

Minutes of Neilston Community Council 28th March in the Glen Halls, Neilston at 7pm.

Present, J Sheriff, R Mould, , M Pettigrew, , J Connery, V Wood , Cllr Gilbert, Cllr O’Kane, Cllr Buchanan, PC Ver Berne, PC Kerr (Police Scotland), J Brown, U Brown ,A Henderson, T McGuinness ,M McGuinness, C High, P McNally, M Eachen, J Ferrie , B Allen, J Mills, B Melrose, G Melrose, S McAlister, J Martin, P Gorman, J Milligan, E waters, W Collins, G Collins, D Jesner

Apologies: Cllr Green, , E Mould, J Scott, A Walker, R Junner

1. Police Report

Officers from Police Scotland attended the meeting and discussed the Police Report.

The Police report for the period 22nd Feb 21st March 2017 is as follows

Assault & Violent Crime

There have been no reports of serious assault in the area over this period.
one instance of common assault raised involving 2 school pupils on 8th March.

Drug Dealing

Two males in Cochrane Avenue on 15th march found in possession of controlled drugs. A 24 year old male and a 45 year old male have been charged and a report sent to Procurator fiscal.

Drunk & Disorderly

45 year old male arrested and charged with threatening and abusive behaviour after an incident on 22nd Feb in Madras Place.
report of disturbance involving a group of males and females fighting in Madras place on 12th March.
On 15th March Police received reports of “dirt bikes” . in Broadlie Rd. The police are keen to receive any information regarding those bikes or the owners.
Considerable public nuisance can be caused by these bikes and their use on public roads may be unlawful.

Reports have been made to Police Scotland regarding the use of off road and quad bikes in Lintmill and Cowdenhall.

Housebreaking etc.

No domestic housebreakings in period.

One theft was recorded in Craighall Quadrant which occurred on 1st March. 2 fence posts were stolen from garden.

In February Local Policing Teams in conjunction with ERC carried out a joint operation targeting bogus callers and traders. 96 vehicles were stopped . A number of road traffic offences were detected but in general the majority of businesses were found to be genuine.

2. Wardens

No wardens present

3. Development proposal on Neilston Rd – Talyor Wimpey.

A team from Taylor Wimpey (TW) , headed by their Technical Director, attended the meeting to outline their proposal for housing development. The proposal was for 149 houses including 15 affordable units.

The proposal is subject to a planning application 2017/0087/tp details of which can be viewed on line at ERC website.

Taylor Wimpy outlined the proposals and invited comments.

A number of issues were raised.

Road Junction access and safety were discussed.

Parking in the proposal and village were an issue.

TW outlined a Traffic Assessment was part of their proposal application.

The issue of Japanese Knotweed was raised but TW xplained this would be treated over a 5 year period but it was not in any area they intended to build on.

The build schedule was estimated to be over 3 – 4 years.

The issue of the number of affordable units being below the 25% outlined in the ERC SPG was raised but TW intimated this had been agreed with ERC and commuted sums agreed.

The issue of the boundary fence on Neilston Rd was raised and explained by TW

TW explained that the approximate “planning gain” was around £3 -4K per property.

The issue of plant access and storage were raised and it was explained that this would normally be controlled by planning conditions but TW were keen to have a positive approach to this with the public.

The issue of street lighting and light pollution was raised..

There was concern that ERC planning officials were not present at the meeting and this was the first some members of the public were aware of the development.

It was explained that the meeting was called at short notice, planning officials are unlikely to attend are not likely to express opinions since that might be seen legally to offer an opinion before all the facts were presented and that there had been various meetings and presentations regarding the development of the site from the MIR, LDP and PAN presentations further Wallace Land had made the Planning In Principle application which the Community Council had responded to and was widely published in the press.

A member of the Planning Applications Committee was present at the meeting who urged members of the public to make their views known to Planning under the normal system available on line or by post to ERC

It was likely that the application would go before the Planning Applications Committee on the 12th of April, the last meeting before the elections..

Neilston Community Council agreed to comment on the findings of the meeting and other public engagement exercises to ERC Planning.

NCC thanked Taylor Wimpey for their attendance at the meeting..

4. Car Park Charges Consultation

Information Commissioner now undertaking investigation.

5. Community Council Issues

Data Protection

Ongoing

On Line Representations in Planning

Ongoing

We perhaps should consider writing to the Ombudsman

Constitution

We have received an agreement from ERC to amend the constitution as voted on by NCC members.

6. Projects

There was some discussion regarding the Main St condition and the sale of the public area.

The issue of parking at the bus stop and the siting of the crossing was raised as an ongoing issue.

7. Sports Hub

A meeting was held regarding the Community Sports Hub and the requirements for its constitution and membership.

Currently this is mainly driven by the football groups but other sports clubs and interests are being actively encouraged to join.

8. CAG

Although the ERREF application for funding has been rejected as previously reported, there is potentially a larger sum available to enhance this project area.

This is being looked at through the CAG and in conjunction with ERC

9. Website

There is still a problem with access to the Facebook page.

10. Minutes

The minutes for the February meeting having been circulated, were proposed by J Connery and seconded by M Pettigrew

11. Treasurers Report

None

12. AOCB

There was no input on the siting of the proposed tribute to Jim Junner, however perhaps a planter rather than a bench might be more appropriate given the current location of benches in the village.

The next meeting of Neilston Community Council is on April 25th 2017 at 7pm in the Glen Halls

Attached: NCC letter to ERC Planning on proposed development.

COPY OF LETTER SENT UNDER PLANNING APPLICATION 2017/0087/tp

East Renfrewshire Council		Neilston Community Council
Environment Department	c/o	
Planning Development Management		Neilston
2 Spiersbridge Rd		Glasgow
Spiersbridge Business Park		
Thornliebank		
East Renfrewshire		30/03/2017
G46 8NG		

**Planning Application 2017/0087/tp – Taylor Woodrow
149 homes Nether Kirkton View
Neilston**

Dear Sirs

Neilston Community Council having consulted locally, including public meetings and having engaged with the developer and reviewed the planning information on line provided by East Renfrewshire Council, would make the following comments on the proposed planning application.

1. **Site Access**

With regard to the access proposed and the transport assessment provided in the application we would consider the priority junction alone to be unsatisfactory.

As indicated in the assessment undertaken in February, the road already has a speeding issue, which has not been adequately tackled over the years.

The introduction of a second priority junction in the eastwardly direction, we would suggest is liable to create accident conditions unless additional measures are taken.

Although the sighting is compliant with the speed restriction on the road, actual speed is higher and we believe that the increase in traffic liable to be experience in the coming years combined with the visual restrictions imposed by the trees to soften the visual impact will have a detrimental effect on road safety.

In summertime the average speed is likely to increase and as demonstrated recently at Lintmill Terrace there has been a serious RTA caused by a priority junction and excessive speed.

Further the increased traffic experienced in Neilston when Lochlibo Rd is closed already shows reduced visibility and the impact of temporary 40mph speed limits and apparent increased police presence, to be largely ineffective in reducing speeds.

We therefore believe that additional measures need to be taken to reduce speed on Neilston Rd and junction sighting, as well as improving traffic access to site.

Traffic calming on Neilston Rd in the vicinity of the site access is a possibility but this would not be a preferred option on a main road.

A light controlled junction would help ensure controlled access as well as reducing average speeds on Neilston Rd in the vicinity.

The problem with that is in winter when snow is experienced in Neilston, traffic signals on a hill will potentially stop vehicles on the main road that cannot restart on a snow covered road. Although this is a bus route and is gritted by ERC as such, we have experienced traction issues on this road in winter.

A roundabout would provide traffic priority control and reduce speed at the same time, without major stopping issues on the uphill route, however uphill traffic exiting the development would have priority over uphill traffic on Neilston Rd.

There is likely to be increased uphill traffic from the development in the morning "school run" period.

Some of this could be mitigated by the design of the roundabout and road surfaces.

There may be siting and road realignment issues in creating a roundabout particularly one where level road surfaces are required to reduce the incline and minimise traction issues in poor weather.

In summary we believe additional road safety measures are required around the access and a suitable roundabout may be the best option for residents and road users alike.

2. **Number of Affordable houses and funds**

We note that the percentage of affordable houses is below the 25% recommended in the SPG, being around 10% and a mixture of RHA and saleable properties.

We believe that there are no mitigating circumstances on this site to justify such a reduction and clarification is needed from ERC on this point.

We further understand that additional funds are being provided to ERC from the developer in mitigation of this, as allowed by the SPG policy.

This needs to be clarified both in terms of authenticity and if such funds are being provided, where ERC intend to utilise them to provide the additional affordable houses.

Is it ring fenced for Neilston?

3. **Affordable Houses – Lack of integration**

The proposal suggests all the 15 affordable houses are in one area at the Barrhead end of the site.

Planning policy is to integrate affordable housing into the mainstream of development, not to isolate them in a potential “ghetto”.

East Renfrewshire Council policy as well as that of Scottish Government and good practice proposes integration rather than segregation.

We believe that this can be achieved with minimal impact on the design and the financial return on the development costs.

4. **Boundary Fencing and landscaping.**

There is fencing on the Neilston Rd boundary softened by edges and mature tree planting.

It is suggested in the Traffic Assessment that this will reduce the “rural area” effect and hence potentially reduce speed. We do not believe that to be the case as displayed at the other end of the village.

Whilst the main boundary fence is proposed as 1.8m high to reduce the impact of traffic noise and visual intrusion for purchasers, the landscape based “softening” should be adequate and comprehensive enough to provide good visual impact on entering and leaving the village.

Given the fact that good visual impact encourages visitors and potential tourism, and that this is an objective of both ERC and Scottish Government, improved boundary treatment is imperative. Further given that Neilston has been acknowledged as the “best place in Scotland to live” nothing we permit should be allowed to affect that, hence boundary treatment has to be excellent.

Hard to improve being the best place to live even with expert landscape architecture and planning.

Some of the trees planted in Kingston Road by the Community Council and NDT were vandalised in a relatively short space of time and had to be replaced, some form of replacement plan needs to be put into place as part of the development.

The development is proposed over a 3- 4 year period, we are already suggesting that Neilston Road landscaping is fully implemented early in the development.

Neilston Rd has more pedestrian traffic than Kingston Rd and a new footpath is proposed on the development side of the road, hence more access for vandalism.

The development consent, if granted should include a detailed upkeep and replacement requirement both during the building process and after completion.

This would potentially mean the ultimate adoption of the Neilston Rd boundary landscape by ERC Parks or Roads.

5. **Protection of natural heritage.**

As detailed in the Community Councils previous submissions on this site, there are a number of unusual species on this site including wild orchids not found in other local areas. We believe a botanical survey should be carried out by Glasgow Botanic Gardens, Royal Botanic Gardens Edinburgh, Scottish Orchid Society or similar body and any rare appropriate species delivered into their care for subsequent return to an appropriate site.

6. **Plant Access and pollution**

In the initial site investigation process for this site various items of contractor's plant were left in local streets overnight to the detriment of local residents.

Clear conditions should be applied to the access, use and pollution from any plant, machinery, materials or transport on or off site.

Whilst this is frequently a condition of planning consent in any case, given the fact it has been ignored in the Planning in Principle site investigations additional assurances are sought by residents along with a clear action and responsibility path for both developer and East Renfrewshire Council

7. **Street lighting**

Concern has been raised over the issue of street light pollution, given the fact that the site is overlooked by a number of properties.

Assurance is sought that energy efficient lighting will be used with the minimum upward light pollution.

We believe that these issues need to be addressed in the planning application consideration and appropriate action taken in the Report of Handling.

Of considerable concern is the access safety given the actual road speed and the lack of effective speed to reduction to comply with the speed limit.

Yours Faithfully

John Scott – Chairman , Neilston Community Council