

Bishopton Action Group

**Appendix G**

**OBJECTION TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION  
STATEMENT**

**ROF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

# Bishopton Action Group

<b>PUBLIC CONSULTATION - THE TRUE RESULTS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Part 1 – General Objections to the Statement .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1. The Public Consultation Statement is incompetent and a sham.....	4
2. There has been no meaningful consultation with the community over the proposal to develop the ROF site.....	4
3. The Community Liaison Group has been a complete failure.....	5
4. The consultation exercise undertaken by the developers was fundamentally flawed from the outset. ....	5
5. The Consultation Statement calls into question the financial viability of the entire project. ....	5
6. Bishopton Action Group refutes the statement that development is required to fund the clean up of the site. ....	6
7. BAE has already made massive profits from the “job lot” purchase of the former MOD sites. The argument that they cannot afford to provide access roads and community facilities is not justified. ....	7
<b>Part 2 – Additional Objections to the Statement .....</b>	<b>9</b>
1. The Consultation Statement is incompetent.....	9
2. Questionnaire results from the first exhibition are not representative.....	9
3. Questions asked were misleading and over simplistic. ....	9
4. Focus groups were not a representative sample of the Bishopton community. ....	10
5. The important issue of development at Georgetown is omitted from the summary of responses.....	10
6. The consultation exercise correctly identifies the crucial importance of access roads, but then states that these are not to be provided in phase 1.....	11
7. The developers’ view of consultation appears to be to ask peoples’ opinions, and then ignore them. ....	12
8. Other issues identified during consultation have not been properly addressed. ....	13
9. Feedback from the second exhibition held in May 2006 demonstrates that Bishopton residents have more concerns now than before. ....	14
10. Objection conclusion.....	15

# Bishopton Action Group

## **PUBLIC CONSULTATION EXERCISE –**

### **THE TRUE RESULTS**

We are pleased to inform Renfrewshire Council of the results of extensive consultation with the community of Bishopton regarding the plans to develop the former ROF site. The consultation has been ongoing during the last 18 months, and has shown remarkably consistent results as follows:

REFERENDUM ORGANISED BY COMMUNITY COUNCIL FOLLOWING BAE EXHIBITION HELD IN FEBRUARY 2005

92% VOTE "NO" TO THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

RESPONSE TO THREE ROUNDS OF CONSULTATION TO THE ALTERATION TO THE STRUCTURE PLAN

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP DELIVERS JUST UNDER 7,000 LETTERS OF OBJECTION ON BEHALF OF BISHOPTON RESIDENTS

FIASCO AT SECOND BAE EXHIBITION HELD IN MAY 2006

93% UNSATISFACTORY ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED BY BISHOPTON RESIDENTS

COMMUNITY COUNCIL SURVEY TO REASSESS VILLAGE OPINION AFTER SECOND EXHIBITION

94% AGAINST DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION SUBMITTED TO RENFREWSHIRE COUNCIL BY BAE/REDROW

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP DELIVERS OVER 2,400 LETTERS OF OBJECTION ON BEHALF OF RESIDENTS

**In view of the above conclusive results, Bishopton Action Group objects to the Outline Planning Application submitted by BAE/Redrow and requests that Renfrewshire Council and its elected members, who are charged with responsibility for protecting the interests of our community, refuse the application on the basis that it goes against the wishes of the vast majority of the population of Bishopton. The Public Consultation Statement issued by BAE/Redrow, and the conclusions it reaches, do not portray the true facts. Our formal objection is outlined in the following report.**

# Bishopton Action Group

## OBJECTION TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION STATEMENT ISSUED BY BAE/REDROW AS PART OF THEIR OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION

### Part 1 – General Objections to the Statement

#### ***1. The Public Consultation Statement is incompetent and a sham.***

The Public Consultation Statement represents an attempt by BAE/Redrow (referred to hereafter as “the developers”) to manipulate the true facts and to pretend that beneficial changes to the initial scheme have resulted from the consultation exercise. In fact, the opposite is true, as will be seen from the following report, and the result of the consultation exercise is that there is now a total mistrust of the developers and a realisation that promises that were made initially will not be fulfilled. The general feeling within Bishopton is that we have absolutely nothing to gain, but everything to lose, from this proposed development. The residents of Bishopton have not been fooled by the so-called “consultation” exercise, and have remained steadfast in their continued opposition to the plans. This has been demonstrated at every possible stage: by the recent CC survey of 94% against the development, by the fact that just under 7,000 letters of objection have been delivered by BAG during three rounds of consultation to the Alteration to the Structure Plan, and by the recent number of over 2,400 letters of objection to the Outline Planning Application.

#### ***2. There has been no meaningful consultation with the community over the proposal to develop the ROF site.***

Page 1 of the Statement mentions the working group set up when the factory closed in the late 1990s. However the representatives from Bishopton on this working group were told that discussions were to remain confidential. The Community Council states in its response (dated 4<sup>th</sup> October 2006) to the Outline Planning Application:

“Bishopton Community Council was not engaged in any meaningful way on the working group in the late 1990s (page 1). The representatives from Bishopton (our local councillor and one Community Council members) were “gagged”, as was recorded in the Community Council minutes of the time.”

Similarly Councillor Iain Langlands confirms this in his letter of representation dated 26<sup>th</sup> September as follows:

“It is misleading to include the Community Council in this comment since their participating representative in historical consultations was prevented from discussing meeting findings in public.”

It does not appear that discussions were taking place against a background of openness and transparency. Although the developers have been engaged in discussions with Renfrewshire Council for several years, the first that the local community knew about the plans was the exhibition in February 2005, following which there was a massive and vociferous outcry against the development. This prompted the CC to carry out a referendum, the result of which was an overwhelming vote of 92% against the proposal to develop the former ROF site.

# Bishopton Action Group

### **3. *The Community Liaison Group has been a complete failure.***

The Statement says that an “independently chaired Community Liaison Group” (CLG) has been set up to “facilitate two-way communication” (page 3), and chapter 8 concludes that the group is “proving itself very effective” (page 51). On the contrary, we contend that the CLG has failed spectacularly in its aim of engaging with the community and is perceived by residents as simply a vehicle for BAE/Redrow to “move things along” and to put a “tick” in the box marked consultation. It has not emerged as a two-way communication channel, but a one-way track whereby the developers have simply informed the CLG members of their intentions (e.g. to renege on their promise of new access roads) instead of taking on board the expressed concerns of the village. Indeed the minutes of the CLG meeting dated 15<sup>th</sup> August contain a written statement from one CLG member who wished to formally register his disgust at the “disdain with which they (BAE/Redrow) have been treating the village representatives on this group” regarding their non-attendance at the meeting and the inconvenience caused by their continually changing the dates of the meeting. He states: “It is simply another example of the degree of contempt which the developers have demonstrated for the villagers.” Following the meeting, the Chair of the CLG had to **write** to Redrow with a list of questions which were causing concern to the local community and had not been answered. In his letter to Mr Stuart Milligan of Redrow, dated 4<sup>th</sup> September 2006 the Chair of the CLG states: “We feel we have not had detailed and considered responses from you in the past”. This is a poor reflection on a liaison group that was meant to inform the local community and “facilitate two-way communication”. We therefore dispute the statement that the CLG is “proving itself very effective”, as this is true only from the developers’ point of view.

### **4. *The consultation exercise undertaken by the developers was fundamentally flawed from the outset.***

The Statement starts by declaring that “at no point did BAE Systems or Redrow seek feedback on the question of **whether** the development should take place at all” (page 3). This begs the question: how can you consult on the **form** a development should take, when almost the entire community is vehemently opposed to the **principle** of development? What is the point of carrying out a consultation exercise on “how an extension to the community might look” (page 3), when the consultees have repeatedly asserted that they don’t want the village to be extended (and destroyed) in the first place? Consultation can never be meaningful under these circumstances. The definition of the word “consult” is “to ask advice” and “to have regard for (a person’s feelings, interests etc) in making decisions or plans” (Collins English Dictionary). If the developers had any regard for the “feelings and interests” of the residents of Bishopton, they would not seek to impose this unwanted new town development on the doorstep of our existing village.

### **5. *The Consultation Statement calls into question the financial viability of the entire project.***

In the referendum, recent Community Council survey and over 9,000 letters of objection, the community has continually and consistently voiced its fears and concerns *if* this proposed development was allowed to go ahead. Similarly the Consultation Statement describes in detail the feedback from the focus groups, stakeholder workshops etc and clearly identifies the facilities and improvements the community would like *if* the development was to proceed.

# Bishopton Action Group

However, in the final Masterplan, topics such as (a) access roads must be in place before any houses are released (b) the requirement for a new secondary school to serve the enlarged population etc, have been swept aside. Having asked people what they see as the key elements in the proposed development, **Chapter 7 of the Consultation Statement then concludes that, for reasons of cost, these will NOT be provided:**

***“the costs of developing this site, particularly the remediation and road infrastructure costs, are huge, and the scheme cannot be funded if all infrastructure and community facilities are built before at least some of the houses”.***

The developers seem to be attempting to evoke our sympathy for the “huge costs” they will incur in the development – but this is not our problem, they should have identified the costs before embarking on the project. This is their “Response” in Chapter 7 (page 43) to the community of Bishopton and the entire consultation process:

***“The Bishopton site is both large and contaminated. The clean up costs alone place a significant burden on the development – particularly as the landowners decided in conjunction with the local council to restrict development to the minimum required to fund the clean up. Add on to these costs the burden of constructing a new motorway junction, building several miles of roads and the funding of affordable housing and the viability of the site becomes a question of some importance.”***

The repetition of the word “burden” here is significant – the developers seem to think that it is a “burden” to provide what would be regarded as normal component of any large scale development. As the landowners, they have a legal responsibility to clean up the site, but they complain about the “huge costs” that they will incur in having to remediate and decontaminate the site – **this is not our concern**. Moreover, it is extremely worrying that the developers are questioning the financial viability of their own project.

**If the developers feel that the project is not financially viable (and indeed no accurate costings have been provided to determine this), and there is doubt about whether they can afford to provide the necessary infrastructure and community facilities and safely carry out full site remediation and decontamination, then Renfrewshire Council must refuse this Outline Planning Application. Our health and safety is too important to be placed secondary to the aim of maximising profits from house sales. The site should be declared as Contaminated Land under the terms of the Environment Act 1995 and the Contaminated Land (Scotland) regulations 2000. Once decontaminated the land could then be returned to agricultural farmland as it existed before its use for munitions manufacture.**

## ***6. Bishopton Action Group refutes the statement that development is required to fund the clean up of the site.***

One of the focus groups also identified this important issue:

***“There was some concern expressed by the group about whether the proposed development was the only way to clean up the site and whether planning permission for the development was the only way to decontaminate the site.”***(page 34).

However, page 4 of the Statement describes the developers’ approach: “Central to these original plans was the premise that development is required to fund the clean up of the

# Bishopton Action Group

contaminated land". At the first exhibition in February 2005, the publicity brochure stated: "We need to ensure that everything we propose – including the clean up of the land, the road and rail improvements, the community facilities and the open space – are paid for by the revenue from development". People at the exhibition were also asked a misleading question to justify this approach. We contend that the clean up of the contaminated land should NOT be dependent on the profit from house sales. The developers' published statements cause great concern, since it means that everything in the proposals – including the vitally important issue of decontaminating the site and protecting the health and safety of the villagers – is dependent on generating profit. This represents an incredible, indefensible and scandalous state of affairs. The health and safety of existing Bishopton residents, and future inhabitants of the development, should not be contingent on how much money the developer can make. **If the developers are doubtful about whether they can make enough money from house sales to carry out site remediation and decontamination, then the entire project should be abandoned.**

Bishopton residents are concerned about what will happen as the development progresses through the various phases and the true costs of full-site remediation and decontamination (which have never been estimated) become known – will they cut corners to save money or simply scrap the project? What if the sale of houses does not generate the anticipated amount of revenue – will the developers be unable to finance the community facilities they have referred to in the Masterplan? We believe that the site should be cleaned up irrespective of, and as a separate issue from, the generation of profit from house sales.

**Renfrewshire Council must refuse this outline planning application until the true costs of remediating and decontaminating the site are known – and it is established whether the developers can afford (and are willing) to support these costs.**

***7. BAE has already made massive profits from the "job lot" purchase of the former MOD sites. The argument that they cannot afford to provide access roads and community facilities is not justified.***

BAE have indicated that they need revenue from the first phase of housing before they can provide access road into the new development, and that the provision of community facilities must be phased in conjunction with house sales. They have also stated (see above) that development is "required to fund the clean up of the site". This approach is outrageous, when you consider the massive profits they have **already** made from the purchase of the former MOD sites. We contend that the proposed development at Bishopton should be regarded as part of the overall acquisition, and that BAE can easily afford to provide access roads and community facilities due to the profits they have already made. The following is a quote from "The National Wealth – Who gets what in Britain" by Dominic Hobson (ISBN 0002559137).

***"Royal Ordnance sold to British Aerospace in April 1987 for £190million, turned out to be a bargain. Within a year, unwanted factories sold by the taxpayers for £5million were sold to property developers for £450million".***

As will be seen above, British Aerospace made an immediate profit of £260million, which represents a massive return on their initial outlay. In effect it meant that the rest of the sites (including Bishopton ROF) cost absolutely nothing. Yet BAE now say that they need revenue from the sale of the first phase of houses to provide the community with the access roads they already promised a year ago. This situation can only be described as a national disgrace. It demonstrates why it is necessary for Renfrewshire Council to impose stringent

# Bishopton Action Group

conditions about infrastructure and facilities **before** any outline planning application is approved. BAE have already made colossal profits from their “job lot” purchase of Royal Ordnance. Bishopton ROF cannot be regarded in isolation from the entire sale - the least we should expect is that BAE give something back to the community in return for the “bargain” they got in 1987.

# Bishopton Action Group

## Part 2 – Additional Objections to the Statement

### ***1. The Consultation Statement is incompetent.***

In our opening statement in Part 1 of this objection, we describe the Statement as incompetent. Minor points of criticism are:

- On the front page, there are no “sign off” names of author, line manager, and director provided, nor is the report dated. Were the employees of the company PPS not confident enough about their report to put their signatures to it?
- The report refers to the “Bishopton Gazette” – we do not know to which publication this refers.
- Page 24 describes Focus Group One being held on “Monday 21<sup>st</sup> 2005” – no reference is made to the month.

### ***2. Questionnaire results from the first exhibition are not representative.***

Twelve pages of the 51 page Statement are devoted to providing an analysis of the first public exhibition held in February 2005 and the questionnaire results. However, this questionnaire was completed by **only 405 people**. We would argue that this is not a representative sample from an adult population of 4,000. It pales into insignificance compared to the grand total of over 9,000 letters of objection to the ROF proposals delivered by the Bishopton Action Group on behalf of residents.

**It is pure folly to produce a consultation statement which tries to pretend that people are satisfied with the development proposals and the supposed changes that have been made, when almost the entire population has consistently and vociferously demonstrated its massive and overwhelming opposition to the plans at every possible stage of the so-called “consultation” process. It is utter nonsense to ask people what they wish to see in a new development, when they are vehemently opposed to the principle of development.**

### ***3. Questions asked were misleading and over simplistic.***

Questions asked on the questionnaire distributed at the first exhibition were over simplistic, skewed in favour of the developers, and also designed to lead the participants to respond in a particular way e.g. “Do you agree with the principle of using the site to generate employment?” Of course people will respond positively, since everyone wants to promote employment opportunities in general. If the question asked was: “do you believe the development will generate the quoted figure of 4,000 jobs?” people would have answered in the negative. Given the empty industrial premises at Inchinnan, Renfrew, Hillington, Linwood, Inverclyde etc, and the fact that no companies have been identified as potential clients to take up the business premises, no-one in their right mind actually believes that the hypothetical figure of 4,000 jobs will ever become a reality.

# Bishopton Action Group

Similarly: “Do you support the idea of cleaning up contamination on the site?” will obviously generate a positive response. This is immediately followed by: “Do you agree with the principle of developing part of the site to pay for the clean up and new infrastructure (roads, bridges, utilities etc.)? Those who answered “yes” to the first question would be inclined to answer “yes” to the second question, without clearly understanding the implications behind it. If the question asked was “Are you happy that the developers will only remediate and decontaminate the site, and provide infrastructure and facilities, if they can make enough profit from house sales?” it would have elicited a completely different response.

## ***4. Focus groups were not a representative sample of the Bishopton community.***

The results of the two focus group meetings are quoted at length on over 10 pages of the Statement. **Of the 23 people invited to the focus groups, only 8 were from Bishopton. Why invite people from Paisley and Erskine, who by their own comments:**

- **Knew little about the ROF situation, and were therefore unable to offer informed opinions.** Focus group two was comprised of 11 people, ALL from outside Bishopton, and the feedback begins by stating that “overall the group admitted that they did not know too much about the site or the plans although some knew about the factory and the contamination but not to any great extent” (page 30). The group were then given the **developers’** promotional/publicity leaflet and asked to comment on the ROF proposals! This is manipulative in the extreme – if they were presented only with positive information about the proposals, of course they would not even be aware of the many negative impacts upon the community of Bishopton.
- **Were not going to be directly affected by the proposals.** One of the main concerns of Bishopton residents is that the development will destroy the nature, character and existing village way of life. People from outside the village will not appreciate or even understand these concerns. On page 30 of the Statement, it refers to focus group two and says: “Other members of the group did not feel strongly about the plans as they did not believe they were going to be affected by them”. Why invite people to give their opinions on matters which do not affect them?

The Statement says that “the two groups aimed to gain feedback from a cross section of people **within the local community**” (page 8). However, the bulk of the members from the two focus groups were from **outside** of the local community. Again, we repeat our objection that the consultation exercise was a total sham - moreover it demonstrates the developers’ failure to understand the strong sense of village identity that exists, or to understand the true nature of our complaint, when they consider that residents from Paisley form part of the community of Bishopton! It also demonstrates a complete lack of sensitivity and is offensive in the extreme.

## ***5. The important issue of development at Georgetown is omitted from the summary of responses.***

One of the attendees from focus group one (Mrs. Margaret Donaldson) has stated to us that the two main themes which emerged from their group discussions were as follows:

# Bishopton Action Group

- Concern about decontamination issues and protecting the health and safety of residents.
- The conclusion that the development should be built at Georgetown, as a separate community.

The group's comments are included in the Statement on page 27 as follows:

"If the development were to be built elsewhere on the site for example the south of the site so that it would be independent from Bishopton it would be more acceptable" and

"If the development was to be built on a different part of the site Bishopton would still benefit from the new amenities proposed but would not encroach or have as many negative impacts as a development immediate to the site".

However this important topic is not included in Chapter 7 (The Response), which lists 53 of the main "suggestions from the community" identified during the consultation exercise. **The developers have been selective about which responses they have included as key issues for the people of Bishopton.** The suggestion that "the scheme should be built on another part of the site away from Bishopton" (page 23) is a crucial issue. However, it is obviously a "hot potato" as far as the developers are concerned - it has been conveniently omitted from the responses and therefore not even addressed as part of the consultation exercise.

## ***6. The consultation exercise correctly identifies the crucial importance of access roads, but then states that these are not to be provided in phase 1.***

At the first exhibition in February 2005, the developers stated on the publicity boards: "To the north and south of the existing village, new junctions on the Greenock Road will take the traffic wishing to enter the site. ***This means no additional traffic caused by the development should need to drive through the existing village***". In the Masterplan itself, para 4.9 page 12, it states that one of the factors in the phasing of the development is "the need to have the road infrastructure in place to accommodate the traffic generated by the development in a way ***that avoids an excessive increase in movements through the centre of Bishopton***".

However at the second exhibition in May 2006, the developers appeared to be suffering from collective amnesia about what they said at the first exhibition i.e. that new access roads would be provided so that no additional traffic would pass through the village. They have since announced at a recent CLG meeting that Phase 1 of the new development, consisting of 400 houses, will be built **before** the access roads are completed, and that all traffic will use the existing and totally unsuitable access roads at Station Road, Newton Road and Rossland Crescent. This is totally unacceptable, and demonstrates why there is now a total mistrust within the community of any of the developer's statements.

**Any planning consent must specify the condition that the developers construct the access roads before the building of the first phase of housing is built. It is normal procedure in any large scale building project to have the necessary infrastructure in place first - this is what the developers have already promised the community of Bishopton, and what they have stated in their own Masterplan.**

# Bishopton Action Group

## **7. The developers' view of consultation appears to be to ask peoples' opinions, and then ignore them.**

The Consultation Statement (page 11) states that “this report has been put together and is being submitted with the planning application to show the process followed and how the submitted scheme has been influenced by the consultation process.” This conveys the impression that the developers were prepared to listen to the views of Bishopton residents, and to take on board issues raised. In fact, as described above in the crucial example of access roads, exactly the opposite is true. We fail to see how the initial plans have been changed as a result of consultation, as claimed in Chapter 7 of the Statement, and cannot identify **any** benefits in the final proposals resulting from the consultation process. To give an example of this, the following is a quote from one of the focus groups:

“Local schools and surgeries are all full if not overrun and we will need new ones to cope with all the new people. They need to be built early on in the process, before we get all that new housing”. (page 27).

Contrast this with what the developers now propose. Para 4.13 page 14 of the Masterplan states that in Phase 1 there will be the “**creation of an opportunity**” for a health centre. This sentence is deliberately vague and meaningless, and gives no indication of who will pay for the building, staffing, maintenance, etc of such a facility e.g. will the developer or Greater Glasgow Health Board pay? The Environmental Statement describes a “multi functional health living centre” incorporating a GP practice unit, and states “**It is envisaged that the healthy living centre would be procured through private investment**” (page 63). Again, this is a hollow and worthless statement and does not commit the developer to any responsibility for providing a new health centre. What will happen if “private investment” is not achieved? **Any planning consent must specify the exact developer contribution to funding a new health centre and describe the precise role and responsibility of the developer in the project. To allow the developer merely to earmark a piece of land for a possible health centre site is not an acceptable option.**

Early phasing of educational provision has clearly been identified in the consultation exercise as an area of great concern to parents. Table 4.2 of the Masterplan shows that in Phase 3 of the development (i.e. 2014 - 2015) a primary school “**site**” will be identified and para 4.24 page 15 states that “through this period of development it is anticipated that the need will arise for a primary school”. This is vague and unclear – to designate a “site” is not the same as actually providing and financing a school. Has the Education Committee of Renfrewshire Council set aside a budget for a new primary school, or will the developers be required to pay towards the cost of this? The existing primary school (which already has extra huts in the school playground to accommodate children) will be unable to accommodate the extra demand for places generated by phases 1 – 3 of the development.

In addition, the developers will **not** be providing a new secondary school – again this is one of the main concerns identified by parents in Bishopton. (The requirement for a secondary school and our objection to the fact that this is not to be provided is contained in other sections of our objection submission). The developers neatly side-step this issue of vital importance, by stating in their conclusions in the Consultation Statement that “in relation to a new secondary school it is the responsibility of Renfrewshire council to come to the view on need” (page 44) and “such a school requires a policy decision from Renfrewshire Council's Education Department.” (page 43). This is a total abdication of responsibility on the part of the developers. Education provision for such a large scale development is a key element of any planning determination, and this issue must be properly investigated and addressed before an outline planning application can be accepted.

# Bishopton Action Group

**Any planning consent must specify the exact developer contribution to funding a new primary school and describe the precise role and responsibility of the developer in the project. In addition, the Masterplan must include proposals for a new secondary school.**

## **8. Other issues identified during consultation have not been properly addressed.**

One of the most cited concerns in the Consultation Statement was that the village cannot cope with any increase in traffic generated by the proposed development (page 47) and that “the access at Station Road should be rethought”. However the developers’ response to this is that “the Station Road access remains necessary” (page 49) and indeed in the Masterplan it is referred to as the “linear access”, and one of the most important features of the development. This is a blatant disregard for the feelings of Bishopton residents, who will be severely inconvenienced by this approach. (Our objection to the Transport Assessment has been submitted as a separate report).

Many other comments, too numerous to mention, were made during the consultation exercise. However the developers are decidedly vague, if not totally evasive, about what they actually intend to provide, and we would strongly contend that this is not acceptable, even for an outline planning application. In the Masterplan and the consultation response, they say that they will “*invest* in the library service” and they will “*upgrade* community hall(s)”. Much later in the development (2016 – 2018) there will be a “*site*” for a local supermarket and a “*site*” for religious purposes, and “*opportunities* for commercial, leisure & recreational uses”. Again, these empty and unsubstantiated statements are totally worthless and do not convince the people of Bishopton that there will be any benefits from this new development.

**We understand that an outline planning application by its very nature does not contain specific details of proposals. However in this current application, the developer does not address the many important issues that the people of Bishopton have raised during the consultation period, nor does it commit them to providing any of the necessary facilities and infrastructure previously promised.**

Chapter 7 concludes by stating the following:

**“For the most part, the applicants agree with the wish list provided by the local community, but it has proved impossible for the applicants to build infrastructure and community facilities in advance of development.”**

It is significant that they refer to infrastructure and community facilities as a “wish list”. The Community Council were “sold” the development on the premise that infrastructure would go in before the housing, and in fact the Chair of the CC repeated this assertion at public meetings. **The developers expect us to believe the propaganda circulated that one day all our wishes might (or might not) come true! The perceived reality of this new development is that the people of Bishopton will gain absolutely nothing, but will lose everything that is currently good about our existing way of life.**

# Bishopton Action Group

## **9. Feedback from the second exhibition held in May 2006 demonstrates that Bishopton residents have more concerns now than before.**

The Consultation Statement set out to prove that after extensive consultation with the public, the development plans would be altered and presented to the community of Bishopton at a second exhibition in May 2006 (i.e. fifteen months after the initial exhibition in February 2005), to show that comments had been taken on board. However, exactly the opposite is true – the consultation exercise has achieved nothing at all, and in fact analysis of the results of the second exhibition prove only that people are more concerned than ever about the dangers of this proposed development. The developers have **not** addressed the issues of key concern to Bishopton residents.

Bishopton Action Group undertook its own survey by handing out a questionnaire to people entering the exhibition and encouraging them to ask a number of pertinent questions about access roads, community facilities, decontamination issues etc. The attendees were then asked to indicate whether they had received a satisfactory response by ticking a yes or no box for each of the six questions. Over 250 people completed our questionnaire (as opposed to only 151 people who completed the BAE/Redrow questionnaire). **Analysis of the returned questionnaires indicated that, for 93% of the questions asked, the developers were unable to provide a satisfactory response. This represents a massive vote of “no confidence” in the developers.** Here are just a few of the additional comments of residents who completed the BAG questionnaire:

- We don't know who to believe, what is the truth.
- Whole thing should be stopped right away. People don't want our village extended.
- They have underestimated public opinion.
- No real technical details particularly regarding contamination.

In addition, analysis of the developers' own questionnaire results by Cass associates also proves that people have grave fears over the proposed development. Here are just a few of the responses from the second exhibition listed in the developer's brochure "The regeneration of the Royal Ordnance Bishopton site":

- |   |         |
|---|---------|
| • Concern about impact of remediation on environment and neighbours | 72% yes |
| • Concern about burning of buildings                                | 77% yes |
| • Concern about control of noise and dust                           | 66% yes |
| • Concern about construction and operation of landfill              | 62% yes |
| • Concern about trees and habitats                                  | 59% yes |

**It is obvious from the above analysis (by both BAG and Cass) that the consultation exercise has in fact failed to reassure the public, or to diminish in any way the huge opposition to the proposals that has existed from the outset, when people first became aware of the plans to develop the former ROF site.**

As previously mentioned, the Community Council undertook a survey to reassess village opinion following the second exhibition. Leaflets were distributed to every household in Bishopton, and people were asked the simple question of whether they were for or against the development. **The result was a massive 94% against the development**, which is actually an increase on the initial referendum result (92% against). The Community Council has taken steps to publicise the result to all concerned, so that there can now be no doubt or ambiguity about the feelings of the local community. The following is an extract from the CC minutes of the meeting of August 2006:

# Bishopton Action Group

“...it was agreed that the secretary will send letters to the MSPs for this area, our local MP, the First Minister, local Councillors, leader of Renfrewshire Council, BAE and Redrow reporting the results of the questionnaire, together with the result of the referendum, **and stating that the Community Council is against the development.**”

**The community of Bishopton is united in its opposition to the proposed development.**

## **10. Objection conclusion.**

**In conclusion, from the points made in Parts 1 and 2 of this objection, it will be seen that the consultation exercise has been a complete failure. The Public Consultation Statement is an affront to the community of Bishopton and should be withdrawn from the Outline Planning Application documentation.**

**This is what Councillor Langlands wrote in his letter of response (dated 26<sup>th</sup> September 2006) to the Outline Planning Application with regard to the Public Consultation Statement:**

**“This document is widely discredited. It is felt that much of the attributed comment within is selectively presented to favour the developer’s aspirations. As a member of one of the participating focus groups and noting the comments attributed to that group, I agree with that sentiment.”**

**The developers have failed to engage in meaningful discussions with the community council, the community liaison group, and the people of Bishopton. The Consultation Statement reinforces the reasons why the people of Bishopton do not want this development. Most importantly, it calls into question the financial viability of the entire project, since the developers question their own ability to provide the necessary infrastructure and facilities, and to carry out the important task of remediating and decontaminating the site.**

**We repeat our initial objection that the Consultation Statement is incompetent and a total sham. It provides no evidence in support of the Outline Planning Application submitted by the developers. Renfrewshire Council is duty bound to protect the interests and the health and safety of the existing electorate in Bishopton, and must refuse the Outline Planning Application until the issues outlined in this objection submission have been properly investigated and addressed.**