise our transport system and promote active travel choices?

Do you agree that this policy will reduce the need to travel unsustainably, decarbonise our transport system and promote active travel choices?:

No, we fundamentally disagree. This does not consider rural and semirural housing where health, banking and secondary school provision all require transportation. Good quality, freely available and subsidized public transport is an absolute necessity with an increase in service – no Sunday buses limit the life experiences of the old, disabled and those with limited financial resources. This is very much against their human rights and equality (Policy 4)

the need to as far as possible facilitate access by reliable public transport, ideally supporting the use of existing services or new services that do not require on-going public sector funding

33 Policy 11: heat and cooling. Do you agree that this policy will help us achieve zero emissions from heating and cooling our buildings and adapt to changing temperatures?

Do you agree that this policy will help us achieve zero emissions from heating and cooling our buildings and adapt to changing temperatures? :



Not without significant investment and, a good level of grants, for solar panels and additional insulation. I am personally attempting to access solar panels and a back up battery for my home and it is an expensive and fragmented methodology.

34 Policy 12: Blue and green infrastructure, play and sport. Do you agree that this policy will help to make our places greener, healthier, and more resilient to climate change by supporting and enhancing blue and green infrastructure and providing good quality local opportunities for play and sport?

Do you agree that this policy will help to make our places greener, healthier, and more resilient to climate change by supporting and enhancing blue and green infrastructure and providing good quality local opportunities for play and sport?:

We would fully agree in this as an aim and commend it however we live in a country where the winter weather is often poor and outdoor play is limited. Green spaces should include community centres and covered play areas to allow for year round access. Green areas should also be zoned so dog access is limited – children should be free to play in parks that are dog free and where dog waste is not to be found.

35 Policy 13: Sustainable flood risk and water management. Do you agree that this policy will help to ensure places are resilient to future flood risk and make efficient and sustainable use of water resources?

Do you agree that this policy will help to ensure places are resilient to future flood risk and make efficient and sustainable use of water resources?:

We would agree

36 Policies 14 and 15 – Health, wellbeing and safety. Do you agree that this policy will ensure places support health, wellbeing and safety, and strengthen the resilience of communities?

Do you agree that this policy will ensure places support health, wellbeing and safety, and strengthen the resilience of communities?:

We would agree

37 Policy 16 – land and premises for business and employment. Do you agree that this policy ensures places support new and expanded businesses and investment, stimulate entrepreneurship and promote alternative ways of working in order to achieve a green recovery and build a wellbeing economy?

Do you agree that this policy ensures places support new and expanded businesses and investment, stimulate entrepreneurship and promote alternative ways of working in order to achieve a green recovery and build a wellbeing economy?:

At this point there is insufficient information and detail in this policy to make a determination therefore we disagree

Questions - Part 3 - National Planning Policy continued

38 Policy 17: Sustainable tourism. Do you agree that this policy will help to inspire people to visit Scotland, and support sustainable tourism which benefits local people and is consistent with our net-zero and nature commitments?

Do you agree that this policy will help to inspire people to visit Scotland, and support sustainable tourism which benefits local people and is consistent with our net-zero and nature commitments?:

We would agree and would look for an open enquiry into the impact of AirBnB on local communities, particularly small rural developments.

39 Policy 18: Culture and creativity. Do you agree that this policy supports our places to reflect and facilitate enjoyment of, and investment in, our collective culture and creativity?

Do you agree that this policy supports our places to reflect and facilitate enjoyment of, and investment in, our collective culture and creativity?:

We would agree

40 Policy 19: Green energy. Do you agree that this policy will ensure our places support continued expansion of low carbon and net-zero energy technologies as a key contributor to net-zero emissions by 2045?

Do you agree that this policy will ensure our places support continued expansion of low carbon and net-zero energy technologies as a key contributor to net-zero emissions by 2045?:

In principle we would agree with this policy but cannot comment on the success of it in achieving net zero by 2045. This will certainly be the case if the incineration of waste becomes commonplace. We are aware this is under review by the Scottish Government

41 Policy 20: Zero waste. Do you agree that this policy will help our places to be more resource efficient, and to be supported by services and facilities that help to achieve a circular economy?

Do you agree that this policy will help our places to be more resource efficient, and to be supported by services and facilities that help to achieve a circular economy?:



We do not agree: resource efficiency is a huge challenge and the current monthly bin uplifts in Stirling which lead to overflowing bins and fly tipping cannot possibly support this.

42 Policy 21: Aquaculture. Do you agree that this policy will support investment in aquaculture and minimise its potential impacts on the environment?

Do you agree that this policy will support investment in aquaculture and minimise its potential impacts on the environment?:

We have no comment

43 Policy 22: Minerals. Do you agree that this policy will support the sustainable management of resources and minimise the impacts of extraction of minerals on communities and the environment?

Do you agree that this policy will support the sustainable management of resources and minimise the impacts of extraction of minerals on communities and the environment?:

We do not agree that this policy fully supports the sustainable management of resources and minimises the impacts of extraction of minerals on communities and the environment.

Our reasons are that there is still lack of clarity in this policy on the role of mineral resource landbanks and how they are managed at a Planning Authority [PA] level and at wider geographical area and national levels.

Landbank

It appears that there is a change in the wording around 'landbank' text and it is not clear whether this is a substantive change or merely textual. NP3 Policy 238 states "Plans should support ...landbank of permitted reserves for construction aggregates of at least 10 years at all times in all markets areas..." NPF4 states "local development plans should support the 10 year landbank at all times in the relevant market areas..."

The change from 'at least 10 years' to 'the 10 year' could mean that the '10 year landbank' becomes more of a target value and there should be less support for developments that would potentially increase the landbank substantially beyond the 10 year value. Currently our understanding is that any development that contributes to the PA landbank appears to be automatically 'supported' which can lead to potential oversupply in one area -with consequential adverse environmental impacts - for the commercial interests of a developer.

Market area /local authority geographical boundary

The Policy is unclear if and by what mechanism a PA can include in its 'landbank' mineral resources from outwith its geographical boundary, and further, if it is permitted to do this, how double counting at a geographical or national level is managed. No guidance is given on necessary liaison between PAs or from national government.

National level planning

Guidance from national government should include projected supply and demand for aggregates in broad geographical areas, taking into account national import /export volumes. This information would inform PAs in a more rational manner than the 'landbank' approach of the contribution the PA need to make to ensure sufficient resources were available to developers in their geographical boundary, or whether all resources could be reliably and economically supplied by cross border imports.

44 Policy 23: Digital infrastructure. Do you agree that this policy ensures all of our places will be digitally connected?

Do you agree that this policy ensures all of our places will be digitally connected?:

We would agree and are hopeful of an efficient outcome

45 Policies 24 to 27 – Distinctive places. Do you agree that these policies will ensure Scotland's places will support low carbon urban living?

Do you agree that these policies will ensure Scotland's places will support low carbon urban living?:

We would wholeheartedly agree to this approach and see it as a good policy.

46 Policy 28: Historic assets and places. Do you agree that this policy will protect and enhance our historic environment, and support the re-use of redundant or neglected historic buildings?

Do you agree that this policy will protect and enhance our historic environment, and support the re-use of redundant or neglected historic buildings? :

We agree

47 Policy 29: Urban edges and the green belt. Do you agree that this policy will increase the density of our settlements, restore nature and promote local living by limiting urban expansion and using the land around our towns and cities wisely?

Do you agree that this policy will increase the density of our settlements, restore nature and promote local living by limiting urban expansion and using the land around our towns and cities wisely?:

We do not agree to this approach – it should not be for a community to give reasons why a green belt is essential but for a developer to prove it is not.

48 Policy 30: Vacant and derelict land. Do you agree that this policy will help to proactively enable the reuse of vacant and derelict land and buildings?

Do you agree that this policy will help to proactively enable the reuse of vacant and derelict land and buildings?:



We agree

49 Policy 31: Rural places. Do you agree that this policy will ensure that rural places can be vibrant and sustainable?

Do you agree that this policy will ensure that rural places can be vibrant and sustainable? :

In principle we agree but would look carefully at how this is managed

50 Policy 32: Natural places. Do you agree that this policy will protect and restore natural places?

Do you agree that this policy will protect and restore natural places?:

We agree it will protect but lack confidence that what is proposed will restore.

51 Policy 33: Peat and carbon rich soils. Do you agree that this policy protects carbon rich soils and supports the preservation and restoration of peatlands?

Do you agree that this policy protects carbon rich soils and supports the preservation and restoration of peatlands? :

We agree

52 Policy 34 - Trees, woodland and forestry: Do you agree that this policy will expand woodland cover and protect existing woodland?

Do you agree that this policy will expand woodland cover and protect existing woodland?:

We agreed the policy could protect existing woodland but designation would have to be clarified. There is too much indecision as to what ancient woodland actually is and the evidence required to prove this

53 Policy 35: Coasts. Do you agree that this policy will help our coastal areas adapt to climate change and support the sustainable development of coastal communities?

Do you agree that this policy will help our coastal areas adapt to climate change and support the sustainable development of coastal communities?: We have no opinion

Questions - Part 4 - Delivering our spatial strategy

54 Do you agree with our proposed priorities for the delivery of the spatial strategy?

Do you agree with our proposed priorities for the delivery of the spatial strategy?: We would agree with this policy

55 Do you have any other comments on the delivery of the spatial strategy? Do you have any other comments on the delivery of the spatial strategy?:

Further detail and fleshing out will have to be made public to garner support for this policy. Vague terms such as "multiple parties" do not give confidence that this policy can be brought to fulfilment with transparency.

Questions - Part 5 - Annexes

56 Annex A. Do you agree that the development measures identified will contribute to each of the outcomes identified in section 3A(3)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997?

Do you agree that the development measures identified will contribute to each of the outcomes identified in section 3a(3)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997? :

We agree other than to point out that in order to increase the rural population, and do so with equality in mind, public transport would have to be available to support such population.

57 Annex B. Do you agree with the minimum all-tenure housing land requirement (mathlr) numbers identified above?

Do you agree with the minimum all-tenure housing land requirement (mathlr) numbers identified above?:

We cannot agree until evidence is supplied as to how these figures were created. Not enough information on the meaning of All-Tenure

58 Annex C. Do you agree with the definitions set out above? Are there any other terms it would be useful to include in the glossary? Do you agree with the definitions set out above? Are there any other terms it would be useful to include in the glossary?:



include housing All-Tenure

Questions - Integrated Impact Assessments

59 Environmental Report. What are your views on the accuracy and scope of the environmental baseline set out in the environmental report?

What are your views on the accuracy and scope of the environmental baseline set out in the environmental report? :

60 Environmental Report. What are your views on the predicted environmental effects of the draft NPF4 as set out in the environmental report? Please give details of any additional relevant sources.

What are your views on the predicted environmental effects of the draft NPF4 as set out in the environmental report? Please give details of any additional relevant sources.:

61 Environmental Report. What are your views on the potential health effects of the proposed national developments as set out in the environmental report?

What are your views on the potential health effects of the proposed national developments as set out in the environmental report?:

62 Environmental Report. What are your views on the assessment of alternatives as set out in the environmental report?

What are your views on the assessment of alternatives as set out in the environmental report?:

63 Environmental Report. What are your views on the proposals for mitigation, enhancement and monitoring of the environmental effects set out in the environmental report?

What are your views on the proposals for mitigation, enhancement and monitoring of the environmental effects set out in the environmental report?:

64 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment. What are your views on the evidence and information to inform the society and equalities impact assessment?

What are your views on the evidence and information to inform the society and equalities impact assessment?:

65 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment. Do you have any comments on the findings of the equalities impact assessment?

Do you have any comments on the findings of the equalities impact assessment?:

66 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment. Do you have any comments on the findings of the children's rights and wellbeing impact assessment?

Do you have any comments on the findings of the children's rights and wellbeing impact assessment?:

67 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment. Do you have any comments on the fairer Scotland duty and the draft NPF4?

Do you have any comments on the fairer Scotland duty and the draft NPF4?:

68 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment. Do you have any comments on the consideration of human rights and the draft NPF4?

Do you have any comments on the consideration of human rights and the draft NPF4?:

Do you have any comments on the consideration of human rights and the draft NPF4?:

69 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment. Do you have any comments on the islands impact assessment?

Do you have any comments on the islands impact assessment?:

70 Business and Regulatory Impact Assessment. Do you have any comments on the partial business and regulatory impact assessment? Do you have any comments on the partial business and regulatory impact assessment? :

About you

What is your name?

Name:

cambusbarron community council

What is your email address?



Email: campbellonforth@outlook.com

Are you responding as an individual or an organisation?

Organisation

What is your organisation?

Organisation:

cambusbarron community council

The Scottish Government would like your permission to publish your consultation response. Please indicate your publishing preference:

Publish response only (without name)

We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Yes

I confirm that I have read the privacy policy and consent to the data I provide being used as set out in the policy.

I consent

Evaluation

Please help us improve our consultations by answering the questions below. (Responses to the evaluation will not be published.)

Matrix 1 - How satisfied were you with this consultation?: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Please enter comments here.:

Matrix 1 - How would you rate your satisfaction with using this platform (Citizen Space) to respond to this consultation?: Very satisfied

Please enter comments here.:



APPROVED

Appendix III Insurance

Assets for which insurance is required

The following information is now required to organise CC insurance.

Please return this form by Friday 18 March 2022. If not returned by this time we will not organise assets insurance for your Community Council. No reminder will be sent.

Please list the assets you wish insured and their approximate value – continue overleaf if required: (hanging baskets get PL cover only, whilst other assets get PL and Material Damage cover)

Item	Quantity	Value per unit	Total Value
Hanging baskets	45	36.30	1647
Notice boards	3	300/600 1000	1900
Historic boards, erected by Stirling Council	3	645	1935
Amberal stone effect troughs	5	270	1350
Watering bowser	1	650	650
Metal bench @ Community Centre	1	650	650
Projector + screen	1+1	155+70	225
Bench @ Kersebarry	1	400	400
Benches @ Tonch Road	2	750	1500

PTO

Please note, it is your responsibility to organise events and activities insurance when required, eg gala days, litter picks. We will not organise this insurance on your behalf.

(For information, competitive rates were previously negotiated with brokers Keegan & Pennykid of which you were notified at the time; you are not obliged to use Keegan & Pennykid.)

Name of Community Council	Cambusbarron Community Council
Print name	MARION MACALLISTER
Position (must be office bearer)	CHAIR
Date	14th March 2022

RETURN BY FRIDAY 18 MARCH 2022 (make sure all fully completed)

email to: ccenquiries@stirling.gov.uk

please keep a copy for your own reference



Note from Douglas Campbell to Stephen Bly

The Burnside Steps and handrails location is as you describe however the cost written in the form is £3500 and NOT £8500.
Sorry for this confusion

Appendix IV Police Report

Name of Community Council	19/04/2022 – Cambusbarron Community Council meeting Our priorities in the Cambusbarron area continue to be Anti-Social Behaviour, Drug misuse/Drug dealing, Road Safety and Community Engagement and Reassurance.
Crime reports	Crime Reports for Cambusbarron area between 15/03/2022-16/04/2022 Undetected: 4 Relating to crimes of dishonesty and road traffic offences. Total Crime Reports: 4 There were 44 calls made to Police for the Cambusbarron area over the stated period. The calls relate to a number of incidents including anti-social behaviour, domestic matters, road traffic matters, vulnerable persons and neighbour disputes.

**Other
Incidents of
note/relevant
Community
Council
information**

None.

**Feedback
from meeting**

Please e-mail any feedback/questions to PC King:

StirlingWestCPT@scotland.pnn.police.uk

APPROVED

MURRAYSHALL QUARRY

REPORT FOR [VIRTUAL] MEETING 19th April 2022

TILlicoultry Quarries /PATERSON QUARRIES ROMP APPLICATION 18/00137

The ROMP process for the determination of working conditions for Murrayshall Quarry has still not been completed

No progress on the suggested future meeting with CCC, councillors and planners to discuss ROMP

Further to March report I had a telephone conversation with Jane Brooks-Burnett [SC planner] on 24th March to discuss the ROMP and any associated Murrayshall issues.

The Developer is required by Condition 14 of the access track planning approval to improve Polmaise Rd in accordance with a technical report prepared by SYSTRA

14. Improvements to Polmaise Road: Prior to the hereby approved access track being operational, infrastructure improvements along Polmaise Road in accordance with the scheme of measures prepared by SYSTRA and detailed within its report Reference AG-105885 Version 4 dated 4 May 2018 (or such other amended improvements as the planning authority may agree in writing beforehand) shall be implemented in full. Reason: To ensure that the effects on amenity and highway safety at Polmaise Road from quarry traffic using the proposed development can be reduced.

The Developer is currently discussing with 'Roads' design aspects of the SYSTRA proposal particularly the provision of footpath along the route, with a focus on the Bearside area

JBB reported that progress on completion of the ROMP process has been difficult due to staff workload issues, but it is now hoped that it will be completed by summer 2022. I highlighted that as Patersons were already on site constructing the access track, no monitoring through a formal liaison group was in place because of the failure to complete the ROMP process.

Douglas Campbell

26th March 2022



Save Gillies Hill
Press Release
06/04/2022

Save Gillies Hill's Call to Protect and Preserve Sequoia Trees is Heard by Quarry Company

Since 2007, campaigners from Save Gillies Hill have been contesting the reactivation of Murrayshall Quarry, Cambusbarron. In the absence of active quarrying, nature has returned, and biodiversity has flourished allowing Murrayshall Quarry to evolve into a community space for walking, running, orienteering, and mountain biking. There is something extra special to be found in the quarry: a grove of five sequoia trees. The five sequoia trees were planted in the 1860s. If left undisturbed, the sequoia trees could live for over 3000 years, attain a volume of over 1400 cubic meters, and become the biggest trees in Scotland.

In 2021, The Scottish Government's Planning and Environmental Appeals Division granted Patersons application to build a new access road, enabling active quarrying to resume. Patersons Quarries now have the legal right to proceed with constructing a new access road and quarrying can be carried out until at least 2042 under the existing 1984 permissions. Melissa Nelson, Chair of Save Gillies Hill, stated that "After years of working exclusively against the reactivation of Murrayshall Quarry, the appeal decision, and the construction of the new access road require a change in strategy. Acknowledging the legal status of the quarry, our focus now is on protecting and preserving the grove of five sequoia trees." Part of Save Gillies Hill's new strategy is to work collaboratively with Patersons Quarries, along with the Cambusbarron Community Development Trust, and the Cambusbarron Community Council to preserve as much of the woodland as possible and to ensure a positive long-term restoration of the quarry.

In March 2022, Save Gillies Hill approached Patersons Quarries with a map indicating the location of the five sequoia trees and the land we hope Patersons will formally commit to preserve. In April 2022, we received the first positive response we were hoping for. Patersons are now investigating the viability of a scheme where the 5 sequoia trees could be retained. Moving forward, Patersons have agreed to provide Save Gillies Hill with bi-annual progress reports on the viability assessment to retain the 5 sequoia trees. There is some further reassurance that quarry operations will not reach the sequoia grove until 2028, at the earliest. Melissa Nelson, Chair of Save Gillies Hill, says that "we are pleased that Patersons appear to share the same respect we have for the historical and biodiversity value of the 5 sequoia trees. Protecting and preserving the five sequoia trees means they will be left standing to take to pride of place in the future restoration of the quarry."

For further information on Save Gillies Hill visit our website www.savegillieshill.org.uk

