

APPLICATION No: 06/0602/PP (ROF BISHOPTON)

That the application be refused as it is contrary to the requirements of both the Structure and Local Plans, and further fails to accord with the finding of the Examination in Public (EIP) and good planning practice, on the following grounds.

1. That the proposal will not result in a Community Growth Area at Bishopton but in the creation of a separate new community on the other side of an elevated railway track from Bishopton.
2. That the proposal is lacking in that it fails to demonstrate a strong sense of place or a sustainable community, lacks a spatial strategy, and fails to provide a vision for the integration of the whole area.
3. The proposal contains little analysis of the existing settlement of Bishopton, fails to demonstrate an adequate understanding of the existing village, the impact of the new settlement on the existing village centre of Bishopton and consequently, fails to provide an overall vision of the proposed enlarged Bishopton.
4. The proposal fails to demonstrate adequate linkage between the existing and proposed elements of Bishopton. The use of the Station Road underpass as the main entrance point restricts that point of connection and will have the effect of dividing the communities at what is intended as a main gateway. The quality and nature of the connection points fails to address in a meaningful fashion how the new and old parts of Bishopton would be successfully linked together. Further, the routes are not DDA compliant and it would be impractical to try and achieve this.
5. It is proposed that access to and from the development via Station Road shall be restricted to walking, cycling and public transport, to traffic related to the park and ride facility, and traffic serving the local village car park only. The available width beneath Station Road railway bridge is 4.5m while the minimum desired width for emergency vehicles is 3.5m. The proposal would therefore result in pedestrians and cyclists competing in both directions for their share of a 1.0m width pavement resulting in Station Road becoming an unsafe linkage between the two communities.

6. The scale of the proposed development is such that it will have a detrimental effect on the quality of life, amenity, character and identity of the village of Bishopton. The rate and degree of expansion being proposed exceeds the ability of the existing community to adjust to the population growth.

7. That the proposals for non-denominational primary schooling are inconsistent with building an integrated community and may lead to further fragmentation, due to a lack of capacity, in the newer community itself.

8. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the costs arising from the proposed development will be borne by those who benefit from the proposals and not by other communities or future generations.

9. The cost of providing infrastructure and facilities associated with the proposed development have neither been quantified nor apportioned, it is therefore not possible to determine the extent to which these costs are borne by the developer which is material to the acceptability of the proposal.

10. The proposed Northern Access Road and the proposed Southern Access Road are both to be located in land currently designated as Greenbelt. Both of these roads will enclose existing areas of Greenbelt and make them more liable to future development.

11. The proposal fails to identify the precise route of the Northern Access Road and therefore fails to satisfy the requirement that any new or existing Greenbelt edge is clear, high quality and defensible in the longer term. Further, delegation of the decision on the final route of this road to council officers will deny interested parties the opportunity of making representations on the specific proposals to the Planning & Economic Policy Board.

12. That the community woodland is not defined or conditioned in the consent.

13. The bridge height restriction (3.8m) on the Houston road (B790) onto which the proposed "Haul Road" accesses will result in some construction traffic being unable to link to the motorway system via Barnsford Road (A726) and St James Interchange. As a consequence, large construction traffic will be required to reach the site through the villages of Houston and Crosslee, exposing these, and potentially other communities, to large vehicles and the resultant problems and threats to public safety this entails.

14. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed business park will produce the level of jobs claimed. There is no proposed link between the building of residential units and the creation of employment or the occupation of floorspace or of Serviced Employment Land, merely to the supply of employment floorspace (phase 1) and thereafter to Serviced Employment Land. This lack of definitive linkage could easily lead to a situation where the site becomes predominantly residential with few local jobs being provided, contrary to the rationale behind community growth areas. Further, Transport Scotland assert that the provision of a new motorway junction is predicated on the delivery of a functioning mixed use development.

15. The proposal is likely to create increased traffic volumes within the existing Bishopton village, other local roads and to create an unacceptable increase in traffic volumes and congestion at St James Interchange.

16. Transport Scotland confirm that design standards on the M8 motorway between Junction 26 Hillington and Junction 29a Bishopton will be exceeded once development trips are realised. It is further conceded that the M8 between Junction 29 St James and Junction 29a St James exceeds the capacity for a two lane motorway link. No funding mechanisms have as yet been agreed for the upgrade, or other measures to increase capacity, of these sections and permission in outline should be reserved until such matters are resolved.

17. Proposals to prevent the occupation of any part of the built development until a contribution framework for measures to improve capacity on the M8 between Junction 29 Hillington and 29a Bishopton, or other agreed works, have been submitted and agreed are inadequate, have the potential to result in a change to conditions being made, the potential for piecemeal development emerging and the potential for dereliction for those buildings built but not occupied.

18. That the White Cart Viaduct is not suitable for "hard shoulder running" as proposed for other parts of the M8 network in the Strategic Transport Projects Review and that significant problems could be created at St James Interchange and other M8 junctions should other proposed ATM measures proceed.

19. That the proposal fails to meet the requirements of the EIP (and therefore of the finalised Structure Plan) in relation to "the development of a Community Growth Area will also depend on capacity problems on the M8 to the east of Bishopton being satisfactorily addressed and on improvements to the rail capacity.

20. The applicant has not demonstrated a sufficient knowledge of the location, extent, nature and implications of contamination on site to warrant granting outline planning consent.