Cass Associates

ARCHITECTURE • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • LAND REMEDIATION

ROYAL ORDNANCE, BISHOPTON

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY LIAISON MEETING

8 NOVEMBER 2005 @ 14:30, COUNCIL HQ, PAISLEY

Attendance:

Ken Aitken	KA	JMP
Scott Allan	SA	Renfrewshire Council Roads Division
David Bryce	DB	Renfrewshire Council Planning Division
Jim Dewar	JD	Renfrewshire Council Planning Division
Robert McArthur	RMcA	Renfrewshire Council Roads Division
Jamie Mackie	JM	Renfrewshire Council Planning Division
Stuart Milligan	SM	Redrow
Graham Trewhella	GT	Cass Associates
Nick Wright	NW	Cass Associates

1 Previous meeting

1.1 JD reiterated that a note of the remediation/decontamination process would be useful, as requested in the meeting with Vincent Goodstadt in a previous meeting relating to the Structure Plan. JD emphasised that remediation and decontamination are big issues locally. A short paper explaining the linkage between remediation and development phasing would also be useful. **ACTION: GT**

2 Visit to Buckshaw Village

2.1 JD said that the trip had been useful and thanked SM and GT for organising it.

2.2 RMcA noted the potential for severance due to the design of Central Avenue. It was agreed that this style of road design should not be replicated at ROB. SA supported the move away from a distributor road towards a more permeable road layout.

2.3 DB noted the virtual absence of pre-development woodland at Buckshaw, and commented that the removal of all woodland through remediation at ROB should be avoided. GT explained that the remediation process is likely to be very different at ROB, retaining more existing features such as woodland.

2.4 SM invited Council officers to visit another Redrow development at Dickens Heath, nr Solihull, suggesting that it might also be useful.

3 Masterplan and phasing

3.1 GT explained recent revisions to the draft land use plan in response to the Council's suggestion of a more permeable road layout and more detailed knowledge of geotechnical ground conditions (which have a significant impact on construction costs). The land use framework proposes 2,500 dwellings (with significant variation in house types and densities through the development) and 150,000m^2 of commercial floorspace. Reserved sites for community uses are currently being considered.

3.2 The proposals have been costed and are commercially viable as they stand.

3.3 JD asked how the ratio between developed and undeveloped areas has changed since previous work in 2001/02. GT explained that the ratio has remained constant, but there has been an increase in the gross housing area within the development area from 81ha to 94ha in order to reflect the input of the housing developer.

3.4 GT explained that the next stage in the process will be to illustrate 3 or 4 character areas in finer detail (e.g. the proposed village core), develop the land use framework into a masterplan, and produce schedules for each development parcel showing density, capacity and character.

4 Phasing

4.1 GT explained the current phasing proposals. He explained that they are currently being refined and would be sent informally to JD for information as soon as possible. **ACTION: GT**

4.2 GT explained that the proposed phase 1 is likely to be 400 residential units, community infrastructure (potentially the health centre), plus a start on enabling infrastructure (including M8 junction, access roads, park and ride improvements) and remediation works (there would also be some remediation work before phase 1). The scale of residential development is largely led by capacity of existing infrastructure. Employment zones are not included in phase 1 as they will require the M8 junction and access roads to be in place.

4.3 Phasing is based on a build rate of just under 200 dwellings per annum after the first phase. SM noted that this build rate is realistic.

4.4 JD noted the need to allow flexibility within the new village centre for the health centre and other facilities to expand. **ACTION: GT**

4.5 Separate discussions had already taken place between KA and SA about the transport implications of the proposed phasing. SA indicated that 400 dwellings in phase 1 appeared to be acceptable in principle, subject to the local community being happy with the proposal. He suggested similar treatment to existing road and footway accesses to the same physical design as roads within the development area, between the site boundary and the A8. KA is currently working on proposals. **ACTION: KA**

4.6 SA said that he would be steered by the developer/consultants as to whether Newton Road and Rossland Crescent should ultimately be closed or remain open. **ACTION: KA**

4.7 SA emphasised the need for frontage development. He suggested that the main streets through the development should not look or feel like distributor roads and should have a 20mph design speed. The only exceptions to this should be the access road to the employment area and those parts of the northern and southern access roads outwith the development area, which should have a 30mph design speed.

ACTION: KA

4.8 SA raised concerns about sites being parcelled out to individual developers, suggesting that this could lead to an unintegrated road and footway network. He recommended that the masterplan should include either detailed road layouts or design standards. GT suggested that the character area illustrations (see 3.4 above) would set the flavour for each area at the outline planning stage, and then design codes could be drawn up prior to each phase of development, to be responsive to changing circumstances through the lifetime of the development as a whole. JD suggested using a model that the Council has used successfully on other major sites: requiring design codes to be submitted as an intermediate stage between outline approval and the submission of reserved matters. This is essentially a mechanism to ensure that the original principles are retained as new developers are brought in.

ACTION: GT/SM

5 Housing mix and tenure

5.1 GT thanked JD for producing the draft paper on housing mix and tenure, and acknowledged it as a well-informed starting point for discussion. He said that the developer/consultant team had been considering its content, and would reply in due course.

5.2 Some points were made in discussion:

ACTION: GT/DS

1. SM suggested revising the initial market split of 33% lower/33% middle/33% upper to 60% lower/25% middle/15% upper. A requirement for straight 25% affordable housing would make the development unviable with the development package currently proposed (reference was made to the paragraphs in PAN74 about brownfield sites with high remediation costs).
2. JD noted that developments of this scale need to have the proper amount of low cost housing, and drew attention to the local community's aspirations in terms of housing mix.

6 Strategic roads issues

6.1 SA expressed concern about the speed of progress with the Scottish Executive on STAG2. KA agreed to send the programme so that SA can monitor progress and assist if need be.

ACTION: KA/SA

7 Public transport

7.1 GT/KA explained that a separate public transport study is being progressed to cover park and ride, bus provision etc. The findings will form an important part of the outline planning application. The study will include an assessment of whether a bus service subsidy is required.

8 Community infrastructure

8.1 ***Health:*** NW reported that potential occupants of a new health centre are essentially positive to it being located within the first phase of the new village core provided that there is sufficient travel integration with the existing village (particularly by car).

8.2 ***Recreation ground:*** JD commented that it is important that the recreation ground remains as an integral part of the proposals.

8.3 ***Education/recreation:*** JD provided an update on progress with his colleagues in Education and Leisure, where all relevant staff have changed since the 2002 study. They are currently revisiting their requirements. A second meeting has been set up for 18 November, following which he will contact NW/GT to arrange a meeting.

9 Green infrastructure

9.1 GT explained the approach being taken to integrate remediation, ecology, trees and landscape issues, which will inform the environmental impact assessment.

9.2 DB noted that the details of tree retention and removal will be scrutinised very carefully at the outline planning stage.

10 Community awareness

10.1 GT outlined the proposed approach to raising awareness of the emerging proposals amongst the local community:

1. Presentation to the Community Liaison Group on the masterplan and how it responds to issues raised in the consultation earlier in the year.
2. Community awareness-raising event timed to coincide with submission of the outline planning application.

11 Next meeting

11.1 The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday 15 December 2005** at 2.15pm in Renfrewshire Council offices, Gilmour House, County Square, Paisley.