

MINUTE
of
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Minute of virtual meeting held at 2.00pm on 16 February 2022.

Present:

Councillor Annette Ireland (Chair)
Councillor Angela Convery
Provost Jim Fletcher

Councillor Stewart Miller
Councillor Jim McLean
Councillor Jim Swift

Councillor Ireland in the Chair

Attending:

Julie Nicol, Planning and Building Standards Manager; Alan Pepler, Principal Planner (Development Management); John Marley, Transportation Coordinator, East Renfrewshire Council Roads Department; Siobhan Wilson, Legal Adviser; Sharon McIntyre, Committee Services Officer and Liona Allison, Assistant Committee Services Officer.

Apology:

Councillor Betty Cunningham.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1884. No declarations of interest were intimated.

APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

1885. The committee considered reports by the Director of Environment on the following applications for planning permission requiring consideration by the committee.

The applications were determined as indicated at Appendix 1 accompanying this Minute, particular reference being made to the following:-

- (i) 2021/0498/TP Neilston Primary School, 43 High Street, Neilston. Demolition of Neilston Primary School, Janitor House and Madras Family Centre and construction of Neilston Learning & Leisure Campus comprising – Neilston Primary School – St Thomas' Primary School - Madras Family Centre – and formation of community library in church hall – associated Landscaping, access roads, parking, roads, sports facilities (with floodlighting) and works to Kirkstyle Lane (Major)(updated and additional information now available).

The Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that the application required to be determined by the committee as it constituted as a Major Development

under the terms of the Town and Country (Hierarchy of Developments) (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Thereafter, he provided a detailed presentation that outlined the existing site plan, and the proposed site plan, elevations, sections and boundary treatments.

He further advised that 10 representations had been received, consideration of which was outlined in the assessment section of the report.

He outlined that further neighbour notification had recently taken place due to the provision of new information submitted by the applicant. This comprised of additional section information illustrating the proposed site levels in fencing adjacent to Duncarnock Crescent and fencing details and floodlighting around the sports pitches adjacent to the properties on High Street. In response to this additional notification, a further representation had been received which reiterated concerns over the position of the service area and sprinkler tank adjacent to the boundary with Duncarnock Crescent.

In addition, a new comment was made on the red line which encroached into rear gardens on the newly published plans, it being advised that this red line related to an annotation on the plans rather than a change to the proposal.

Reference was made to the main areas of concern being outlook and visual impact, privacy, overshadowing and noise and disturbance. The proposed section plan displayed further detail on this and although it was acknowledged that the development would result in a change in the outlook from some of the properties on Duncarnock Crescent, exacerbated by the changing levels in this area. However given the separation distance between the school and the properties, as well as the proposed mitigation, it was considered that any loss for amenity for the adjacent residents would not be significant.

It was noted that the proposed section displayed detailed the floodlights at 60m in height was incorrect, it being explained that throughout the course of the application the height of the floodlights had reduced to 8m.

It was further advised that following consultation with statutory consultees no objections had been received although comments had been received from the Roads service and Environmental Health, both of which were outlined in the report.

Following the presentation and in response to Councillor Miller and Councillor Convery, the Principal Planner confirmed that the height of the floodlights had been reduced to 8m from 60m, as it was noted that light pollution could be an issue. In response to a question from Councillor Miller on lighting levels, the Principal Planner confirmed that a restriction on lux levels was detailed in the conditions for the proposed application and baffles for the lighting was being sought and accompanied with the light spill diagrams. This mitigation was deemed to be appropriate.

Responding to Councillor Convery, the Senior Planner confirmed that 7 representations from the total of 10 representations had been received from Duncarnock Crescent. Councillor Convery outlined that the proposed application provided significant benefits for the community and Neilston with a much needed school and was therefore in support of the proposed application.

Councillor McLean enquired as to the extensive list of conditions and whether the proposed application could have been finalised further prior to determination to reduce the number of conditions outlined. He also enquired as to whether the 3m fence would

provide sufficient mitigation. The Principal Planner noted that unfortunately there would be an impact on residents although that the mitigation was in place in terms of the 3m fencing, a stand-off distance of 30m and planting. It was also noted that in planning terms there is no right to a long distance view. The Principal Planner and Planning and Building Standards Manager outlined that the conditions detailed were deemed to be necessary and proportionate in consideration of the proposed application as a major planning application.

Provost Fletcher advised that he was supportive of the proposed application as a result of the benefit to Neilston, both educationally in terms of improving attainment at the two schools and through the recreational facilities provided. He was understanding of the objections received although noted the mitigation measures outlined and the current use of the site as a school.

Councillor Miller enquired as to the proposed use of the church hall in response to which the Senior Planner advised that it is intended that the church hall would be the new community library.

Councillor Swift enquired as to whether acoustic fencing would be included and the consideration given to a building design of a flat roof in contrast to a sloped roof taking into account the Scottish climate. The Principal Planner advised that acoustic fencing was included in the proposed application. The Principal Planner and Building Standards Manager confirmed that in planning terms the scale of the design was suitable although it was noted that the roof design would have been a consideration for the architectural design of the building.

Councillor Ireland sought confirmation that the tree planting and fence would be included in the proposed application. The Principal Planner advised that landscaping conditions were in place in addition to a phasing condition. Councillor Ireland welcomed the reduction in the operating hours from 10pm to 9pm and the reduction in the height of the floodlights. She welcomed the proposed application for the benefit of the residents of Neilston.

Having heard from the Principal Planner, the committee agreed that the application for planning permission be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

(ii) 2021/0754/TP – A rear single storey extension at 111 Paisley Road, Barrhead.

The Senior Planner advised the application was a Local Development under the terms of the Town and Country Planning (Hierarchy of Developments) (Scotland) Regulations 2009. In accordance with East Renfrewshire Council's Planning Scheme of Delegated Functions, it was being reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the applicant was an employee in the Planning and Building Standards Service.

The Senior Planner provided a detailed presentation which outlined the existing and proposed block plans, existing and proposed rear elevations and proposed side elevations. He advised that no objections had been received.

Councillor Miller noted the reasoning of the submission to the Planning Applications Committee and that the recommendation of the report was to approve the proposed application. Councillor Convery and Provost Fletcher also noted this reasoning. Provost Fletcher noted the modest proposed development and that no representations had been received.

1778

Having heard from the Principal Planner, the committee agreed that the application for planning permission be granted.

CHAIR

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997
AS AMENDED BY THE PLANNING ETC (SCOTLAND) ACT 2006
PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997**

Index of applications under the above acts considered by Planning Applications Committee on
16.02.2022

Reference No: 2021/0498/TP

Ward: 2

Applicant:

Mr John Adam
2 Spiersbridge Way
Spiersbridge Business Park
Thornliebank
East Renfrewshire
G46 8NG

Agent:

Lindsey Mitchell
15 Exchange Place
Glasgow
United Kingdom
G1 3AN

Site: Neilston Primary School 43 High Street Neilston East Renfrewshire G78 3HJ

Description: Neilston Primary School 43 High Street Neilston. Demolition of Neilston Primary School, Janitor House and Madras Family Centre and construction of Neilston Learning & Leisure Campus comprising - Neilston Primary School - St Thomas' Primary School - Madras Family Centre -and formation of community library in church hall - associated Landscaping, access roads, parking, roads, sports facilities (with floodlighting) and works to Kirkstyle Lane (Major) (updated and additional information now available)

Decision: Approved Subject to Conditions

Reference No: 2021/0754/TP

Ward: 1

Applicant:

Mr Paul Hodge
Crinan
111 Paisley Road
Barrhead
East Renfrewshire
G78 1HS

Agent:

Site: 111 Paisley Road Barrhead East Renfrewshire G78 1HS

Description: A rear single storey extension

Decision: Granted
