

MINUTE
of
EAST RENFREWSHIRE COUNCIL

Minute of special Meeting held at 2.00pm in the Council Chamber, Council Headquarters, Giffnock, on 29 January 2014.

Present:

Provost Alastair Carmichael	Councillor Ian McAlpine
Deputy Provost Betty Cunningham	Councillor Gordon McCaskill
Councillor Tony Buchanan	Councillor Stewart Miller
Councillor Danny Devlin	Councillor Mary Montague
Councillor Jim Fletcher (Leader)	Councillor Paul O’Kane
Councillor Charlie Gilbert	Councillor Tommy Reilly
Councillor Barbara Grant	Councillor Ralph Robertson
Councillor Elaine Green	Councillor Jim Swift
Councillor Kenny Hay	Councillor Gordon Wallace
Councillor Alan Lafferty	Councillor Vincent Waters

Provost Carmichael in the Chair

Attending:

Lorraine McMillan, Chief Executive; Caroline Innes, Deputy Chief Executive; Mhairi Shaw, Director of Education; Andy Cahill, Director of Environment; Fiona Morrison, Head of Education Services (School Performance and Provision); Andy Corry, Head of Environment (Environmental Services and Roads); Iain Maclean, Head of Environment (Planning Property and Regeneration); Charlie Armstrong, Network Manager (Roads); Gillian McCarney, Planning and Building Standards Manager; Ian Conway, Principal regeneration officer; Anne McAleer, Senior Planner; Julie Nicol, Principal Planner; Richard Greenwood, Principal Planner; Eamonn Daly, Democratic Services Manager and Jennifer Graham, Committee Services Officer.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

914. There were no declarations of interest intimated.

PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

915. The Council considered a report by the Director of Environment seeking approval of proposed responses to representations made in respect of the Council’s proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) and more recently proposed modifications to the LDP, and authority for these to be sent to the Scottish Government for formal Examination.

A copy of all the representations made, together with proposed responses, together with a list of alternative development proposals put forward by developers/landowners for inclusion in the LDP, accompanied the report.

By way of background, the report explained the process that had been followed relative to the production of the proposed LDP, including the public consultation that had taken place. Furthermore, the report explained that following the initial consultation period, 2 proposed modifications to the LDP had been approved as the basis for further consultation.

The report provided an overview of responses to the proposed LDP, and explained that overall the strategy of the LDP for the period to 2025 reflected the need to achieve a sustainable pattern of development, and that in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy it set out a settlement strategy to provide a long term context for development; promoted the efficient use of land and buildings; co-ordinated development with infrastructure requirements; and ensured the protection of the environment.

The report highlighted that the proposed LDP provided an effective and generous land supply to meet the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy and the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan and that no additional land releases were required. In particular it was explained that all the proposed sites put forward by developers/landowners had been assessed and evaluated, but that none were being recommended for inclusion in the final Plan.

The report also provided an overview of responses to the proposed modifications; provision of a new denominational primary school and associated preschool provision on a site on South Waterfoot Road, Newton Mearns; the provision of a religious/community facility on a site on Capelrig Road, Newton Mearns, and a technical modification relative to the replacement Barrhead High School and associated greenspace enhancement.

It was noted that almost 3,000 representations had been received relative to the religious/community facility proposal, with approximately one third being supportive with two thirds opposed. Following consideration it was recommended not to pursue the proposed modification.

The report then provided a summary of all the recommended modifications to the LDP and explained the procedure to be undertaken following approval of the LDP by the Council. This included the preparation of finalised Schedule 4 reports which would be submitted along with supporting documentation (including Development Frameworks) to the Scottish Government for Examination.

Councillor Grant having thanked planning staff for their efforts in preparing the plan, expressed particular concerns about the wider implications for the greenbelt in the vicinity of the proposed school site on South Waterfoot Road, Newton Mearns, and the need for strong and clearly defensible green belt boundaries. Furthermore she requested that local Members be fully involved in discussions relative to any future planning applications for the site.

Councillor Miller also expressed concerns relative to the proposals, both in terms of losing greenbelt and also as in his view it would lead to increased traffic in the area with associated risks to pedestrian safety, particularly school pupils.

Councillor Gilbert having welcomed the recommendation not to continue with the proposed religious/community facility at Capelrig Road, Newton Mearns, Councillor Devlin sought clarification of the status, with particular regard to land ownership, of an objector to the non-

inclusion of land at Patterton for housing and around Ryatt Farm and Ryatt Linn for mixed use developments. In reply, the Planning and Building Standards Manager clarified the status of the particular individual, explaining that all those individuals listed in the report were simply being identified either as a supporter or objector to the particular proposals in respect of which their name was listed. In respect of the particular case referred to by Councillor Devlin, the person mentioned was noted as having submitted an objection to the Council's proposals not to include either the Patterton and Ryatt sites for residential development.

Councillor McAlpine welcomed the proposals for the designation of land for a school site on South Waterfoot Road. He referred to proposals to establish a joint faith campus on the site and sought clarification of levels of support from both the Catholic and Jewish communities. In reply the Director of Education provided details of the informal consultation that had taken place to date, that high levels of support for the proposals had been established, and that if the proposals to designate the land for use as a school site were approved, formal consultation would take place in due course. Furthermore, referring to the potential for increased traffic at the site, Councillor Robertson suggested that the creation of a new school at the site would help to address traffic management issues around other denominational schools in the area, and that as long as appropriate traffic management measures were put in place the development of a school at the site was in his view appropriate. In addition, in response to Councillor Robertson, the Head of Environment defined "inconsequential amendments" in terms of the delegation being sought by the Director of Environment.

Councillor Lafferty was then heard on the plan. Having commended officers for their efforts, he highlighted that the plan, once approved, would shape how development in the area was taken forward in the medium to long term. He referred to the important part that consultation with the public had played in the local plan process and the need for all representations made to be given careful consideration.

Councillor Green echoed Councillor Gilbert's comments relative to the recommendation not to continue with the proposed religious/community facility at Capelrig Road, Newton Mearns. She further clarified that whilst committed to the development of a site suitable for such a facility, in her view the site adjacent to Eastwood High School was inappropriate for the reasons outlined in the report and so was happy to support the recommendation.

The Planning and Building Standards Manager was heard in response to comments from Councillor McCaskill about how the requirements on the Council to release greenbelt land for development stemmed from Strategic Development Plan requirements, and the need for a defensible boundary between any proposed new school on South Waterfoot Road and the greenbelt. She explained that if the proposed site was approved, design guidance would be prepared which would take account of the need for a robust and defensible green belt, and that Elected Members would be consulted in relation to this guidance. Furthermore, in response to Councillor Wallace, she explained the preliminary work that had already been carried out relative traffic management and that steps to address increased traffic would also form part of the guide.

Councillor Buchanan was then heard in the course of which he summarised the local plan process from inception to the present time. He highlighted the levels of public consultation throughout the entire process and expressed disappointment at the negative manner in which some members of the public had engaged in the consultation process. He referred to the role of the Member/Officer working group in the preparation of the plan and to the benefits of the plan receiving unanimous support from the Council prior to submission to the Scottish Government Reporter for examination.

Councillor Fletcher was then heard on the plan and how having defensible greenbelt boundaries was one of the key considerations at the start of the process. He welcomed the proposals for the school site on South Waterfoot Road, and to the support the joint faith campus proposals had received from Catholic and Jewish families.

He acknowledged that the proposals to designate land on Capelrig Road as a site for a religious/community facility had been controversial but had been proposed based on a significant number of representations received. He reminded Members that they had a duty to look after the interests of all East Renfrewshire residents, including minority groups, and that there would now be an opportunity for development of a religious/community facility at Maidenhill.

With regard to development at Maidenhill, Councillor Swift suggested that in his opinion it did not accord with the Strategic Development Plan in that it did not make use of brownfield sites in the area and did not link in with the local rail network. In addition he suggested that any development at Maidenhill increased the likelihood of flooding in the area, and that full flood risk assessments should be carried out with the implementation of a flood protection scheme if required. Consultation with residents in the area should also take place.

In reply, the Planning and Building Standards Manager explained that a full flood and drainage assessment would need to form part of any development proposals brought forward.

Thereafter the Council:-

- (a) approved the proposed responses and recommendations to representations made as set out in Appendix 1 accompanying the report;
- (b) delegated to the Director of Environment to approve any minor inconsequential changes arising from the responses to be incorporated into the finalised Schedule 4 reports; and
- (c) approved submission of the proposed LDP, supporting documents and the finalised Schedule 4 reports to the Scottish Government in due course for examination.

PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – DRAFT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS

916. The Council considered a report by the Director of Environment seeking approval of the Draft Development Frameworks for the three Strategic Development Opportunities included in the proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) at Maidenhill/Malletsheugh, Barrhead South, and Shanks/Glasgow Road.

The report explained that as part of the LDP process three major areas for change had been identified and were subject to a master planned approach to delivery. The proposals for the three areas were referred to as Strategic Development Opportunities and were considered to be critical to the delivery of the Council's long-term vision and development strategy for East Renfrewshire.

The report explained that whilst the proposed LDP set out broad development principles, the Development Frameworks set the planning context and provided clear guidelines for the key principles to be achieved across each individual site.

Councillor Buchanan having been heard further on the background to the 3 framework documents, Councillor Fletcher reminded Members not to overlook the significant development that had already taken place as well as the proposed future development in the Levern Valley area.

Councillor Swift again made reference to potential flooding in the Maidenhill area as a result of any development in response to which the Planning and Building Standards Manager explained the requirements on developers to produce flood and drainage assessment as part of any development proposals.

Councillor McCaskill having also commented on the need for hydrological studies in the area surrounding Maidenhill, Councillor Wallace referred to the manner in which the Council was placed under pressure by external sources to release land for housing development, and to the supportive efforts of the Conservative Group to achieve a reduction in the number of houses the Council was required to accommodate

Thereafter Councillor McAlpine welcomed that 2 new schools and the provision of affordable housing were key considerations for the master plan proposals. Supported by Councillor Lafferty, he emphasised that the proposals had been shaped by future population projections which clearly identified a need for development of the kind proposed.

The Council approved the Draft Development Frameworks for the 3 Strategic Development opportunity sites.

PROVOST

