

MINUTE
of
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Minute of meeting held at 2.00pm in the Council Chamber, Council Headquarters, Giffnock on 14 September 2022.

Present:

Councillor Betty Cunningham (Chair)	Councillor Jim McLean (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Paul Edlin	Provost Mary Montague
Councillor Annette Ireland	Councillor Andrew Morrison
Councillor Chris Lunday	

Councillor McLean in the Chair

Attending:

Julie Nicol, Planning and Building Standards Manager; Alan Pepler, Principal Planner (Development Management); John Drugan, Senior Planner; Ian Walker, Senior Planner; Siobhan Wilson, Solicitor; John Marley, Principal Traffic Officer(*); Steven Reid, Policy, Planning and Performance Manager, East Renfrewshire Health and Social Care Partnership(*); Sharon McIntyre, Committee Services Officer and Liona Allison, Assistant Committee Services Officer.

(* indicates remote attendance)

HM QUEEN ELIZABETH II

122. Prior to the start of the meeting the committee observed a minute's silence in memory of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

123. No declarations of interest were intimated.

APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

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

It was agreed that the applications be determined as indicated at Appendix 1 accompanying this Minute, particular reference being made to the following:-

- (i) 2021/0232/TP - Erection of residential care and nursing home with associated car parking, formation of new access, infrastructure and landscaping at Greenbank Church, 36 Eaglesham Road, Clarkston.

The Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that the application was one of three related applications at the site of Greenbank Church being presented to the committee at the meeting.

It was noted that application 2021/0405/TP was for the erection of an extension to the existing church building to create new church halls and community facilities, creation of a new vehicular and pedestrian entrance from Mansfield Road, and formation of 5 new accessible parking bays. Erection of a detached two storey dwellinghouse with driveway access to Mansfield Road, while application 2021/0407/LBC for Listed Building Consent was for the erection of an extension to the existing church building to create new church halls and community facilities, demolition of adjoining 1990's extension, creation of new openings to the external fabric linking the church to the new extension and creation of a new fire escape.

The Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that the applications all required to be assessed separately, and that Greenbank Parish Church was the applicant for application 2021/0405/TP and a joint applicant for 2021/0232/TP.

He outlined that Greenbank Parish Church had advised that the release of the land for sale by the church for application 2021/0232/TP would enable this development. It would also complete the funding required for 2021/0405/TP which would be an important community resource.

He summarised the consultation responses outlined in the report from both Clarkston Community Council and the Health and Social Care Partnership (HSCP).

It was noted that a total of 112 representations had been received, with 63 in objection and 49 in support and that the report had commented on 109 representations due to the receipt of 3 representations after the publication of the report. An assessment of those matters raised in relation to all 112 representations was contained in the report.

It was noted that with regard to fire safety concerns, this would be considered by building standards and was therefore not a material planning consideration. The loss of community buildings and reference to Policy D12 was noted, and in this regard it was recognised that the community facilities would be lost through demolition. He clarified that it was not possible to legally connect application 2021/0232/TP and 2021/0405/TP although it was recognised that Greenbank Parish Church proposed to replace and enhance community facilities as part of their wider proposals and therefore there was no conflict with Local Development Plan 2 in this respect.

He then outlined the proposals in full, advising that the main issues outlined in the report included design and visual impact, impact on neighbouring properties, impact on the listed building and its setting; impact on green space, trees and protected species, roads and drainage and specialist residential and supported accommodation. He then shared slides and outlined the site location, existing and proposed site and landscaping plans, street view, comparison of the existing buildings and the proposed development, and proposed elevations and sections.

Councillor Ireland noted the important role of the church in the community. She enquired whether the care home would be incongruous to the area and whether it would sit forward of the listed building. She sought confirmation of whether this was a joint application. She noted that it was good that the balconies had been removed and sought confirmation of this and enquired whether any further changes had taken place.

Councillor Ireland also noted concerns regarding car parking and that the road was incredibly busy with car parking taking place on both sides. She noted that two car

parking spaces had been removed and enquired regarding where the buildouts would be and where two car parking spaces were being removed from. She expressed concerns about the visibility splays and how the creation of access would impact the parking opposite. She noted that this was already a difficult area to park and that accidents and near accidents occurred a lot. She noted that 16 spaces were detailed and enquired as to how many spaces were required per resident. She asked how many staff would be employed, where they would park and how many spaces were allocated for visitor parking. She noted the previous care home application and assisted living accommodation before the committee at Drumby Crescent which had 55 spaces allocated, and was concerned by the low figure of 16 car parking spaces included in this application.

In reply, the Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that the building was assessed as to whether it was incongruous and as a result there was a substantial change to the length however it was set back significantly and landscaped to the front of the site. The elevations could be interpreted to show the care home building to be incongruous however the applicant had used the land where they can, building into the slope and at the Planning Authority's request had introduced measures to improve the visual impact. He agreed there was a major change visually although given the urban context this was a development that would be expected. He confirmed that this was a joint application by the care home developer and Greenbank Parish Church.

The Principal Traffic Officer (Environment), advised that the Roads Department went back to the applicant regarding the number of car parking spaces and the visibility splays. He noted that the guidelines normally used could not be referenced for this site and therefore the applicant employed the company AECOM to produce a report. He shared plans of the proposed parking and outlined the build out and improved access created further north on Eaglesham Road. He advised two on street car parking spaces had been included. He shared the figures outlined in the AECOM report relating to other care homes in the area and advised that the car parking was on a par with the parking provided at these care homes.

Councillor Morrison noted that the AECOM report was not included in the meeting papers in response to which the Planning and Building Standards Manager advised that the AECOM report can be viewed on the online planning system through accessing the application link detailed in the meeting papers.

Councillor Morrison having enquired as to the location of the comparable sites, were they urban, rural or suburban. The Principal Traffic Officer (Environment), advised that the active travel and sustainable transport links to the proposed site were good and therefore this allowed for the number of parking spaces to be reduced. It was also clarified that a maximum parking standard was detailed although not a minimum.

Councillor McLean enquired about the ratio of the car parking spaces in comparison to the size of the care home. He also noted the number of residents, staff and visitors that would be attending the care home, that the bus service in Eaglesham was not reliable and that the area was already extremely busy. He advised of the current road safety issues at the site with school children and no road crossings, and that parking was already extremely difficult. He noted that the report outlined the peak times of between 8am and 9am in the morning and 5pm and 6pm at night for use of the 16 car parking spaces by the 100 staff and visitors. He stated that it was more than likely that the busiest visiting times would be in the afternoon at the same time the children were coming out of the school, with the road busy and that this would be a difficult situation. He also sought confirmation of why AECOM and the applicant provide a reduced figure of car parking spaces when the roads department had outlined a maximum of 35 car parking spaces.

The Principal Traffic Officer (Environment), explained that the applicant would claim that as they were providing off street car parking this would then not impact on the existing activity on the public road. In terms of the visiting of residents this should take place throughout the day. The developer required to make a case for a reduction in the number of car parking spaces for consideration by the roads department. With regards to staffing the report provided by the applicant outlined that their research details that staff would use more active and sustainable transport options.

Councillor Cunningham highlighted the busy nature of the street, the lack of parking currently and the impact of the road safety issues from the children attending the school and nursery. She noted that 16 car parking spaces was not adequate for the size and requirements of the care home. She also raised concern whether the care home would be fully occupied.

Councillor Morrison echoed Councillor Cunningham's points and noted that the report refers to Scottish Planning Policy and the requirement to support socially sustainable places and that having an underused care home would not be socially sustainable.

Councillor McLean noted the objection received from the HSCP on the grounds of over provision and invited the Policy, Planning and Performance Manager, HSCP to comment on this. In reply, he advised that the HSCP based concerns on overprovision in East Renfrewshire on high levels of vacancies and that this had been apparent for a number of years. Additionally there were concerns regarding the cost to the HSCP of health care provision and general demand for other services linked to the care home. The HSCP were not satisfied that the level of care home development in the area is reflective of the demand and would result in an oversaturation of the market therefore impacting on the viability of care homes and the residents staying there.

Councillor Edlin noted that he did not feel there would be inadequate parking although sought clarification of the economic viability. The Planning and Building and Standards Manager advised that each application should be considered on its own merits, and noted that economic viability was not a material consideration although Greenbank Parish Church had provided further information in their supporting statement.

Councillor Morrison also highlighted the parking issues at the site. He noted the National Roads Development Guide guideline figure and although he did note the public transport options he did not feel reducing the guideline figure by more than fifty percent was appropriate.

Councillor Ireland supported this view and sought confirmation as to why developer contributions were not sought for this development. In reply, the Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that development contributions are not currently required for care home developments.

Provost Montague noted the concerns raised by the HSCP in relation to overprovision and the on cost for health care provision and the services, she noted this was also raised by Clarkston Community Council. When there is a deficit in tree removal, she sought clarification as to why trees were then not proposed to be replanted at the site or at another location if this was not possible.

The Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that 18 trees would be removed and 26 planted and therefore there was not a deficit and that for this application there was not an issue regarding sustainable development.

The Planning and Building Standards Manager, advised that for the next Local Development Plan HSCP colleagues would be consulted to identify whether physical

infrastructure could be linked to developer contributions. She highlighted that the on cost of care was not a material consideration and that given the type of application, it would not be applicable for other forms of development contributions.

Councillor Cunningham, seconded by Councillor Morrison moved to refuse the application due to the objection from the HSCP, road safety and parking issues including that the reduction in the number of car parking spaces by more than fifty percent of the National Roads Development Guide guideline figure was not appropriate, that the care home is a four storey building, and that there is non-compliance with Strategic Planning Policies supporting economically and socially sustainable places.

There being no further comments the committee agreed that the application be refused for the reasons as stated.

Councillor Edlin abstained.

- (ii) 2021/0405/TP - Erection of an extension to the existing church building to create new church halls and community facilities, creation of a new vehicular and pedestrian entrance from Mansefield Road, and formation of 5 new accessible parking bays. Erection of a detached two storey dwellinghouse with driveway access to Mansefield Road at Greenbank Church, 36 Eaglesham Road, Clarkston.

The Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that a total of 20 representations had been received, with 15 in objection and 5 in support and that the matters raised were outlined in the report. He advised that the main issues raised relate to the negative impact on the listed building, visual impact, loss of open space, traffic congestion, loss of privacy and overshadowing, loss of trees and noise, light and dust pollution. No objections had been received from consultees.

He then outlined the proposals in full and shared slides which showed the site location with a 3D view of the proposed scheme, the elevations of the house and the proposed east elevation.

Councillor Cunningham sought confirmation of the number of car parking spaces. In reply, the Principal Planner (Development Management) confirmed that there were five spaces.

Councillor Ireland noted the strong objection from Clarkston Community Council with regard to application 2021/0232/TP however for this application overall they supported the proposal. She welcomed the good design and advised that she wholeheartedly supported the application. She noted from the report 'that it is considered that the proposed new halls and facilities will improve the existing community facilities as well as allow for the range of activities to be extended, thereby promoting social and community benefits within the area.' She advised that she was in agreement with this statement and that the church was at the heart of the community and is already well used, she welcomed the plans.

Councillor Edlin was in agreement with Councillor Ireland's comments and noted that as there was no change of use there would not be an impact on car parking issues.

Councillor Ireland noted that there were five car parking spaces and that this was also her understanding.

Councillor McLean noted that Clarkston Community Council 'highlight some concern regarding the new vehicular access and lack of parking, but notes the parking situation is no different to the current situation.'

Provost Montague noted that the report outlines that 'the proposal will result in the loss of 39 trees of mix size and condition.' whilst noting other trees would be retained. She highlighted the positive impact of trees on the environment and wished to confirm the deficit for this application and if there was an option for trees to be planted at another location to compensate for this loss.

Councillor McLean noted that the report outlined that 'should the Planning Authority be of a mind to approve the application, a condition can be attached to the planning permission ensuring adequate replanting and retention of remaining trees. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal raises no significant issues in terms of loss of trees.'

The Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that a condition regarding trees was proposed and if necessary this could be updated to outline that there should be no overall deficit to the loss of trees. Provost Montague confirmed that she would welcome this.

Councillor Cunningham sought confirmation that the proposals could be accommodated at the site. The Principal Planner (Development Management) shared a slide of the site plan and outlined the location of the proposals at the site. He noted the improved access and parking at the site, as currently there is no formal parking. Councillor Cunningham sought confirmation that the development would not lead to an increase in off-road parking. In reply, the Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that there would be no change to the current situation.

The Planning and Building Standards Manager confirmed that the position is unchanged therefore the number of car parking spaces currently available is the same as the number of car parking spaces proposed. The access would be improved and the car parking more formally presented in the new scheme.

Councillor Cunningham sought confirmation of the number of electric vehicle charging points. In reply, the Principal Planner (Development Management) advised that no information had been submitted although Condition 12 seeks confirmation on this matter.

Councillor McLean, proposed that the application for planning permission be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the report and an update to Condition 5 to include that the deficit in the loss of trees would be compensated by replanting. This was seconded by Councillor Ireland.

There being no further comments the committee approved the application for planning permission subject to the conditions as outlined in the report with the exception of Condition 5 which was to be updated to confirm that there was to be no overall deficit in terms of any trees removed and replaced on site.

- (iii) 2021/0690/TP - Alterations to approved housing layout (2016/0712/TP) comprising substitution of house types (58 units) and amendments to roads layout and associated works at Maidenhill Pod E, Newton Mearns, East Renfrewshire.

The Senior Planner outlined the proposals in full and shared slides which outlined the proposed layout of Pod E. He advised that no objections had been received from consultees.

Councillor Ireland sought clarification whether any useable green space had been removed as a consequence of these changes. In reply, the Senior Planner advised that the green space had not been removed and that Pod E is enclosed in a framework of landscaping although this had not been shaded green on this plan.

Having heard Councillor McLean the committee agreed that the application for planning permission be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

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
14.09.2022

Reference No: 2021/0232/TP

Ward: 4

Applicant:

Morrison Community Care(Clarkston)Propco Ltd Kirk
Session Of
1 Cambuslang Road
Glasgow
Scotland
G32 8NB

Agent:

Shahid Ali
130 St Vincent Street
Glasgow
UK
G2 5HF

Site: Greenbank Church 36 Eaglesham Road Clarkston East Renfrewshire G76 7DJ

Description: Erection of residential care and nursing home with associated car parking, formation of new access, infrastructure and landscaping

Decision: Refused

Reference No: 2021/0405/TP

Ward: 4

Applicant:

Greenbank Parish Church
36 Eaglesham Rd
Clarkston
Scotland
G76 7DJ

Agent:

John Brown
20 James Morrison St
Glasgow
Scotland
G1 5PE

Site: Greenbank Church 36 Eaglesham Road Clarkston East Renfrewshire G76 7DJ

Description: Erection of extension to existing church building to create new church halls and community facilities, creation of a new vehicular and pedestrian entrance from Mansefield Road, and formation of 5 new accessible parking bays. Erection of a detached two storey dwellinghouse with driveway access to Mansefield Road.

Decision: Approved Subject to Conditions as outlined in the report with the exception of Condition 5 which was to be updated to confirm that there was to be no overall deficit in terms of any trees removed and replaced on site.

Reference No: 2021/0407/LBC**Ward:** 4**Applicant:**

Greenbank Parish Church
36 Eaglesham Rd
Clarkston
Scotland
G76 7DJ

Agent:

John Brown
20 James Morrison St
Glasgow
Scotland
G1 5PE

Site: Greenbank Church 36 Eaglesham Road Clarkston East Renfrewshire G76 7DJ**Description:** Erection of extension to existing church building to create new church halls and community facilities. Demolition of adjoining 1990's extension. Creation of new openings to the external fabric linking the church to the new extension. Creation of a new fire escape.**Decision:** Approved Subject to Conditions**Reference No:** 2021/0690/TP**Ward:** 5**Applicant:**

Mr Kenny Blue
Unit C, Ground floor, Lightyear Building
Marchburn Drive
Abbotsinch
Paisley
Renfrewshire
PA3 2SJ

Agent:**Site:** Maidenhill Pod E Newton Mearns East Renfrewshire**Description:** Alterations to approved housing layout (2016/0712/TP) comprising substitution of house types (58 units) and amendments to roads layout and associated works.**Decision:** Approved Subject to Conditions