



**East Ayrshire Local Development Plan  
Summary of Responses Received to Main Issues Report**

**March 2015**

**PART 1: Summary of comments received at Main Issues Report Stage**

In the tables below, a summary of responses received to each of the main issues is provided in the left hand side column and the Council's response to these is provided in the right hand side column.

<b>Main Issue 1: Achieving Good Design</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue explores how the LDP can best ensure that high quality design becomes an integral part of the planning process in East Ayrshire</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>Respondents generally agree with the preferred option of ensuring design is an important part of the LDP.</p> <p>Caution is requested, primarily from the development sector, in relation to ensuring that any design policy takes account of development viability and is not unduly onerous so as to stifle development.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building control is the most appropriate means of securing energy efficiency. Any planning policy should give flexibility to achieving energy</li> </ul>	<p>Within the MIR, the preferred option was to make design a fundamental element of the planning process by including a core design policy with associated supplementary guidance providing additional detail. The LDP has carried this forward by creating an Overarching Policy which applies to all new development and which places significant emphasis on good design. Leading on from this is the place making section which sets out how our places can become more successful in line with the Scottish Government's 6 qualities of successful places. Design Guidance setting out more detail on design will be prepared as set out in the LDP Action Programme.</p> <p>The proposed plan has taken the same general approach as was stated in the MIR with which respondents were generally in agreement. The Development industry can remain assured that development viability will be a consideration in the assessment of planning applications. However, the Council is of the view that quality design can be achieved without significantly eating into profit levels and that well designed places are generally more economically successful.</p> <p>Planning Authorities are required by Section 3F of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act (as amended) to contain planning policies relating to low and zero carbon generating technologies. Policy ENV 14 of the proposed</p>

<p>efficiency in different ways, not necessarily with 'bolt on' technologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any core design policy should promote the delivery of the green network, promoting linkages with surrounding habitats. Good design should apply to green spaces as well as the built environment, ensuring that green spaces are high value habitats for wildlife.</li> <li>• Early engagement with the development industry is vital in developing design guidance. The proposed SPG should be issued alongside the LDP, giving the opportunity for meaningful engagement.</li> <li>• Processes such as 'Enquiry by Design' should be used</li> <li>• The preparation of computer aided visual representations of new developments would help promote high quality design.</li> <li>• There may be a case for encouraging individual houses of outstanding design quality on land not designated for housing.</li> <li>• A design policy should promote enhanced access opportunities, linking to wider access networks than just active travel routes.</li> <li>• The LDP should contain a commitment for all Council depts. to work together in pursuit of high quality design. This is especially relevant to the Roads Authority.</li> </ul>	<p>plan sets this out.</p> <p>Overarching Policy OP1 states that all new development should assist in the delivery of the green infrastructure.</p> <p>The development industry will be fully consulted on Supplementary Guidance on Design Guidance when it is published.</p> <p>The Charrette or Enquiry by Design process is a valuable tool in achieving good quality design for changing places and the Council would advocate its use wherever possible. However, it is recognised that the time and costs involved are significant so in many cases this approach will not be a viable option.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that housing in the countryside should require to meet with both rural housing and design policies.</p> <p>Policy OP1 and the place making section of the proposed plan all promote good connectivity.</p> <p>All relevant Council departments were and will be consulted on the design aspects of the Proposed Plan and associated guidance.</p>
--	---

<b>Main Issue 2: Recognising and supporting green networks</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue explores how the LDP should support the development of green networks in Ayrshire, specifically linked to the Central Scotland Green Network.</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>The respondents largely support the preferred option of giving policy support to green networks within the LDP and supporting this with specific SPG.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan places significant emphasis on the delivery of green network objectives. Support for its promotion is contained within the Overarching Policy OP1 and in a dedicated Green Infrastructure policy within the Delivering Infrastructure section. The place making section of the plan shows in detail where our existing green networks are situated within Kilmarnock, Cumnock, Stewarton, Galston and Dalmellington and highlights opportunities for making improvements to them. A similar approach will be taken for all other communities as per the LDP Action Programme.</p> <p>Whilst specific supplementary guidance on green networks is no longer proposed, both the place making section and the forthcoming Design Guidance will both promote green infrastructure/network objectives and will result in this issue being a key consideration in future development. The way forward proposed in the Proposed Plan is considered to be broadly consistent with that proposed in the MIR. Given that respondents largely agreed with policy support for green networks, it is considered that the proposed plan approach will also be supported.</p> <p>The Council recognises the links between the green networks and the water environment and it has ensured that the water framework directive and river basin management plans have been taken into account. Within the place making section of the plan where green networks have been mapped, in most cases there is a complementary 'blue network' running alongside it. Suggested projects within this part of the plan aim to enhance the blue and green network and make it more accessible to, and safer for, the public.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linkages between green networks and the water environment must be recognised. Any SG must relate to the water framework directive and river basis management planning.</li> <li>• The green network policy should recognise the recreational value of green networks.</li> <li>• The green network policy should promote a network of off-road cycling and walking paths. The priority should be to link public transport facilities to community facilities and housing areas.</li> <li>• In developing guidance for large scale redevelopment and greenfield sites, it should be ensured that development viability is fully considered. Any site specific requirements should be clearly justified and any supporting information made publicly available.</li> </ul>	<p>Implementation of the green network policy will take full account of ecological matters. The East Ayrshire Leisure Trust's Countryside Manager will actively assist with this process.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure policy does recognise their recreational value.</p> <p>The place making section of the proposed plan has examined opportunities for the promotion of off road cycling and walking paths. Where these have been proposed, the potential for wider linkages where appropriate has been taken on board.</p> <p>Development viability has been considered throughout the proposed plan and it ensures that any green network initiatives required as part of a development is not too onerous. All requirements will be made public through either the proposed plan or supplementary guidance.</p>
---	---

<b>Main Issue 3: Reducing the risk of flooding</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue addresses how the LDP can best play its in part reducing the risk of flooding within East Ayrshire.</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>Respondents are generally supportive of the preferred approach that looks both at reducing flood risk strategically in terms of taking account of flood risk in the allocation of land, and more locally through ensuring flood prevention measures are put in place in the design of new developments.</p>	<p>The preferred option in the MIR was to reduce the risk of flooding by undertaking a number of measures including, where possible, avoiding the identification of LDP sites in areas of medium to high flood risk and ensuring that Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes are provided as an integral element of new developments as well as stating that the Council would fulfil its obligations to prepare a Flood Risk Management Plan within agreed legislative timeframes.</p> <p>There was general agreement with this approach. The LDP flooding policy</p>

<p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference should be made to avoidance being the first principle of sustainable flood management. Regard should also be had to one of the main duties under the Flood Act, which is an overall reduction in flood risk.</li> <li>• The links between flood risk and green networks should be fully recognised within SPG.</li> <li>• Rather than focusing on a blanket ban on development in flood plains, the Council should work with developers and SEPA to consider localised flooding solutions.</li> <li>• The LDP should detail any flood prevention schemes that the Council plans to bring forward.</li> </ul>	<p>and supporting text takes a similar approach albeit that it has been updated to take full account of SPP 2014.</p> <p>Reference to avoidance being the first principle is made in the LDP flooding policy.</p> <p>There will now be no SPG specifically on green networks. However, clear reference to the benefits of green infrastructure in minimising flood risk is made in the Infrastructure &amp; Energy section of the LDP under 'green infrastructure'.</p> <p>In line with SPP, there will be no 'blanket ban' on development in areas of flood risk. Instead, certain types of development will be permitted in such areas if robust evidence is submitted which clearly demonstrates that any flood risk can be mitigated against. Avoidance of development will, however, remain as being the first principle of flood prevention.</p> <p>The Council does not currently intend to bring forward any flood prevention schemes.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Main Issue 4: Affordable Housing</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of issue: The preferred approach to Affordable Housing is that a new affordable housing policy is contained within the LDP. This would require private housing developments of 30 or more houses to provide a benchmark of 25% affordable housing in the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub Housing Market Area. In the Doon Valley area, this requirement would be 15% and in the Cumnock area there would be no affordable housing requirement. Supplementary Guidance (SG) setting out how the Council will implement this policy will be prepared. Maximum flexibility in how affordable housing can be delivered will be offered to developers.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>Most respondents accepted the need for an affordable housing policy and</p>	<p>The Council is pleased that most respondents agree with the Council's</p>

<p>agreed with the Council's preferred option. One respondent (Homes for Scotland) out of a total of 21 expressed concerns over the methodology used in the Council's Housing Needs and Demand Assessment to calculate affordable housing requirements.</p> <p>Most comments related to the need for the affordable housing policy and the accompanying SG to be fully flexible in how they are implemented stating that affordable housing can be successfully delivered by the private sector as well as by Registered Social Landlords and Councils. Respondents are generally keen that a range of affordable housing tenures are permitted and that each site can be negotiated at planning application stage. There was also a suggestion that provision should be made for any update to the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment that may be carried out during the plan period.</p> <p>There was some concern that the affordable housing requirement could render some sites unviable or that it would act as a disincentive to developers looking to build in East Ayrshire.</p> <p>A small number of respondents stated that more new market housing sites need to be brought forward in order to achieve higher levels of new build affordable housing because, as the MIR states, unconsented local plan sites alone will not be able to produce sufficient affordable housing to meet the HNDA shortfall in full.</p>	<p>preferred option and the LDP follows the MIR preferred option of the inclusion of an affordable housing policy. Whilst Homes for Scotland has concerns with the HNDA methodology, this document was approved by the Scottish Government as being robust and credible. The Council is therefore of the view that an affordable housing policy is appropriate and fully justified.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that the affordable housing policy and accompanying supplementary guidance is fully flexible allowing for the affordable element of developments to be negotiated on a site by site basis in line with Scottish Government guidance. The fact that affordable housing can be delivered by the private sector is recognised and will be considered where appropriate.</p> <p>The 25% and 15% are benchmark amounts and will be subject to negotiation with developers. In order to avoid a situation where an affordable housing element is in danger of rendering a development unviable, provision will be made for developers to make a case for the requirement to be reduced or waived. In such cases developers will normally require to share financial information with the Council to demonstrate site viability.</p> <p>A flexible approach will also be adopted regarding the tenure of affordable housing to be sought on sites. It is recognised that private housing which is deemed to be affordable may be more suitable for some sites than RSL/Council housing and also that funding availability for RSL/Council housing is difficult to accurately predict.</p> <p>The Council does not agree that more new market housing sites should be brought forward solely on the basis that they will provide more affordable housing and help to better meet shortfalls identified in the HNDA. The Local Housing Strategy looks at other ways to provide affordable housing over and above the LDP affordable housing policy. The contribution that private</p>
---	--

<p>Some respondents also propose the use of commuted sums (i.e. payment in kind to the Council for use in its own affordable housing schemes) as opposed to on-site provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>One respondent is keen that enabling housing development, i.e. housing that is being used to subsidise another development, is not subject to any affordable housing development.</p>	<p>developers can make is just one method of provision.</p> <p>The SG on Affordable Housing takes a sequential approach to affordable housing provision with on-site provision being most preferred, followed by off-site provision. Commuted sums will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where reasonable efforts to provide both on-site or off-site provision have been made and have not been successful. This is fully in line with the Scottish Government's Planning Advice Note 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Audits.</p> <p>The Affordable Housing SG sets out in full which types of housing development will be subject to the affordable housing policy. The SG does not request affordable housing to be provided as part of any enabling development proposal.</p> <p>The LDP is fully reflecting the views of the public in its approach to affordable housing. When each planning consent is being negotiated, representatives from the Council's Housing service will provide advice on the particular housing needs of an area. This will include housing for different groups including both young and older people.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Main Issue 5: What level of housing growth should we go for?</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of issue: This issue asks which of the three housing growth scenarios from the Council's Housing Needs and Demand Assessment should be used in the LDP. The options are a) planning for a stable population, b) planning for modest growth and c) planning for higher growth. The preferred option is b) which, once a generosity allowance has been added to it means that 6880 new houses are needed over the next 13 years.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p> <p>No respondents were in favour of planning for a stable population. Slightly more agreed with the Council's preferred option of going for modest growth than those who were in favour of planning for higher growth. However, the</p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>The Council remains of the view that a modest growth approach is most appropriate and this approach is being taken forward through the LDP.</p>

<p>split was almost equal between these latter two options.</p> <p>The development industry is generally of the view that the Council needs to go for a higher growth approach and release more land to ensure that more sites come forward particularly in the northern part of East Ayrshire.</p> <p>Concern over the methodology used in calculating the existing housing land supply was stated by some respondents. This mainly relates to the assumption made that 50% of the established land supply will come forward for development in the lifetime of the plan. It is suggested that this approach is not in line with SPP and that the housing land supply should be carefully examined looking at each site on an individual basis to determine which of them is likely to make a realistic contribution to the land supply.</p> <p>Some respondents stated that the Council should potentially reassess the housing requirement when Census 2011 results are published as this could impact upon the calculation.</p> <p>It was also suggested that larger sites identified in the EALP 2010 are unlikely to come forward due to the upfront infrastructure costs involved and that more smaller sites should therefore be identified to stimulate development activity.</p>	<p>Within the Kilmarnock and Loudoun area where the development industry generally sought more housing release, sufficient housing land to meet the housing supply target plus an additional 20% generosity allowance has been identified. It is not considered appropriate to identify further land releases.</p> <p>In preparing the Proposed Plan, the existing land supply was examined in detail in order to allay the concerns of the development industry with every site being tested for its effectiveness. This approach moves away from the 50% assumption used in the MIR.</p> <p>The 2012 Housing Needs and Demand Assessment provides housing demand figures, this being the Council's most up to date source of housing demand.</p> <p>All sites, including the larger green field releases have been tested for their effectiveness in association with the development industry. In addition to this, the land supply consists of a mix of housing sites of varying sizes.</p>
--	---

**Main Issue 6: The Existing Housing Land Supply**

**Synopsis of issue: This issue notes that many of the new housing land release sites contained in the East Ayrshire Local Plan 2010 have not yet been taken forward by developers and asks for views on whether the majority of these should be rolled forward through to the new LDP. It is the Council's preferred option to roll these sites forward given that the EALP was adopted relatively recently and that the economic downturn is continuing to have an impact on the house building industry.**

<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>The majority of those who responded to this issue disagreed with the Council's preferred option. In most cases, these particular respondents are promoting alternative non-allocated sites and wish to see their sites identified for housing development in the LDP with certain EALP 2010 sites being de-allocated. It is argued by these respondents that some EALP 2010 sites are not effective and will not contribute to the land supply in the plan period. Particular reference to larger sites was made stating that the upfront infrastructure costs required to develop such sites was preventing them from coming forward. It was suggested that more, smaller sites should be identified instead.</p> <p>Another proposal put forward was that some of the EALP 2010 allocations should be 'pushed back' with alternative, more effective sites being allocated for delivery in the short term.</p> <p>A number of respondents stated support for the continued allocation of some sites.</p> <p>Comments also stated that more detailed appraisal and evaluation work on the deliverability of those EALP 2010 sites needs to take place to determine whether they can be developed within the plan period with those with more limited prospect being deleted and other sites identified instead.</p> <p>Some respondents were of the view that if a site is not developed within 5 years of being allocated in a plan then it should be deleted and that the LDP should make specific provision for sites to be reviewed during the plan period and for alternative sites that are more likely to contribute to meeting housing needs to be identified.</p>	<p>In preparing the proposed plan, a detailed assessment of the full housing land supply was undertaken to test for effectiveness. This included meeting with landowners/potential developers to establish what is required to bring sites forward. Where the Council was satisfied that sites could be brought forward during the plan period, these have been rolled forward into the LDP. However, where it was considered that sites were unlikely to come forward, they were deleted from the plan. If new alternative sites were found to be required, the list of suggested new sites received as part of the MIR consultation was examined in order to determine whether any of these were suitable. East Ayrshire's land supply consists of sites of varying sizes. All sites have been realistically programmed with a proportion of the capacity of larger sites being excluded from the housing supply and demand calculation where appropriate.</p> <p>This exercise has been undertaken in preparing the LDP.</p> <p>At this time, it is not considered appropriate for the LDP to contain a mechanism allowing the review individual housing sites during the period of the plan. Sites will be reviewed every 5 years when the whole plan is reviewed. The Scottish Government also wishes to see plans kept up to date. The plan does, however, contain a policy which permits additional new</p>

<p>Clarification is also being sought from a small number of respondents on whether sites with planning consent will be identified for housing development in the LDP.</p>	<p>housing land release where it can be demonstrated that there is a shortfall in the effective housing land supply.</p> <p>For clarification, all sites with planning consent as at the date of the housing land audit being used to prepare the plan will be identified as housing sites in the LDP. Realistic programming of these sites has, however, also been undertaken and where some capacity is considered likely out-with the plan period, this has been taken into account in the housing demand and supply calculations.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Main Issue 7: The balance of Market Housing Demand and Supply</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of issue: This issue recognises that there are shortfalls across all three sub Housing Market Areas and looks at whether additional land over and above those sites identified in the EALP 2010 requires to be identified. The preferred option sees one new greenfield release in the Kilmarnock and Loudoun HMA and, given the low historic new build rates, no additional releases in either the Cumnock or Doon Valley HMAs.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>Almost all respondents to issue 7 made comment on the balance of market housing demand and supply in the Kilmarnock and Loudoun housing market area. Only one was received for the Cumnock HMA and none for the Doon Valley HMA.</p> <p>Most of those responding to this issue are, or are acting on behalf of, promoters of alternative housing sites to those proposed in the MIR. They disagree with the Councils preferred option and suggest either the deletion of certain, in their view, non-effective sites, and replacing them with the sites they are promoting, or that the LDP should identify additional specified housing sites. The justification for this is that some of the proposed housing land supply is constrained by factors such as landowners unwilling to sell land at the current lower market value, significant upfront infrastructure costs, difficulty in accessing development funding and the fact that certain towns are more popular than others. Limited specific detail about why certain sites</p>	<p>After undertaking a full examination of the effectiveness of the housing land supply, the Council is of the view that the preferred option for main issue 7 remains appropriate.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken a detailed assessment of the full housing land supply to test the effectiveness of all sites. This has included meeting with landowners/potential developers to establish what is required to bring each site forward. Where it was found that sites were unlikely to be developed within the LDP period, then these have been deleted. Where a proportion of larger sites has been programmed outwith the plan period, then this capacity has not been included in the demand and supply calculation. Where alternative sites were found to be required, the list of suggested new sites received as part of the MIR consultation was examined in order to determine whether any of those were suitable.</p>

<p>should be deleted is provided other than the above more general points.</p> <p>Comment was also made that not enough detailed development options were considered by the Council before reaching the preferred option.</p>	<p>The Council has considered a range of development options in the preparation of the LDP.</p> <p><b>Note: A number of sites were suggested to the Council for inclusion in the LDP for residential and other mixed uses. A schedule of these can be found in Appendix 1 to this document.</b></p>
---	---

<p><b>Main Issue 8: Future Direction of growth post 2025</b></p> <p><b>Synopsis of issue: In line with national planning policy, the MIR looked at which settlements are likely to require sites for long term future growth post 2025. The preferred option was that such growth should take place in the larger settlements of Kilmarnock, Galston and Stewarton. It is not considered that any additional settlements require such areas to be identified. Two main options for each of these towns were shown and views on these were sought.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>In general terms there was no clear preference for future growth stated in any of the three towns shown in the MIR maps with a relatively even split between the option set out by the Council. Additional suggestions in each of the three towns were also put forward.</p> <p>Locations within the following additional towns were also suggested for future growth: Auchinleck, Laigh Fenwick, Mauchline, Kilmaurs, New Cumnock.</p> <p>The majority of suggested locations for future growth were put forward by respondents promoting new sites for development mentioned under issues 5, 6 and 7. Most of these respondents stated that, if their sites were not considered as housing sites pre 2025, then they wish them to be considered as future growth areas post 2025. Given that new sites being promoted as new housing land releases tend to be in edge of town locations, the</p>	<p>Full consideration has been given to the responses received at MIR stage in the preparation of the proposed plan. This coupled with the detailed work undertaken to determine the effectiveness of sites and particular locations has resulted in the Council arriving at a settled view as to which areas require future growth areas to be identified. It was not considered necessary to identify future growth areas in any other settlements at this time. This will, however, be reviewed as part of the next local development plan.</p> <p>The suggestions of respondents were all taken into account in arriving at the future growth areas.</p>

<p>respondents quoted the part of the town where their site is located.</p> <p>Comments were also made on the fact that any new areas of future growth should be accessible by public transport and should have easy access to green networks and enhance these where possible. All new growth areas should also be suitable for development in landscape capacity terms.</p> <p>The House building industry is also willing to assist with the marketability of certain locations.</p>	<p>All future growth areas are in sustainable, accessible places with good access to green network opportunities. Engagement with the house building industry has also taken place to ensure that market considerations were taken into account in the preparation of the proposed plan.</p> <p>The Council appreciates the offer of assistance from the house building industry.</p>
---	---

[Main Issues 9-15 covered Surface Coal Mining and Mineral Extraction. These issues will be the subject of a separate Minerals Local Development Plan]

<p><b>Main Issue 16: Strategy for Business and Industrial Land</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of Main Issues: This issue looked at the strategy for identifying and safeguarding business and industrial land within East Ayrshire.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>The response to main issue 16 was split with 3 respondents for and 4 respondents against the preferred business and industrial strategy.</p> <p>Most of those respondents not in agreement with the preferred option were against the principle of mixed use i.e. additional housing being developed to cross fund business uses on the same site.</p>	<p>During preparation of the MIR the Council commissioned Ryden consultants to undertake a review of the supply of business and industrial land in East Ayrshire. This involved assessing of the current supply of business and industrial land and property and making judgement on whether it fulfils current and likely future business requirements. This review and the Council's Background Paper were used in the preparation of the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Ryden recommend that, on a selective basis, the Council should identify sites for mixed use development to stimulate economic activity.</p>

A small number of respondents favoured Alternative Option 2: Reduce the Amount of Business and Industrial Land throughout East Ayrshire.

Additional specific comments:

- Temporary greening of long standing vacant and derelict sites, to establish on site green infrastructure prior to development proceeding.
- Employment areas should be identified adjacent to the smaller settlements to encourage smaller businesses.
- It is important for the Council to regularly monitor the supply/effectiveness of land allocated for business/industry on a bi-annual basis.
- Opposition to the proposed reallocation of land at Rowallan Business Park/Northcraig to mixed-use development.

The Ryden report undertook an assessment of all safeguarded business and industrial land in East Ayrshire and looked at the location, amount and specification of existing business space and whether it is able to meet current and future demand. The Ryden report cautions against reducing the total amount of employment land within East Ayrshire and indicates that there may be a qualitative shortfall within some settlements.

The Council is supportive of the principle of the temporary greening of vacant and derelict development sites and contains a policy (INF8) which supports and encourages this. The place making section of the plan also identifies sites which would particularly benefit from temporary greening.

Business and Industrial sites or 'local business locations' have been identified in within or o the edge of smaller settlements where appropriate.

In line with SPP the Council will carry out Business Land Audits on a regular basis as resources permit.

The opposition to the reallocation of this area to mixed use is noted. However, the Council remains firmly of the belief that the economic development benefits of the scheme make it a worthwhile proposition. Business and industrial development at this area is unlikely to happen without some form of cross funding/enabling development. It is for this reason that the Council has taken the view to proceed with the principles set out in the preferred option within the MIR.

<b>Main Issue 17: Changes to Business and Industrial Locations</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issues: The main issue sets out the Council's preferred option for which EALP 2010 sites will be changed and/or carried over into the EALDP as a result of the business and industrial land and property review.</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>The responses were split, with 3 respondents in favour of the preferred option and 2 respondents against it.</p> <p>One respondent objected to a specific site within the preferred option which related to an extension to a safeguarded business and industrial site.</p> <p>Two respondents wanted further information on the proposed mix of uses within the sites suggested for re-allocation to mixed use.</p> <p>One respondent preferred the alternative option in favour of the preferred option, but no explanation was given by the respondent as to why the alternative option should be used.</p>	<p>A relatively small number of responses were received on this main issue and those that were received were split. The Council is of the view that on the basis of the responses received there is no merit for any significant change to the preferred option set out in the MIR with the exception of Templeton Roundabout, Auchinleck which has not been included as a development site in the Proposed Plan. The Ryden Review of Business and Industrial land that was undertaken to inform the East Ayrshire Local Development Plan concluded that whilst the existing three strategic sites at Rowallan, Meiklewood/Mossie and Moorfield (North) in Kilmarnock should remain to facilitate future inward investment and indigenous growth and that the Barony Road/Highhouse Industrial Estate at Auchinleck is a good location for business and industry, larger sites ranging in size from 5-10 hectares, outwith Kilmarnock and in secondary locations, are more difficult to justify against a background of very limited uptake and poor economic outlook and accordingly should be considered further. The Proposed Plan fully reflects these findings. Templeton Roundabout, Auchinleck has been removed from the business and industrial land supply as it forms a site of between 5-10ha out-with Kilmarnock and has very high infrastructure development costs. This is reflected in the fact that planning consent for mixed use developed has now lapsed. Moorfield Strategic Industrial site has also been extended to the north as a third phase to reflect the success of the existing two phases. In addition to the above, a search area for a future strategic industrial site has been identified at the Bellfield Roundabout area in Kilmarnock as part of a future M77 Investment Corridor which runs from East Renfrewshire in the north to Prestwick Airport in the south. Further work on this will be carried out</p>

<p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposition to Rowallan Business Park/Northcraig being re-allocated to mixed-use;</li> <li>• Alternative suggestion that the developer at Northcraig funds the development of units themselves;</li> <li>• Suggested alternative option: redraw boundary around existing Rowallan Business Park but include the three fields with outline planning permission for class 4 office use forming an extension to the business park (Planning application ref: 10/0918/PPP) and redraw the boundary of the site to exclude the rest of 008MXD. The new site to be safeguarded business and industrial land.</li> <li>• Objection to a proposed extension of Barony Road/Highhouse Industrial Estate;</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Masterplans or design briefs for the mixed use sites should incorporate green network aims into the development of the sites. Masterplans or design briefs should also consider the existing green infrastructure on site and the potential for development to link in with the wider network. One example is the site at Darvel as it offers the opportunity to develop better access and habitat connections along the river.</li> <li>• Scottish Water advises that industrial sites in Darvel and Kilmarnock would discharge Trade Effluent to their PFI asset at Meadowhead, Kilmarnock. They advise Additional Trade Effluent Consents at this asset may require discussion with the PFI company as Scottish Water's contract for treating this type of waste has a Trade Cap.</li> <li>• Brown Street, Newmilns (Local Plan 2010 Ref 348B) should be classified as a strategic area for attracting new businesses.</li> <li>• The area of Brown Street, Stoneygate Road is worthy of an in-depth study to establish future requirements and to encourage new</li> </ul>	<p>over the lifetime of this LDP and a formal designation, if still considered appropriate will be formally identified in a future LDP review.</p> <p>The issue of Rowallan Business Park is covered in Main Issue 18.</p> <p>The extension to Barony Road/Highhouse Industrial Estate is considered appropriate. The Ryden Report states it is a good location for business and industry</p> <p>Volume 2 of the Proposed Plan indicates where the developers of mixed use sites will be required to provide master plans and design statements as part of their proposals. Green infrastructure issues will be required to be addressed.</p> <p>Noted. This has been included as a note attached to relevant industrial sites in Volume 2 of the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>The area at Brown Street Newmilns is retained as a business and industrial area</p>
--	---

<p>employment opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mixed use allocation on the former Diageo site should be amended to include specific reference on the plan as a college development site and distinguished as such within Table 14.</li> </ul>	<p>The area being constructed for the college is shown on the place making maps in Volume 1 and educational uses are included within KILMARNOCK12 in Volume 2 of the proposed plan.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Main Issue 18: Rowallan Business Park/Northcraig</b></p> <p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: Explores the options to encourage and enable business and industrial use at this location.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p> <p>Of the responses received to this issue, two respondents are in favour of the preferred option while three respondents are in opposition to it. Those in opposition mainly object to additional residential development within the Northcraig/Southcraig area of Kilmarnock.</p> <p>Southcraig and Dean Community Council are not in favour of any further development of the Rowallan Business Park and Northcraig farm sites, citing it would be detrimental to Kilmarnock as a whole and that the Council should concentrate on town centre living and working.</p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>The take up of industrial land in the existing Rowallan Business Park has been slow. The last unit to be constructed was in 2007/8, and there are no positive signs that the remaining larger plots will be developed in the near future. The currently un-serviced expansion area of Northcraig has had no interest from the market as a business and industrial development in the last 10 years. Despite the site gaining Planning Permission in Principle for business and industrial uses, the land owner has stated that they have had no interest in the development of this site for these particular uses.</p> <p>The Council's Economic Development Strategy 2012-2017 contains six priorities, one of which is to accelerate the pace of infrastructure improvements. The Strategy states that providing the space and accommodation to support the indigenous business base and to attract new investment is essential.</p> <p>Speculative development is unlikely to be undertaken by private developments without grants or subsidies as the financial returns are too low. As Local Government finances are already under pressure the provision of subsidies or grants to the private sector for new business and industrial units in this economic climate is considered unlikely. Alternative methods of financing are required as East Ayrshire cannot offer the same incentives as Enterprise Zones within neighbouring authorities. The Ryden Report also</p>

<p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no foundation for the MIR's assertion that cross funding from private housing is required to stimulate employment related development on this site.</li> <li>• There is nothing in Background Paper 1 that supports the MIR's preferred strategy under Main Issue 18.</li> </ul>	<p>acknowledges and concurs with these issues.</p> <p>The Council's preferred way of providing business and industrial development for this location is cross-funding from residential development. In a similar way the Council has previously facilitated the development of business and industrial land at Moorfield, Kilmarnock.</p> <p>Following from the research that Ryden undertook for the Council, it was recognised that there was an opportunity, on a selective basis, to identify mixed-use development to bring forward employment property. The Report also states that where sites are in close proximity to other uses, such as residential, they may be suitable for mixed use proposals going forward.</p> <p>Rowallan Business Park is located in close proximity to the existing Southcraigs residential estate and to the forthcoming development at Northcraig, which has Planning Permission in Principle for residential development. The existing business park already has uses that would be compatible with residential development within a mixed site.</p> <p>Taking into account all of the above, the Council has taken the view that the economic development benefits of the proposed scheme at Rowallan/Northcraig make it a worthwhile proposition. Business and industrial development at this area is unlikely to happen without some form of cross funding/enabling development. It is for this reason that the Council has taken the view to proceed with the principles set out in the preferred option within the MIR. Policy IND2 of the proposed plan sets this approach out in full.</p> <p>The Council believes that the Ryden report and its own analysis provides sufficient justification.</p>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The same arguments for the rejection of Mixed Use Development on Meiklewood/Mossie surely apply to Rowallan Business Park/Northcraig, in terms of residential development, as the sites are adjacent to each other.</li> <li>• A further 200 houses on top of the already granted 500 houses are too many for the Northcraig area.</li> <li>• To date there has been no market interest in the site for industrial/business use development. Its loss as a Strategic Business Location will not impact upon the Council's requirements to maintain an industrial land supply.</li> <li>• There is absolutely no mention in the MIR of how the Council intends to regenerate Kilmarnock town centre, and that any plan to develop Rowallan Business Park, is instead in direct opposition to this key strategy as it will serve only to attract industry and families away from the town centre at a time when they should instead be encouraged into the town centre to support and generate local business.</li> <li>• Former Northcraig reservoir site should be considered together along with Rowallan Business Park/Northcraig or incorporated into the mix.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council is of the view that the Rowallan/Northcraig site is closer to and relates better to existing residential areas at north Kilmarnock.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that this area can adequately accommodate 700 houses albeit it is acknowledged that certain infrastructure improvements in the form of a larger roundabout on Glasgow Road will be required.</p> <p>As can be seen in the proposed plan, a key part of the LDP strategy is town centre regeneration. The Place making section of the plan sets out in detail how Kilmarnock town centre should be regenerated.</p> <p>The Council does not consider that additional land at Northcraig reservoir is required to accommodate development needs for the period of this LDP.</p>
---	--

<b>Main Issue 19: Meiklewood/Mosside</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issue: Explores the options to safeguard business and industrial use at this location.</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>Four respondents are in favour of the preferred option with three respondents favouring alternative option 2, that is, to re-allocate the site to mixed use.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The allocation of the site as a mixed use development will also help Kilmarnock to diversify its local economy and flexibility is the key to future success. The Council will appreciate that Meiklewood/Mosside is not directly competing with the other brownfield or greenfield sites in Kilmarnock as allocated in the finalised plan but with other comparable development sites in surrounding Council areas.</li> <li>• The site is physically divorced from the rest of Kilmarnock and does not therefore represent a sustainable location for residential development.</li> <li>• Alternative Option 1 to reallocate it as a Mixed Use Development Site is also 'dangerous'. This option could end up with piecemeal industrial &amp; business development on greenfield land on the approaches to Kilmarnock. Given the slow rate of development at Southcraigs, mixed use might well turn into designation as 'a development opportunity site', with an element of residential sprawl appearing too.</li> <li>• As there is sufficient industrial land already available in Kilmarnock; with some developed sites under-used and with vacant industrial and business properties throughout the Town, I recommend Alternative Option 2: De-allocate this site- should be given serious consideration as the most appropriate option to ensure good re-use of existing</li> </ul>	<p>The Ryden report supports the continued identification of Meiklewood/Mosside, Kilmarnock as a strategic business and industrial site in order to attract inward investment given its location and size. The report also states that alternative development, such as residential, would not likely be supported given its isolated and peripheral position. The Council shares this view and for this reason the site has been retained as a strategic business and industrial site in the proposed plan.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that reallocating the site to mixed use is likely to result in an oversupply of housing at north Kilmarnock and in the wider Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub-housing market area. It has therefore retained business and industrial designation at Meiklewood/Mosside.</p> <p>The Council agrees that Meiklewood is physically divorced from key residential areas in Kilmarnock.</p> <p>The Council shares the view that the Meiklewood site should not be designated as a mixed use site.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that the site should not be de-allocated as it forms part of a wider suite of strategic business and industrial sites in Kilmarnock. It is considered that this site will not provide direct competition to other serviced</p>

<p>industrial land; and to ensure that new industrial estates do not remain half developed for another decade.</p>	<p>sites as the upfront infrastructure costs required to service this site are significant. For this reason, the Meiklewood site is seen as a longer term prospect with other serviced sites at Moorfield and Rowallan Business Park being developed in advance of this one.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Main Issue 20: Caponacre Industrial Estate</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: The main issue explores the options to maximise economic development at Caponacre.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>One respondent agreed with the Councils preferred option for this main issue.</p>	<p>The Council has followed the MIR preferred option and has identified Caponacre as a miscellaneous development opportunity site in order to encourage a wider range of uses on former industrial land.</p>

<p><b>Main Issue 21: Stewarton</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: Seeks to designate a new business and industrial location within Stewarton.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>There was support for the preferred option; however, the majority of the support was due to the fact that most respondents were against alternative site 2 (Cutsburn Brae) and therefore supported the preferred option. One respondent objected to alternative option 1 (Draffen East).</p> <p>One of the respondents favoured alternative option 2 as a significantly better option, whilst one respondent favoured option 3: retaining the existing supply of business and industrial land as in the Local Plan 2010.</p>	<p>Taking into account all representations received, as well as viability and land supply issues, it is considered that the most suitable and viable prospect for future industrial use is the site at Bridgend, Stewarton. The proposed plan identifies this for industrial and business uses.</p>

<p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preferred location could be readily served by public transport.</li> <li>• Designation of new business and industrial areas should be applied to all settlements.</li> <li>• It is considered there is a need to provide an additional allocation. That allocation needs to be of a different scale and in a different type of location, one where the environment and development offering is more suited to office, business and light manufacturing uses, and where there can be long term provision for company growth and expansion. Basically this suggested provision would be a business park for Stewarton. In terms of locations, the positive attributes of the Cutsburn Road Fields site have already been recognised in the MIR text. These positive attributes can be enhanced by the inclusion a Business Park use within a mixed use allocation that can spread the costs of the necessary infrastructure, and provide for a phased development of the Stewarton Business Park to provide both speculative and bespoke units.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council agrees that the site is well served by public transport. The LDP has only identified new business and industrial areas where a shortfall in supply has been identified through the Council review of business and industrial land.</p> <p>The Council does not agree that an additional, larger mixed use designation is required in Stewarton. Mixed use could result in an oversupply of housing land in the town as there are already significant housing allocations within the plan.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Main Issue 22: A Spatial Framework for Regeneration</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue suggests a spatial framework for regeneration, setting out the potential priority settlements for regeneration initiatives.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>The response to the regeneration hierarchy is mixed. There is a view that Kilmarnock and Cumnock/Auchinleck should be equal in terms of regeneration priorities. There is another view that accepts that Kilmarnock should be the priority for regeneration, but would like to see Galston included alongside Cumnock/Auchinleck.</p>	<p>The Council has noted the responses received and the MIR preferred option has been incorporated into the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy.</p>

<p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan should consider the Loudoun Castle Estate, which could make a significant contribution to the economy of East Ayrshire and help to increase the status of Galston and Kilmarnock.</li> </ul>	<p>Loudoun Castle Estate is identified as a miscellaneous development opportunity site suitable for a range of tourism related uses.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Main Issue 23: The future use of the Johnnie Walker site, Kilmarnock</b></p> <p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue explores the appropriate future uses for the former Johnnie Walker site on Hill Street, Kilmarnock.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>On balance, the respondents generally support the preferred option, which involves changing the allocation of the former Johnnie Walker site from business and industrial to a mixed use site with potential for a wide range of uses in a line with the extant planning permission in principle.</p> <p>Only 1 respondent supports the alternative option of supporting large scale retail. It is suggested that this option should not be dismissed as it could assist in the delivery of the site and offer economic benefits in terms of employment. 1 respondent strongly objects to the use of the site for large scale retail, due to the potential impact on the town centre.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a concern that the pedestrian linkages between the site and the town centre should be developed. Conversely, there is concern that the policy must be worded very carefully to ensure the delivery is not inhibited by onerous criteria that is out-with the control of the applicant.</li> <li>It is requested that the LDP should include the Diageo site at Balmoral</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed plan has allocated the site as a miscellaneous development opportunity site suitable for uses in line with the extant Planning Permission in Principle. A large scale retail designation is not considered appropriate. Any small scale retail development proposed for the site should meet with the sequential test meaning that town centre sites are considered prior to this one.</p> <p>The Council agrees that pedestrian links between the site and the town centre should be developed. This can be seen on the place making map for Kilmarnock town centre. The Council is actively trying to seek improvement to the train station underpass and a multi-agency working group has been set up in this regard.</p>

Road within the mixed use allocation for Hill Street.	The Diageo site at Balmoral Road has been allocated as a miscellaneous development opportunity site suitable for residential, business and industry or leisure and cultural uses.
---	---

<b>Main Issue 24: The future direction for Kilmarnock town centre</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue questions how the LDP should plan for the future of Kilmarnock Town Centre and whether it should take account of the recently approved Integrated Urban Development Plan for the town.</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>In general, respondents support the preferred option of incorporating the relevant of parts of the IUDP into the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>There is general support for the principle of town centre living. 1 respondent has questioned the need for a town centre living boundary to be mapped.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is concern about reallocating the retail opportunity on Titchfield Street. It is recommended that this continue to reflect the extant planning permission for a supermarket.</li> <li>• There is a request for caution in widening out the uses in the core area, to ensure that the result is not a proliferation of bad neighbour developments that would deter future retail investors.</li> <li>• There is a request that the Glencairn Retail Park be identified as a commercial centre and its role and contribution to the towns retail offer</li> </ul>	<p>The Council has prepared place making maps for Kilmarnock, Cumnock, Stewarton, Galston and Dalmellington. A realistic assessment of which parts of the IUDP can be delivered within the LDP period and been made and these projects are all shown on the Kilmarnock town centre and wider Kilmarnock place making maps. Timescales and progress on delivery of these projects is shown in the Action Programme.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that a town centre living boundary is useful in showing the extent of the Council's preferred areas for this particular use.</p> <p>The allocation of all LDP sites needs to take account of the extant planning permissions. The Council is of the view that the LDP should, however, give flexibility to deliver alternative proposals, should the extant consents not be taken forward.</p> <p>The widening out of the acceptable uses in the core area will be prevented by policy TC6 which ensures that all proposals for food and drink, public houses, clubs and hot food takeaways do not have a detrimental impact on the town centre.</p> <p>The LDP through its network of centres table is clear on the role of commercial centres, including Glencairn and Queens Drive Retail Park. The</p>

<p>clearly set out. The allocation of the site to the north of the retail park should take cognisance of the extant planning consent. In contrast, 1 respondent requests that the allocated sites to the north and west of Glencairn retail park be removed from the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queens Drive should be retained as a commercial centre. The Plan should make clear the role of the commercial centre within the hierarchy of centres.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to removing the bulky goods restriction on Queens Drive retail park to reflect current trends in retailer requirements.</li> <li>• There is concern about reliance on TIF and JESSICA funding as the drivers for implementing the IUDP</li> <li>• There needs to be further work done on the implications of the major traffic circulation changes proposed through the IUDP, particularly with regards to how these relate to public transport. Public transport around the town centre should be a priority.</li> </ul>	<p>town centre remains the prime destination for retail development and the role of Queens Drive should remain as a bulky goods retail location. Glencairn helps to meet demand for large retail floorspace requirements and compliments the town centre of Kilmarnock helping to stem expenditure leakage to destinations out-with East Ayrshire.</p> <p>Queens Drive remains as a commercial centre in the LDP suitable for bulky goods retailing.</p> <p>The delivery of the IUDP will explore all funding options available.</p> <p>The Council, in association with SPT has appointed consultants to examine the feasibility of the transportation interventions set out in the IUDP. This also examines public transport implications. The ongoing conclusions of this study will be incorporated into the Action Programme as it progresses. The place making maps and action programme provide further information on this matter.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Main Issue 25: The role of Cumnock town centre</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue explores the how the LDP should provide a policy framework to drive the regeneration of Cumnock town centre and help supports its position as the main service centre for the southern area.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>Respondents generally agree with the preferred option, that Cumnock town centre should remain the focus for retail and commercial activity within the southern area and that this should be driven by a new town centre strategy.</p> <p>It is generally agreed that the retail should be focused in the town centre and Glaisnock Centre and that no retail allocations should be identified out-with</p>	<p>The LDP spatial strategy promotes Cumnock town centre as the key location for retail and commercial activity within the southern area. The future of the Glaisnock centre is a key priority for the plan as shown on the place making map for Cumnock town centre. No retail sites are identified out-with the town centre boundary.</p>

<p>the town centre boundary.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any town centre strategy must incorporate green network considerations and public transport and pedestrian linkages.</li> <li>• The town centre living boundary and support for new residential development should not over-ride the need to redevelop the Glaisnock centre.</li> </ul>	<p>The place making maps for Cumnock have a specific focus on green network and green infrastructure issues.</p> <p>The drive for town centre living and the redevelopment of the Glaisnock centre are complimentary with neither taking precedence over the other. Both matters form key elements of the regeneration of Cumnock town centre.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Main Issue 26: The Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere</b></p> <p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue questions whether the LDP should give policy support to the Biosphere</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p> <p>There is a mixed response to the issue of policy support for the Biosphere. Generally the development industry disagrees with a Biosphere policy and questions the appropriateness of such a policy, with concerns that the non-statutory biosphere designation could become a barrier to development.</p> <p>Other responses generally agree that the LDP should support the Biosphere designation, agreeing that it represents a unique opportunity for East Ayrshire that should be reflected in the LDP.</p> <p>If a policy is included, it should be clear in specifying what needs to be protected and what will and will not be acceptable.</p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>The LDP has taken a supportive yet balanced approach to the issue of the Biosphere in that it includes a policy (TOUR5) which encourages developments and proposals that support the overall aims of the Biosphere but does not presume against certain types of development within its boundaries.</p> <p>The Biosphere policy and accompanying text makes the purpose of the Biosphere clear and is aligned with its aims. In addition to this, the potential of the Biosphere is acknowledged in the place making section of the plan. The policy is purposely not too specific to avoid over complicating the development management process.</p>

<p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A policy for the Biosphere is not necessary, as its objective can be achieved through existing designations (eg. SSSI's). A specific policy would be unnecessary duplication.</li> <li>• The LDP should take a proactive approach to branding and increasing awareness of the Biosphere.</li> <li>• Wind farms should be seen as an important part of achieving sustainable development.</li> <li>• The focus for any Biosphere policy should be on recognising Ayrshire's natural heritage as an asset on which sustainable development can be based. This asset needs appropriate protection and policies should prevent significant damage to the natural habitats and wildlife in the biosphere area.</li> <li>• Aside from LDP support, the Biosphere initiative will require investment with a dedicated core team for the project.</li> <li>• Sustainable tourism initiatives promoting the natural heritage should be supported by the Biosphere policy. Policy should also support appropriate recreation related activities, which should not be automatically excluded from the Biosphere core area.</li> <li>• It is suggested that a spatial SPG for the area to the south of Dalmellington may be appropriate, tying together all aspects of policy relevant to this area.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council is of the view that a Biosphere policy is required in the LDP in order to both raise its profile and to support and encourage appropriate development within its boundaries.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that the LDP does raise awareness of the Biosphere. The Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere Partnership has primary responsibility for specific issues such as branding.</p> <p>The Biosphere should be one of many issues considered in the Environmental Impact Assessments carried out for wind farm applications. During this process, the sustainability of proposals can be assessed.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that the LDP's natural environment policies adequately protect natural habitats and wildlife in the Biosphere. It is considered that the key role of the Biosphere policy should be to support its aims and encourage development which achieves these.</p> <p>A dedicated Biosphere partnership and team is already in operation.</p> <p>The tourism policies of the LDP as a whole encourage and support sustainable tourism initiatives as well as appropriate recreation related activities. It is considered that there is no need to repeat the content of the general tourism policies in the Biosphere policy.</p> <p>The LDP has not taken the route of preparing spatial supplementary guidance for the Dalmellington area as it is considered that this would not sit comfortably with the overall structure of the LDP and could lead to confusion amongst plan users.</p>
---	---

<b>Main Issue 27: The Dark Sky Park – A Driver for the Regeneration of the Doon Valley</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue seeks views on whether the LDP should have a policy that awards protection to the Dark Sky Park in the Doon Valley area.</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>There was a mixed response to whether the LDP should give policy support to the Dark Sky Park. There is significant opposition, particularly from the development industry, to a Dark Sky policy based on a non-statutory designation that could have the potential to be a barrier to development, particularly wind farms.</p> <p>A number of questions were raised on the lack of clarity over how the boundaries of the Dark Sky Park have been established and how proposals would be assessed against a policy e.g. how would 'significant adverse impacts' be measured. There were various concerns that such a policy could be contrary to SPP, on the basis of the non-statutory basis of the designation and the level of weight that may be given to it in decision making.</p> <p>There was support for the Dark Sky Park, as a driver for sustainable tourism, reducing light pollution and establishing East Ayrshire as a model of environmental excellence.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Dark Sky Park and Observatory should be given necessary protection from lighting as well as anything that generates vibrations through the ground or infrasound. An exclusion zone should be drawn, within which harmful proposals should be contrary to policy. This would give certainty to the local community and developers.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to an industrial development exclusion</li> </ul>	<p>Whilst it is recognised that the Dark Sky Park is a non-statutory designation, it is nevertheless considered to be a resource of key importance that requires protection in order to retain its status. For this reason the Dark Sky Park is identified as a non-statutory designation within the LDP. A LDP policy (TOUR4) presumes against development proposals that would produce levels of lighting that would adversely impact on the Dark Sky core zone. Within the Buffer Zone as shown on the map within Volume 1 of the LDP, developers will be required through policy TOUR4 to ensure that non statutory guidance on Dark Sky Park lighting is fully complied with. Wind Farm proposals are common within or in the vicinity of the Dark Sky Park. Policy TOUR4 will ensure that any lighting proposed on wind turbines does not impact detrimentally on this important designation.</p> <p>The Observatory is not specifically mentioned in the DSP policy. However, overarching policy OP1 protects the tourism offer of East Ayrshire from inappropriate development. This policy together with the DSP policy will give adequate protection to both.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to identify a DSP industrial development</p>

<p>zone and to increasing the Dark Sky Park northwards to the upper Nith Valley.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The boundaries of the Dark Sky Park are imposed by a third party (the International Dark Sky Association) and is not accountable to any level of government in Scotland. The boundaries can be changed by the association without due consultation – would any planning policy boundary therefore have to change on a unilateral basis.</li> <li>• The rationale for the Buffer zone is unclear. This should be extended to protect the character of the area, particularly the Dalmellington Observatory and its function.</li> <li>• The Dark Sky designation was sought by the Forestry Commission to drive tourism. It should not be used to stop development.</li> </ul>	<p>exclusion zone in the LDP as this could unnecessarily prevent otherwise acceptable economic development. The Council is of the view that both the business and industry policies and the DSP policy will provide adequate protection.</p> <p>The DSP map has been reproduced in Volume 1 of the LDP. If boundaries are changed, this would be revised as part of the next LDP review.</p> <p>The purpose of the buffer zone is made clear in the text of the LDP. Within this area, developers will be encouraged to follow the guidance provided in the Dark Sky Park Lighting non statutory guidance.</p> <p>It is agreed that a primary function of the DSP is to attract tourism. However, in order to retain the DSP status, inappropriate lighting must be avoided. If the DSP policy and non-statutory guidance are followed then sympathetic development will not be stopped.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Main Issue 28: East Ayrshire Four Towns Enquiry by Design</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of issue: This issue explores how the Four Towns Reports, prepared following the Enquiry By Design, should be taken forward and incorporated into the Local Development Plan.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>In general, there is support for the preferred option of refreshing the existing four towns strategies and approving the refreshed strategies as SPG.</p>	<p>The Council is now of the view that the Four Town strategies should be incorporated into the place making maps set out in the Place Making section</p>

<p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regeneration of East Ayrshire's towns could be supported by reducing business rates.</li> <li>• Any revised plans should be targeted and realistic.</li> <li>• The Enquiry by Design Process should be extended to other places in East Ayrshire.</li> <li>• It is suggested that Community Planning Partners be asked to prioritise the issues in the four towns strategies within their own programmes for each site.</li> </ul>	<p>of the plan. Not all of the projects set out in the Four towns strategies have been carried forward into the place making maps. Instead, a realistic assessment of which land use based projects can make most impact in achieving Scottish Government's six qualities of successful places has been made and included on the maps. The Four Towns strategies have been taken full account of in this process as have other relevant documents such as the Kilmarnock Integrated Urban Development Plan and Community Action Plans.</p> <p>The LDP cannot influence business rates.</p> <p>It is agreed that revised plans should be realistic and targeted. All identified projects have been set out in the draft LDP Action Programme with any progress timescales for achieving them attached.</p> <p>Ideally all of East Ayrshire's settlements would go through an Enquiry by Design/Charrette process. However, current staff and financial resources would not permit this. Instead, a placemaking map for Kilmarnock, Cumnock, Stewarton, Galston and Dalmellington are included in the LDP. As is set out in the LDP Action Programme, all East Ayrshire settlements will have its own placemaking map and these will form Supplementary Guidance to the plan.</p> <p>Community Planning Partners (CPPs) have been consulted prior to publication of the plan and will be consulted on additional place making maps that will be prepared as supplementary guidance. CPPs will be encouraged to align their own programmes with these.</p>
--	---

<b>Main Issue 29: Mauchline's future growth and infrastructure</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue acknowledges the peak hour congestion present in Mauchline but states that the proposal for a by-pass funded by private housing development is no longer viable in today's economic climate. The Council's preferred option is to create an alternative western relief road to reduce right turning traffic southbound at the cross thereby allowing traffic to flow more freely north to south through the cross.</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>Only 5 out of 12 respondents support the Council's preferred option stating that it would help to reduce congestion at the cross but stating that green networks should be taken into account in the development of associated housing land.</p> <p>SPT states that funding from the Scottish Government would be required to realise the full scale eastern by-pass but that this project does not feature on any current funding programme. However, the A76 Partnership is pushing for appropriate improvements to the road. For this reason they think that the Council should retain reference to the full scale eastern Mauchline by-pass in the proposed plan as an aspiration using the A76 Action Plan as a justification.</p> <p>Other respondents who disagree with the Council's preferred option are of the view that a smaller scale western relief road would not reduce traffic congestion and would be a waste of time and resources. One community council state that changes to the existing traffic signals at the cross could ease traffic flow.</p> <p>Other comments included the fact that it could be difficult to justify developments in other settlements paying contributions because the new by-pass is not needed to make those developments possible.</p>	<p>The Council is of the view that the preferred option set out in the MIR is no longer a viable prospect. A developer who previously had an interest in developing the land required to create a western relief road has indicated that they will no longer be proceeding with development at this part of Mauchline and that negotiations with land owners at this part of the town had ceased. For this reason the Council has opted for Alternative Option 2, No traffic relief proposal as any by-pass/relief road proposal is reliant on significant funding which is not available from either the development industry or the Scottish Government at the present time. It is recognised that this does not resolve known congestion at Mauchline Cross. However, without funding or developer interest, there are no alternative realistic options available to the Council. The Council does however support in principle a bypass for Mauchline. The LDP includes a proposal which states that the Council will, in partnership with relevant parties, investigate the potential funding mechanisms which could enable the construction of a by-pass.</p>

<b>Main Issue 30: Developer Contributions</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issue:</b> This issue acknowledges that the EALP 2010 policy on developer contributions was written at a time when the housing market was at its peak. Since 2008 there have been significantly less private housing completions which has meant that contributions have been collected at a much lower rate than was envisaged. The Council's preferred option is therefore to revisit the list of projects for which contributions will be sought with a view to reviewing and prioritising projects and potentially reducing their number.	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>Of the 10 respondents who gave views on this issue, 6 agreed with the Council's preferred option. Additional comments stated that the Council should ensure all developer contribution projects are related in scale and kind to the proposed development and that consideration should be given to increasing the threshold at which the developer contributions policy applies.</p> <p>The House building industry has offered to engage with the council in discussions on the implications on developer contributions of reduced funding availability.</p> <p>Only one respondent disagreed with the preferred option but no reasons for this were given.</p>	<p>The Council has carried through its preferred option from the MIR and has significantly reduced the number of projects that developer contributions will be directed to. These projects are related in scale and kind to proposed developments. Whilst a project list has been drawn up, exact costings have not yet been calculated. This will be included within Supplementary Guidance on Developer Contributions which the house building industry amongst others will be fully consulted on.</p>

<b>Main Issue 31: Next Generation Broadband</b>	
<b>Synopsis of Main Issue:</b> The main issue states that the Local Development Plan will contain policies residential and business and industrial developers to provide fibre optic cable direct to new premises.	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
<p>All of the 5 respondents agreed with the preferred option for Next Generation Broadband.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p> <p>Small out of the way villages like Sorn, Dunlop and Skares should not be</p>	<p>The Council has taken forward the preferred option has included a policy on the Installation of Next Generation Broadband for New Developments (INF2).</p> <p>With regard to comments relating to the roll out of next generation broadband to specific East Ayrshire settlements, this is dealt with under the 'Step Change Project' which sits separately to the LDP and is working to different</p>

<p>forgotten in the consultation.</p> <p>The rollout of optic cabling into the Irvine Valley is essential to maintain current business and encourage new start-ups.</p> <p>Currently in Sorn householders are only receiving speeds of 0.4 megabytes which is well below national averages, by connecting to the main junction box in the village this speed would increase immediately to 5 megabytes.</p>	<p>timescales. Council officials are, however, are working closely with the Scottish Government to ensure that all of East Ayrshire settlements benefit from next generation broadband between now and 2017.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Main Issue 32: A spatial framework for large scale wind farms</b></p> <p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue addresses how the LDP should plan for large scale wind farms and in particular whether the Plan should identify a new area of search for large scale wind farms.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>The responses received were split over whether an Area of Search should be identified, with 8 supporting a new Area of Search and 5 against a new area of search. Those in favour of a new Area of Search were predominantly from the wind farm development sector, who believe that East Ayrshire can support further areas of large scale wind farms and that these areas should be identified through a spatial framework with the LDP.</p> <p>Of those that that did not support the identification of a new area of search, it was generally felt that East Ayrshire currently has enough wind farms and that any more would be damaging to the area.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p>	<p>Since the MIR was produced and consulted on, a revised SPP has been published (June 2014). The new SPP requires planning authorities to follow a set methodology in preparing spatial frameworks. Using these spatial frameworks, planning authorities are then required to identify where, if appropriate, it considers that strategic capacity for wind energy development exists. In this regard therefore, Main Issue 32 has largely been superseded by new national policy.</p> <p>In preparing the LDP and associated Supplementary Guidance, the Council has concluded that there is one area of strategic capacity at the existing Whitelee wind farm. No additional areas within East Ayrshire are considered to have strategic capacity. This view is fully justified in Volume 1 of the LDP and Supplementary Guidance on Planning for Wind Energy.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a considerable level of comment on the landscape capacity study that is currently being prepared. It was requested by several respondents that this be subject to public consultation and scrutiny by industry.</li>   <li>• Concern was expressed by several respondents on the danger of putting too much onus on the conclusions of the landscape capacity study and that the LDP process should ensure that this is only one of a number of considerations taken into account. Other specific considerations raised comprised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All the criteria listed in SPP must be taken on board</li> <li>○ Aviation constraints</li> <li>○ Wetlands and Peatlands. Peatlands in particular should be avoided</li> <li>○ Reference should be made to the RSPB Bird Sensitivity Map</li> <li>○ Impacts on the water environment, in reference to the overarching aims of the Water Framework Directive</li> <li>○ Buffer zones around settlements and properties should be increased</li> <li>○ Ecological links between designated areas, including an area of protection around designated sites.</li> <li>○ Inclusion of community owned turbines</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• Several respondents requested that should an Area of Search be identified, this should not preclude wind farm development in other areas. In contrast, one respondent requested that any development out-with an identified area of search should be considered contrary to policy, whilst is noted by one further respondent that proposals for wind farms out-with areas of search, undermine the whole concept of identifying areas of search.</li>   <li>• Instead of identifying an area of search, it is suggested that guidance is prepared on areas where development would be contrary due to particular sensitivities. In all other areas, proposals would be assessed against set criteria.</li> </ul>	<p>The Scottish Government has confirmed that the procedures the Council has gone through in publishing the Ayrshire Landscape Wind Capacity study are sufficient and that no public consultation exercise is necessary.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that landscape capacity is a key consideration in setting out its policy stance on wind energy development. SPP omits landscape issues from the spatial framework stating that this should be one of many considerations at development management stage. Whilst the Council has taken this on board in preparing the spatial framework, the wind energy section of the LDP uses the conclusions of the Ayrshire Landscape Wind Capacity Study in arriving at its conclusions on whether there is any strategic capacity for wind energy development in East Ayrshire and does so following a meeting with Scottish Government officials. It is, however, fully recognised that landscape capacity is one of many factors that needs to be taken into account in assessing wind energy proposals. In line with SPP, the LDP covers all relevant factors. Schedule 1 of Volume 1 the Plan sets out Renewable Energy Criteria.</p> <p>SPP requires planning authorities to show, through their spatial frameworks, those areas where significant protection should be afforded against wind energy development. Likewise, the spatial framework shows areas with potential for wind energy development. No areas are automatically precluded from development; instead they require to meet with the provisions of the spatial framework.</p> <p>The role of the spatial framework as required by SPP is to show on a map certain constraints where wind farms are not acceptable (there are none of these in East Ayrshire), areas of significant protection and areas with potential for wind energy development. It is not considered appropriate to</p>
--	---

<p>In terms of specific areas that may be suitable for wind farm development, the following suggestions were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area to the east of the A76</li> <li>• The area to the south and south east of the A76</li> <li>• The area to the south of the A713</li> <li>• Land between the B7046 and the B741</li> <li>• The area to the east of Cumnock / north of New Cumnock</li> </ul>	<p>comment on particular suggested areas, instead developers are directed to the Spatial Framework map, the Wind Energy Section of the LDP and Supplementary Guidance on Planning for Wind Energy.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Main Issue 33: The approach to small-medium sized wind turbine proposals</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: In recognising the growth in demand for single scale turbines and the potential impact on the landscape of these developments, this issue questions how the LDP should provide a policy framework to guide wind turbine proposals below 20MW.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>The majority of respondents support the proposal to provide spatial guidance for small-medium scale wind turbine proposals. It is considered that this would help manage and guide the large number of proposals for single turbines that East Ayrshire is experiencing.</p> <p>Only one respondent was strongly against the preferred option, indicating that a spatial approach would be unable to accurately reflect the diversity within the landscape when it comes to siting small scale developments. Instead, it was suggested that a criteria-based policy should be developed, whereby every proposal would be assessed on its own site specific merits against set criteria.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy framework should not rely just on the landscape capacity assessment, but should pay due regard to all other relevant considerations/constraints.</li> </ul>	<p>SPP no longer makes the distinction between wind energy developments of under and over 20MW. Instead, individual planning authorities are required to define what scale of development will be the subject of the spatial framework. The East Ayrshire LDP is of the view that any wind turbine of 50m or more in height can have a significant impact and has therefore used this as a basis for its spatial framework. All proposals under 50m in height will be assessed under a different policy and supplementary guidance provides design guidance for smaller scale proposals.</p> <p>The policy approach for wind energy does not rely solely on the landscape wind capacity study. It covers all relevant considerations and fully complies with SPP.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be relevant criteria sitting alongside the spatial framework, against which proposals would be assessed.</li> <li>• Any SPG should be open to scrutiny and consultation.</li> <li>• Policies should be more sympathetic to small-medium sized turbine proposals, which generate money for local people, if there are no neighbour objections</li> </ul>	<p>Smaller scale proposals require to be assessed against policy RE6 and design guidance.</p> <p>Supplementary Guidance on Planning for Wind Energy is being published alongside the proposed plan and comments on its content are welcomed.</p> <p>All proposals will be assessed against relevant criteria and if they are found to be acceptable in terms of their impact then the Council will look favourably upon them in line with national policy.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Main Issue 34: The Renewable Energy Fund</b></p>	
<p><b>Synopsis of Main Issue: This issue seeks views on whether the operation of the Renewable Energy Fund should be reviewed and what changes, if any, should be made to the current Local Plan policy. Specifically, this issue questions whether the contribution rate should be increased from £2,500 to £5,000 Per MW capacity and whether the contribution should be required from single turbines over a certain height.</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of comments</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>Whilst there was some support for the Renewable Energy Fund policy, the majority of respondents disagreed, some very strongly, with the current policy approach.</p> <p>In general terms, the renewable energy sector is happy to provide community benefits to the local area in which they will be operating, and is generally content that a contribution of £5,000 per MW capacity is appropriate. However, the industry objects to the mandatory and restrictive nature of the current REF policy. It is suggested that flexibility is required to allow developers to work directly with communities and provide benefits to best fit the needs of the particular communities affected.</p> <p>It is further indicated by a number of respondents that the inclusion of a Renewable Energy Fund policy that makes the payment of money for</p>	<p>In light of the comments received and after consultation with communities and the development industry, the Council is taking a different approach to that set out in its preferred option.</p> <p>Whilst a £5000 per MW of installed capacity is being retained, £2500 per MW of this will be paid directly to affected communities with the remaining £2500 per MW being directed to a Council managed Renewable Energy Fund. The Council will then make this available to communities to for a wide range of more strategic projects.</p> <p>It is recognised that a mandatory community benefits policy would not meet with the provisions of Circular 3/2013 Planning Obligations and Good</p>

<p>community benefits mandatory, is contrary to Scottish Government Circular 1/2010 on Planning Circulars. This view is endorsed in the response from the Scottish Government.</p> <p>A number of respondents are of the view that community benefit payments should not be considered a planning matter, therefore the LDP should not include a policy on this.</p> <p>It is generally considered that the approach that is adopted for large scale wind farms should also apply to single turbines of a certain height.</p> <p>Additional specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 respondents are of the view that £5,000 is too low and that this should be increased to £10,000</li> <li>• 1 respondent suggests maintaining the current approach and level of contribution, but that at the same time the Council could encourage additional voluntary payments to be made to some form of Trust, similar to how the Minerals Trust operates.</li> <li>• It is suggested that whilst the £5,000 is generally appropriate, there should be flexibility to reduce this if the viability of a scheme is affected by particularly onerous site constraints e.g the cost of a radar mitigation scheme.</li> <li>• There is some concern that the 10km radius will not be appropriate for all cases and that the 'local community' should not be defined so crudely.</li> </ul>	<p>Neighbour Agreements. In this regard the policy <u>encourages</u> applicants to provide a community benefit payment.</p> <p>Community benefits are considered by Scottish Government policy and guidance to be a matter that can be included in a Section 75 planning obligation. It is therefore appropriate that the LDP contains a policy on this matter.</p> <p>The community benefits policy will be applied to all wind energy development of 50m or more in height.</p> <p>£5000 per MW is the current industry standard contribution and the Council does not wish to deviate from this.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that all £5000 per MW requires to be voluntary.</p> <p>The policy states that £5000 per MW will be requested. If any developer wishes to make a case for a lower amount, then discussions with relevant Council officers can take place.</p> <p>The Council considers that 10km is an appropriate distance to measure the impact of wind farms.</p>
--	---

**Part 2: Assessment of, and Council response to, sites suggested at MIR stage**

The table below sets out all sites suggested as potential Local Development Plan sites and provides a summary of how the Council has assessed the site and whether or not it appears in the LDP. Some sites are being suggested for the first time whilst others have previously been promoted for development without success. Lastly, some sites listed appeared in the East Ayrshire Local Plan 2010 and their continued identification in the EALDP is being promoted as they remain undeveloped.

<b>MIR ref and Name of Respondent</b>	<b>Site address</b>	<b>Summary of Response submitted at MIR Consultation stage</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
19MIR James Barr (now GVA James Barr)	Caprington, Kilmarnock	Housing site 320H in the EALP 2010 should be carried over into the EALDP.	This remains undeveloped despite being identified in the EALP 2010. Meetings with the land owner's agent have taken place and it has been stated that the economic downturn has prevented the site coming forward. The landowner is now proposing a reduced scheme which involves remodelling of the 18 hole golf course and the construction of 250 houses. This assists in securing the future of the popular Caprington Golf course which the Council will soon no longer manage. A reduced site has been carried over to the EALDP and forms site 320H and adjacent open space.
28AMIR Hope Homes	Crofthead Road, Kilmaurs	Housing site 305H in the EALP 2010 should be carried over to the EALDP.	The Council is of the view that this site should be carried over to the LDP. It is in a marketable accessible location and the landscape can comfortably accommodate housing at this site. It is noted that the owner has marketed the site in recent months. However, given its location, the Council is confident that it will be developed within the LDP period.
28BMIR Hope Homes	Dunlop Road, Stewarton	Housing site 356H in the EALP 2010 should be carried over to the EALDP.	The Council is of the view that this site should be carried over to the LDP. It is in a marketable and accessible location, relates well to the existing settlement and the landscape can comfortably accommodate housing at this site. It is noted that the owner has marketed the site in

			recent months. Initial discussions on layouts have taken place with the prospective purchaser, a national house builder. The Council is therefore confident that it will be developed within the next five years.
28CMIR Hope Homes	Bridgehousehill, Kilmarnock	Housing site 321H in the EALP 2010 should be carried over to the EALDP.	There has been no interest in this site since it first appeared in the EALDP 2010 in 2008. This location is not considered to be particularly marketable being close to the A77 and the topography of the site makes its servicing difficult. In landscape terms, only a small portion of this site is suitable for housing. For all of the above reasons, the Council has decided to delete the site. It therefore does not appear in the proposed plan and the settlement boundary of Kilmarnock has been redrawn to exclude this site.
28DMIR Hope Homes	Mill O'Shield Road, Drongan	Housing site 273H in the EALP 2010 should be carried over to the EALDP.	The Council is of the view that this site should be carried over to the LDP. It is in an accessible location, relates well to the existing settlement and the landscape can comfortably accommodate housing at this site. It is noted that development in Drongan has slowed significantly in recent years as a result of the economic downturn. It is nevertheless considered that this site should be made available through the LDP for when the market picks up.
41MIR ATH Resources (now in administration)	Sites at Drongan	Housing sites 273H and 289H should be carried over to the EALDP. Land to the north of site 289H should be identified for growth in future LDPs.	Housing sites 273H and 289H are being carried forward to the EALDP. They are both accessible housing sites which relate well to the settlement. It is noted that development in Drongan has slowed significantly in recent years as a result of the economic downturn. It is considered that this site should be made available through the LDP for when the market picks up.
49MIR Land Improvement Holdings	Site at Kilmaurs Road, Crosshouse	EALP 2010 housing site 258H should be carried over to the EALDP.	This site now has planning consent and is therefore being carried over to the EALDP.
142MIR Sir Claud Haggart Alexander	Site at Ayr Road Mauchline	EALP site 336H should be carried over to the EALDP to support the construction of a bypass for	Site 336H of the EALP 2010 was identified for housing development as part of a wider proposal to fund a bypass for Mauchline, the premise being that profit from housing

		Mauchline.	development would be used to forward fund a bypass. The housing developer who established this proposal and was going to take it forward has since indicated to the Council that this is no longer a viable option in light of the economic downturn and the change in the lending practices of financial institutions. This developer has not renewed their options with various land owners around Mauchline for this reason. Sir Claud Haggart Alexander owns the land at Ayr Road and is confident that the development of this site could assist in funding a bypass. However, no detailed information which justifies this position has been submitted to the Council. The Council considers it unlikely that this one site could provide the significant funding required to fund a bypass and no other supporting funding sources are available at this time. For all of the above reasons, the Council has deleted this site. It therefore does not appear in the proposed plan and the settlement boundary of Mauchline has been redrawn to exclude this site.
5MIR Matthew Clark	Irvinebank Road, Darvel	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing development in the EALDP.	This site has not been identified as a housing development site primarily because it lies adjacent to the River Irvine in an area indicated by SEPA to be at risk of flooding. There is also considered to be sufficient areas housing land with planning consent and/or free from flood risk to accommodate housing growth in Darvel for the LDP period.
12MIR Strathearn Estates	Northcraig Reservoir, Kilmarnock	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing development or as a future growth area in the EALDP.	This site has not been identified as a housing development opportunity because there is deemed to be sufficient housing land in the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub HMA without this site. In this particular part of Kilmarnock, there is already a site with a consent for 500 units at Northcraig and up to 200 units are being proposed through mixed use site 005MXD. Whilst it is recognised that the former reservoir site lies directly adjacent to both of these sites,

			additional release of housing land would result in an oversupply of land in this particular locality as well as an oversupply of land in the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub housing market area.
15MIR Caine, Gibb, Harwell (owners)	West Galston	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP.	This site sits in a location identified through the ENTEC Landscape Assessment carried out in 2005 as not having potential for development in landscape capacity terms. Satisfactory access to this site is also restricted which is acknowledged by the respondent themselves in their supporting statement. Only a limited number of houses could be accessed off the existing residential street network, after which time a new direct access off the A71 would be required. There is some doubt over whether such a new road would be financially viable and no evidence was submitted by the respondent to allay these concerns. In Galston overall, it is considered that in terms of access and landscape capacity and integration with the town, development and future expansion to the east is most appropriate. This site has not been included as a LDP housing site.
20MIR GVA James Barr	Site to north of Galston	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP	This site sits in a location identified through the ENTEC Landscape Assessment carried out in 2005 as not having potential for development in landscape capacity terms. It also lies in an area of flood risk. It is recognised that Tesco, the Coop and other development has taken place to the north of the river to the south east of the A71 roundabout. However, it is considered that, at this location to the south west of the roundabout on the A71, which is currently undeveloped, the river forms a strong boundary to the town and this area of land protects its setting. It is further considered that the level of development that is considered appropriate in Galston for the LDP period can be more appropriately located to the east of the town. This site has

			not been identified as a LDP housing site.
22MIR McTaggart and Mickel	Standalane, Kilmaurs	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP	Whilst it is accepted that this site is generally suitable for housing development, it is considered that sufficient housing land has been identified in Kilmaurs for its growth over the plan period and that the addition of this site is not required in terms of housing numbers both in the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub housing market area and the village of Kilmaurs itself. This site has not been included as a LDP housing site.
26MIR James Dewar	Newmill Road, Dunlop	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP	This site sits in a location identified through the ENTEC Landscape Assessment carried out in 2005 as not having potential for development in landscape capacity terms. In addition to this, there is considered to be sufficient land identified in the LDP within the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub housing market area. Dunlop has grown significantly in the last 5-6 years as a result of the former industrial site adjacent to the train station being developed for housing. Further significant growth at this time could detract from the small scale conservation village character that is currently present as well as putting additional pressure on Dunlop Primary School which is already nearing capacity. The respondent wanted this site identified to replace site 356H at Stewarton by stating that the Stewarton site is not effective. This is not accurate as site 356H is in the process of being sold to a national housebuilder. This site has not been included as a LDP housing site.
27MIR Taylor Wimpey	Land to east Fenwick	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP	Whilst there is some limited landscape capacity at this site for future housing development, it is considered that the scale of the site would be too large an expansion for this small conservation village and would detract from its character. There is also adequate housing land identified in the LDP within Fenwick on sites are considered to be more suitable sites in terms of their scale, location and

			relationship with the village. For these reasons this site has not been included as a housing site in the LDP.
33MIR Craig Steven	Waterslap Fenwick	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP	Whilst there is landscape capacity at this site for future housing development, it is considered that the scale of the site would be too large an expansion for the small conservation village of Laigh Fenwick and could detract from its character. There is also adequate housing land identified in the LDP within Laigh Fenwick on a site that has planning consent and is considered to be more suitable in terms of its scale, location and relationship with the village. For these reasons this site has not been included as a housing site in the LDP.
43MIR Gladman Developments	Peacockbank, Stewarton	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP	There is limited landscape capacity at this site for housing development and vehicular access to it would be required at a location to the south which is remote from the town itself. The site also does not integrate well with the town being separated by the river and its associated banking and green space. It is further considered that sufficient housing land is identified within Stewarton on alternative sites which integrate well with the town in landscape and access terms. These alternative sites also have a current active interest from national housebuilders. This site has not been identified as a housing site in the LDP.
48MIR Kilmarnock College	Holehouse Road, Kilmarnock	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP	This site is currently in use as the Kilmarnock College. However, a new college is under construction on an alternative site and this site will become vacant during the period of the LDP. The Council agrees that the most appropriate use for this site is housing and has identified the site as residential development opportunity site 426H.
54MIR Lynch Homes	Irvine Road, Kilmaurs	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP	This site has landscape capacity for residential use and has a suitable access onto Irvine Road to accommodate this level of development. In addition, there is a developer on board who is keen to take the site forward in the short

			term. The Council is of the view that this site will contribute towards meeting housing shortfalls identified in the Council's HNDA and has therefore identified the site as 422H in the LDP.
56MIR Land Improvement Holdings	Fardalehill, Kilmarnock	Respondent wishes to see this existing local plan housing site expanded towards Crosshouse Hospital in the EALDP	This proposed expansion site sits in a location identified through the ENTEC Landscape Assessment carried out in 2005 as not having potential for development in landscape capacity terms. It is accepted that part of the existing Fardalehill housing site 318H already partially sits within such an area. However, by taking the development further to the west as suggested by the respondent, Crosshouse would effectively coalesce with Kilmarnock which is not considered appropriate at that location for either settlement. In topographical terms, the land to the west of existing local plan housing site 318H is constrained as is acknowledged in the respondent's submission. The Council is of the view that there are more preferable areas in Kilmarnock for future growth and expansion which have greater landscape capacity and no coalescence issues. This area has not been identified for housing development or as a future growth area in the LDP.
62MIR Hope Homes	Gatehead Road, Crosshouse	Respondent wishes to see this site identified for housing in the EALDP	Whilst it is accepted that this site is generally suitable for housing development, it is considered that sufficient housing land has been identified in Crosshouse for its growth over the plan period and that the addition of this site is not required in terms of housing numbers both in the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub housing market area and the village of Crosshouse itself. There are two alternative housing sites identified in Crosshouse one of which has a current consent for in excess of 100 units which demonstrates that sufficient effective capacity exists elsewhere in the village. This site has not been included as a LDP housing site.

67MIR Hallam Land	Land to west and north west of Kilmarnock	Respondent wishes to see significant areas of land at west and north west Kilmarnock released for development in phases 2015-2017, 2017-2025 and 2025-2035). These sites would replace other sites in Kilmarnock namely, Treesbank, Bridghousehill and Caprington.	The respondent is proposing a significant expansion to Kilmarnock which is in excess of the numbers required by the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) and the Local Housing Strategy. The masterplan submitted also suggests that existing housing site 319H will be developed by 2017. It is highly unlikely that this site will have started construction of 500 units before 2017. Only some parts of the land put forward by the respondent have capacity for development in landscape terms. Whilst the Council is of the view that not all of this land can feasibly be identified for development through the LDP, a portion of land to the west of Altonhill has been identified as Future Growth Area 2. It has some landscape capacity and integrates well with the town. An additional point to note is that in the past 15 years significant development has taken place at north Kilmarnock (in the region of 800 units) and a further 700 units are proposed through the LDP. This is considered to be sufficient growth at this part of Kilmarnock and no further development over and above that identified in the LDP is therefore proposed at this location. This is both to avoid overloading infrastructure such as school capacities, water supply and waste water treatment and to avoid further 'elongation' of Kilmarnock north and westwards. Only a portion of the suggested land is included in the LDP as Future Growth Area 2.
68MIR Hope Homes	Land at Kirklandside, Kilmarnock	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a future growth area for residential and associated uses.	The Council is of the view that this site is not an appropriate location for future residential growth of Kilmarnock. It is not suitable in landscape capacity terms for large scale development, does not integrate well with existing residential areas in Kilmarnock and will result in the coalescence of Kilmarnock and Hurlford. In addition to this, the Bellfield Interchange is nearing capacity and development of the scale proposed is likely to result in

			major upgrading of this junction. The information submitted in support of the site was written for the preparation of the last local plan and is now dated. Up to date supporting information for this site should be submitted that satisfactorily covers the Bellfield Interchange issues. Whilst the Council does not agree with the respondent that such a large residential based growth area is appropriate at this location, it is considered that a smaller scale future growth area for business and industry in support of the regeneration of Kilmarnock should be identified at this general location in a future LDP. This proposal will have far less landscape impacts, will not result in coalescence with Hurlford and the Council will undertake detailed modelling of the Bellfield Interchange to ensure that a satisfactory transport solution can be found here.
69MIR Karina Bowlby	Land north of Stewarton	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site and/or a future growth area for residential and associated uses.	It is considered that sufficient housing land has been identified in Stewarton for its growth over the plan period and beyond and that the addition of this site is not required in terms of housing numbers both in the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub housing market area and in Stewarton itself. There are three alternative housing sites identified for private housing development in Stewarton with a collective capacity in excess of 230 units. There is also an additional major site under construction. This demonstrates that sufficient effective capacity exists elsewhere in the town. With regard to future growth, the Council is of the view that such a large area is not required and that future growth can be best accommodated to the west of the town both in landscape capacity and integration with the town. This site has not been included as a LDP housing site or a future growth area.
70MIR William Smith	Land at Peacockbank,	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use	There is limited landscape capacity at this site for housing development and vehicular access to it would be required

	Stewarton	in the LDP.	onto a minor road. It is further considered that sufficient housing land is identified within Stewarton on alternative sites which integrate well with the town in landscape and access terms. These alternative sites also have a current active interest from national house builders. This site has not been identified as a housing site in the LDP.
73MIR Hope Homes	Martnanam Way, Drongan	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	Completion rates in Drongan have dramatically slowed in recent years and it is considered that sufficient housing land has been identified on alternative sites which are considered to be less visually intrusive than this site at Martnanam Way.
78MIR Omnivale	Land south of Barony Road, Auchinleck	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP. Deletion of site 243H is suggested.	This site has not been identified for housing development in the LDP. The Barony Industrial Estate has been extended instead in line with recommendations of the Ryden report on Business and Industrial land supply in East Ayrshire. The report suggested that this site is best for future business/industrial growth in Auchinleck being as it is located adjacent to an existing Industrial Estate. The alternative sites in the town which have been identified for housing are considered to be more suited to residential development in terms of surrounding uses and integration with the town.
86MIR Allanvale Land	Site to north of Glasgow Road	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	There is very limited landscape capacity for development at this location and the alternative sites that are identified for housing in the LDP are preferable in landscape capacity terms. Added to this is the fact that the alternative sites, together with the identified future growth area, are sufficient both in terms of the housing requirements of the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub-market area and for Stewarton itself.
95BMIR Hope Homes	Water of Coyle, Drongan	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	Whilst it is accepted that parts of this site (particularly the north eastern portion) are generally suitable for housing development in landscape capacity terms, it is considered

			that sufficient housing land has been identified in more sustainable locations in Drongan for its growth over the plan period and that the addition of this site is not required in terms of housing numbers both in the Cumnock area sub housing market area and the village of Drongan itself. This site has not been included as a LDP housing site.
97MIR Hope Homes	Ballochmyle View, Catrine	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	This site is not suitable for housing development in landscape capacity terms nor is access to the site currently satisfactory. The alternative sites identified in Catrine are considered to be preferable in landscape capacity and access terms and are sufficient in that no additional sites are required to meet with demand over the LDP period.
102MIR Nicolls Trust	Annandale, Kilmarnock	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	This site is located within the settlement boundary of Kilmarnock but forms safeguarded open space in the LDP in order to protect the setting and provide a green edge to this part of the town. It should also be noted that a high pressure gas main runs underneath this site and that development would therefore be severely constrained by this.
103MIR Mr and Mrs MacPherson	Kirkmuir/Gillhill, West Stewarton	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a short term housing site or a future growth area for residential and associated uses.	This site is considered suitable for development subject to further future testing of the Stewarton Cross junction. In the short term, however, there is sufficient land identified on suitable sites elsewhere which either have planning consent or active interest from national house builders. In the longer term, this is considered to be a suitable site for Stewarton's longer term growth and further work will be carried out in a future LDP regarding the exact site boundary of the site. The site has been identified as Future Growth Area 4 in the LDP.
109MIR Stewart Milne	Hillhead Farm, Mauchline	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	Given a new Mauchline Bypass can no longer viably be cross funded by housing development, housing sites which appeared in the EALP 2010 have been deleted and do not appear in the LDP. However, it is considered that

			Mauchline will need another site to accommodate its future growth over the LDP period. In this regard the site suggested by the respondent has been identified as, being located to the north of the town, it will place less pressure on the already congested Mauchline Cross. This site is identified as site 425H in the LDP.
115AMIR Terrace Hill	Carskeogh Caravan Park, Patna	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	This site has planning consent for housing and has therefore been included for residential use in the LDP as site 351H.
115BMIR Terrace Hill	Dunselma, Fenwick	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	Whilst planning consent has lapsed on this site, it is a partial brownfield site with the former nursing home having been demolished. A sensitive, low density development which ensures that protected trees can be retained will be required at this site. It is identified as site 405H in the LDP.
115CMIR Terrace Hill	Irvine Road, Kilmarnock	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	This site has planning consent and has therefore been identified as housing site 418H in the LDP.
116MIR Sandy Loudoun	Historic Loudoun Kirk Village by Newmilns	Respondent wishes to see the reinstatement of Loudoun Kirk village (residential use)	Whilst it is acknowledged that Loudoun Kirk was once a small settlement, it is no longer in existence in this form. SPP encourages sustainable development by directing new housing and other uses to existing settlements and the new LDP is required to reflect this. As a result, all new housing sites are located either within or adjacent to existing settlement boundaries. This site has not been allocated for residential use in the LDP.
118MIR Allanvale	Land south of Moorfield	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a short term housing site or a future growth area for residential and associated uses.	Much of the growth in Kilmarnock in recent years has taken place to the north and west of the town. Whilst some capacity for development remains in these locations, it is considered that a formal designation for growth to the south of the town may be appropriate in a future LDP. This area has therefore been identified as Future Growth Area 3 in the LDP.

120MIR Allanvale	Meadowside, Crookedholm	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	Whilst it is accepted that there is landscape capacity at this location, there is concern about the ability of the junction of Main Road and Grougar Road to accommodate 200 units and this has not been addressed in detail through the respondent's submission. In addition to this, Crookedholm is a village and 200 units would effectively double its size. It is considered that larger sites should generally be directed to those towns capable of accommodating such growth in line with the LDP spatial strategy set out in Volume 1 of the LDP. For this reason the allocation of 50 units remains as site 256H with no additional land being released at this location through the LDP.
125MIR CWP	Site to north of Old Glasgow Road	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	There is very limited landscape capacity for development at this location and the site would not form a logical boundary to the town. The alternative sites that are identified for housing in the LDP are preferable both in landscape capacity terms and in how they integrate with the town. Added to this is the fact that the alternative sites, together with the identified future growth area, are sufficient both in terms of the housing requirements of the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub-market area and for Stewarton itself.
132MIR Bobby Thomson	Little Mossie, Kilmarnock	Respondent wishes to see this site included for residential use. Would also like to build a new road which leads from the Kilmaurs/Fenwick road directly to the site.	This location is considered to be isolated from the town and would contribute towards ribboning of residential development towards Fenwick. Part of the site forms the business and industrial allocation for Rowallan Business Park which is needed to encourage strategic business development to locate in Kilmarnock. Sufficient residential development at more preferable locations has been identified in the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub housing market area and in Kilmarnock itself. This site has not been identified for housing development in the LDP.
136MIR Mr McAllister	Fisher Court,	Respondent wishes to see this site	Knockentiber has seen very little development in recent

	Knockentiber	included as a site for residential use in the LDP.	years. It is agreed that a small, well located allocation such as this is appropriate for Knockentiber. This is identified as site 423H in the LDP.
137MIR John Young Life	Galston Road North, Hurlford	Respondent wishes to see this site rolled forward as a housing site in the LDP.	The Council acknowledges that this site was in the late stages of a planning application and the site was not developed due to a developer going into liquidation. It is considered to be an effective site capable of development within the LDP period and it is agreed that the site should be rolled forward. It forms site 113H in the LDP.
139MIR Mrs D Lindsay	Maxwood Holdings	Respondent wishes to see this site included as a future growth area for residential use.	The Council agrees that this is the most suitable location for future growth of Galston particularly in terms of access and landscape capacity. It has therefore been included as Future Growth Area 1 in the LDP.
141MIR J Rutherford	Crofthead, Priestland	Respondent wishes to see this site identified as a housing site in the LDP.	Whilst there is landscape capacity for new development at this location, Priestland is a small village and the inclusion of this site within its settlement boundary would increase its size significantly. It is considered that this proposed extension is too large in scale for the size of the settlement and that adequate housing land for the period of the LDP has been identified in nearby Darvel. This site is not identified for housing development in the LDP.
144MIR B Dobson	Laigh Wylieland Fenwick	Respondent wishes to see this site identified as a housing site in the LDP.	This site appeared in draft versions of the EALP 2010 but was removed by the Reporter during the local plan examination on access grounds. It was stated that land out with the respondent's control would be required to access the site. The respondent has since demonstrated that this is not the case and that he has control over all land that will be required to upgrade the road and footpaths to the site. It is considered that a small development at this site of up to 20 units could be accommodated comfortably at this location. The Reporter inserted a site at Stewarton Road North to replace this site. However, there has been no interest in this site to date. The Council is of the view that

			the Stewarton Road North site lies too close to the M77 and is highly visible from this road and is likely to require a significant landscape buffer to reduce noise and its visual impact which would further reduce the developable area of this already long narrow site. The Council is of the view that the site at Laigh Wylieland is preferable in development terms to the Stewarton Road North site and has therefore included Laigh Wylieland as site 406H in the LDP. The site at Stewarton Road north site is not identified for housing development in the plan.
--	--	--	---

#### Other Site Specific Issues

<b>MIR ref and Name of Respondent</b>	<b>Site address</b>	<b>Summary of Response submitted at MIR Consultation stage</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
3MIR R. Alexander	North of Stewarton	A new ring road and site for mixed leisure/housing is suggested to the north of Stewarton	The suggested ring road is distant from the settlement boundary of Stewarton and would require significant funding to construct it. The size of the proposed mixed use site proposed to support it would constitute too large an extension to Stewarton. No detailed supporting information has been submitted to the Council as to how the scheme would be financed and built out. For these reasons, the LDP does not make provision for a northern ring road for Stewarton.
24 Mr Gilmartin	Old Glasgow Road, Stewarton	Removal of current safeguarded public open space designation.	The current safeguarded area of public open space located either side of the Annick Water between Bessies Bankhead and the sand cliffs at Robertland contributes to the recreational green infrastructure and green network corridors within Stewarton. It also contributes to the character and landscape setting of the urban area. Removing this designation would have a detrimental

			impact on the landscape setting, green infrastructure provision and green network corridor within the town and would open up adjacent areas to development which may have significant adverse impacts on these features which cannot be replaced. For the reasons set out above the Council has retained the safeguarded public open space designation.
52MIR Sainburys	Rigg Street, Stewarton	Respondent would like the town centre boundary of Stewarton to be extended to include the proposed store extension.	The Council notes that Sainsbury is longer proposing to extend its Stewarton store. In this regard, it is not considered necessary to make any changes to the town centre boundary. Any new retail proposal will be assessed against the LDP retailing policies and will require to meet the sequential test.
53MIR Taylor Wimpey	Western Road, Kilmarnock	Miscellaneous Development Site 232M in the EALP 2010 should be identified for residential and retail.	In order to reflect a recent planning consent, the LDP has re-designated this area to residential (LDP site reference 413H) with a separate small scale neighbourhood centre (LDP site reference 232M) allowing Class 1, Class 2, Class 3 and hot food uses allocated directly across from 413H.
55MIR Diageo	Hill Street, Kilmarnock	The respondent wishes the former Diageo site to be identified as suitable for large scale retailing.	The Council is of the view that if large scale retailing were permitted at this site, it would compete with the town centre where there are already a number of vacant sites which the Council would support for retailing use before the former Diageo site. The range of uses acceptable at this site within the LDP reflects the most recent planning consent granted which does not include large scale retail use.
58 MIR Graham and Sibbald	Cutsburn Fields, Stewarton	Identify site for Mixed Use: residential, retail and business	The majority of the site sits in a location identified through the ENTEC Landscape Assessment carried out in 2005 as not having potential for development in landscape terms, with a smaller area being identified as having limited potential for development. There is doubt whether the site could be developed due to its topography and steep gradient and whether it could be satisfactorily accessed.

			Retail uses are not acceptable at this location given its out of town centre location. The portion of the site with limited development potential was considered for business and Industrial uses as a reasonable alternative within the MIR. However, due to concerns about access to the site and its compatibility with residential uses, it was considered that the site should remain out with the settlement boundary. This site has not been included as a LDP mixed use site.
71MIR Duffield Morgan	Rowallan Castle Estate	Amend the site specific zoning to include increased housing	Consent for additional enabling housing has been granted at Rowallan Castle. However, it is not considered necessary to reflect this in the LDP. The primary purpose of this site identification is to promote hotel, leisure and recreational (golf) purposes and there is no need to include additional housing which has a consent to proceed. No change has been made to the LDP in this regard.
77MIR Loudoun Castle Estates	Loudoun Castle Estate	Retain EALP designation but expand to add site suitable for 550 houses	The Council has received (in January 2015) an application for a mixed use tourism based development which includes the potential for up to 1025 houses which, it is proposed, will be used to enable works to the listed Loudoun Castle and to cross fund elements of the tourism development. The EALP 2010 allows for sympathetic enabling development which would secure and enhance the function and viability of the Castle Estate as a major tourism destination. The Council is firmly of the view that this should remain the case as the amount of enabling development required to fund the overall proposal is currently unknown. Furthermore, Loudoun Castle Estate is environmentally sensitive and the Council remains of the view that any enabling development must be sympathetic. No housing numbers have been included within the permitted uses for this site in the LDP.
89 MIR Henderson Chartered Surveyors	Meiklewood/Mosside, Kilmarnock	Change from Business and Industrial to Mixed Use including residential	The Council is of the opinion that a mixed use development would not be acceptable as the site is physically divorced

			from the rest of Kilmarnock and residential development at this location is not considered to be sustainable. Allowing mixed use development at this site could also set a precedent for further ribboning of development towards Fenwick. There is also considered to be sufficient areas housing land within Kilmarnock and the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub housing market area for residential development. This site has not been included as a LDP mixed use site.
94 MIR Hope Homes	Riccarton Road, Hurlford	Allocation of land for Mixed Use, including residential, business and commercial	The Council does not support mixed use at this location. Firstly, there is considered to be sufficient land identified in the LDP within Hurlford and within the Kilmarnock and Loudoun sub housing market area. The site itself is physically divorced from Hurlford and is considered to be too large an expansion for the village. There is also no requirement for additional business and industrial and commercial land within Hurlford as there is already a large business and industrial area safeguarded for business and industrial uses within the village. Moreover, there is also a sufficient supply of employment land within Kilmarnock. This site has not been included as a LDP mixed use site.
105 Land Engineering (Scotland)	Gardum House, Near Fenwick	Request are of land within the rural area be identified as business and industrial land	The LDP does not generally identify rural sites for business and industrial use unless they are large scale brownfield sites that would benefit from reuse. In order to follow sustainability principles, such uses are generally directed to existing industrial areas in settlements. The LDP does not therefore identify the area for business and industrial use.
MIR 107 (a) Health and Safety Executive	319H Northcraig, Kilmarnock	There is potential for this site to encroach on H&S consultation zones	Any development within this extension to this residential area will be required to abide by the development advice given by the HSE and should be taken into account by developers when masterplanning the site.
MIR 107 (b) Health and Safety	Barony	There is potential for this site to	Any development within this extension to the existing

Executive	Road/Highhouse Industrial Sites	encroach on H&S consultation zones.	safeguarded business and industrial site will be required to abide by the development advice given by the HSE and should be taken into account by developers when developing proposals for the site.
MIR 107 (c) Health and Safety Executive	332B and 005MDX Hill St/Balmoral Rd	There is potential for this site to encroach on H&S consultation zones.	Any development within these sites will be required to abide by the development advice given by the HSE and should be taken into account by developers when developing proposals for the site.
MIR 121 Killy Property	Glencairn Retail Park, Kilmarnock	Glencairn should be identified as a Commercial centre in the LDP	The Council has identified Glencairn Retail Park as a Commercial Centre within the LDP. The retail park has maintained a good rate of occupancy but to encourage development on the vacant northern part of the site the Council have widened the range of uses allowed within the Commercial Centre.
MIR 138 Strathclyde Partnership for Transport	Mauchline By-Pass, Mauchline	Retain reference to Mauchline by-pass within the LDP	The reference to the Mauchline by-pass has been retained by the Council. PROP 20 of the LDP which states:  <i>“In recognition of peak time congestion at Mauchline Cross, the Council will, in partnership with relevant parties, investigate the potential funding mechanisms which could enable the construction of a by-pass for Mauchline”</i>