



CAMBUSLANG Community Council

Whitlawburn East Housing Redevelopment (P/18/0012/PAN)

Response by Cambuslang Community Council to the Public Meeting - 16th January 2019

On behalf of Cambuslang Community Council (CCC), Michelle Farmer (Vice-Chair) and David Porter (Secretary) attended this public meeting which was called under the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 (Ref.1) - see Part 2, para.7, subsection (2) (a). Subsequently, CCC were provided with the information boards by SLC.

The Agent and the Applicant have asked for comments. The following are CCC's observations, comments and conclusions. Specific points where we would request a response from the Applicant or Agent are highlighted in bold.

Consultation process

The event was informative, and the staff of the applicant's Agent (Stallan-Brand Architecture + Design Ltd.) on hand were very courteous, knowledgeable and responsive to the enquiries made. The consultation appears to have had a high level of interest and interaction. Also, the information posters on the development and other hand-outs available were of high quality and full of relevant details. It is positive that a local firm is being contracted to undertake the development.

1. When questioned, none of the Agent's staff seemed to be aware of the other separate requirement of the Ref.1 Regulations stated in Part 2, para.7, subsection (1) viz. "The prospective applicant is to consult as respects a proposed application every community council any part of whose area is within or adjoins the land where the proposed development is situatedetc." CCC were not contacted by the Applicant or Agent in this regard.
2. SLC Planning had informed CCC about this public event describing it as a 'public consultation'. However, CCC's experience of the event was that it was more an exercise in disseminating information to the public and responding to questions on the material presented as opposed to a consultation in the normally understood meaning of the word. For example, nobody appeared to take note of the questions raised and the subsequent discussions on these – although the CCG information boards state that comments “will be collated and considered by the design team”. We are concerned that the PAC Report accurately summarises the comments made at the consultation.



We welcome the importance given (in the information boards) by the developer to community participation in all phases of the project, in particular the potential involvement of a local residents' association. This should be enshrined as a condition in the project planning permission with the developer being required to appoint a community liaison officer with powers to investigate and resolve any complaints that may arise during the construction phase.

We would welcome:

- ***clarification as to how the questions and discussions and the understandings reached will be recorded in the applicant/Agent's consultation report;***
- ***clarification on the stakeholder engagement will actively engage with community groups and the wider community from now on throughout the development process, especially during the planning application phase, and crucial stages of demolition, site start, construction, occupation (e.g. through a local residents' steering group, appointment of a community liaison officer).***

Development proposals

According to the development proposals, it is planned to construct 320 housing units which is 60 units down from present total 380 units. Currently only around 50% of the 380 units are occupied as prospective tenants are put off by the poor quality of the estate. 100 of the new units will be of superior quality for private sale, a land grant from SLC making it profitable for developer. 220 social housing units for SLC will be constructed at lower costs. 120 of these social units will be flats in 5 blocks of 24 units.

3. The indicative design, built-quality and landscaping of the proposed development looks very good as judged by the illustrative examples shown of projects that have previously been executed by the developer/contractor. The development has a positive mix of private and social housing, and good layout standards in terms of density and scale. CCG is a local firm with a good track record, and the information boards convey a strong sense that they want to make this a distinctive development. The commitment to placemaking and references to the vernacular of historic Cambuslang tenements in designing the development is very welcome given the unimaginative templates used by other housing developers for other recent developments in the area. The architectural style is reminiscent of the housing units constructed in the east end of Glasgow for the Commonwealth Games in 2016 for which the Agent was also responsible. It appears that modern construction techniques will be employed which include pre-fabrication of large interior sections of the housing units. Adequate car parking spaces are to be provided per unit in relation to each unit's size.

Given the above, we assume that the development will follow (or go beyond) the good practice recommendations in Scottish Government planning advice, notably Planning Advice Note 67 (housing quality) and Planning Advice Note 83 (master planning). Please provide information of any areas where this planning advice is not being followed.

We would also welcome clarification as to whether there will be a policy of priority rehousing back to the new development for those residents who want to stay in the area or are not able to be rehoused locally.

4. The first phase of the development will be part of the social housing provision. At the consultation event, reference was made to the housing standards to be applied (e.g.

minimum room size, garden depth etc) – it would be helpful to have more detail on the housing standards to be applied.

5. Apart from disabled access facilities for the flats required by Building Regulations, there appear to be no other explicit facilities being built into the housing units to make them suitable for disabled persons or people with impaired mobility. e.g. wheelchair access, handrails, internal fitments such as walk-in shower units, safe kitchens, alarm/call buttons. Clearly such items can be **retro**-fitted, but the present plan does not convey the important message of inclusiveness.

We would welcome clarification how the developers intend to make housing fully inclusive in terms of accessibility. In particular, we recommend an access audit at final design stage.

6. In terms of energy efficiency, the development appears to have high insulation standards. The illustrative drawings from past projects show solar panels but other than this, no explicit reference was made to this matter. This issue is also not addressed in the information boards.

We would welcome further information on the approach being taken to energy efficiency, and in particular the extent to which the design will follow (or not) Scottish Government guidance in this area, and specifically PAN 84 (Reducing Carbon Emissions in New Development) and PAN 63 (Waste Management Planning).

7. There are no specific children's play or other recreational areas included in the development, and this is mentioned only in passing in the information boards. It could be that the intention is to utilise existing play areas shared with West Whitlawburn. It has also been mooted that the current Whitlawburn Community Hall, which is not part of the proposed development, needs replacing. It is important that consideration is given to upgrading the existing play areas where necessary and providing a new and expanded Community Hall in parallel with the proposed development to facilitate bringing together different parts of the Whitlawburn community.

We would welcome further information on the provision of facilities in the 'central amenity space' and specifically the provision of (a) community meeting space (e.g. a hall) and (b) good-quality play areas throughout the development area.

8. On the question of encouraging fit and healthy lifestyles, there was a noticeable absence of any reference to cycle paths and connectivity of these to the local network in and around Cambuslang. This is also not mentioned in the information boards. Some of the images on the information boards imply 'traditional' provision of pavements and roads but no integration of cycling. Given the Scottish Government's objectives on active travel, we consider it critical that the design of roads, incorporate provision to encourage cycling (for all ages) in the design of the development, following the good practice recommended by Sustrans, notably Sustrans Design Manual Chapter 10 (Cycling in New Developments)

We would welcome further information on the anticipated design of provision for cycling and the extent to which Sustrans Design Manual Chapter 10 will be followed (or not).

9. The issue of an Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) for the development was raised by CCC, and the Agent's representative (Mr Ian Harper, Director) responded that SLC Planning

had advised that this would not be required. CCC then asked for reassurances on the following.

- a) Asbestos decommissioning from existing buildings, on-site handling and temporary storage, and off-site final disposal. The Agent confirmed that asbestos was indeed present, that an audit had been conducted to identify locations and the extent of this problem and that the contractor would adhere to all regulations and good practice guidelines in managing this issue.
- b) The Agent stated that no other hazardous materials in the existing buildings had been identified that would require special measures during demolition and disposal.
- c) Concerning invasive alien plant problems such as Japanese knotweed, the Agent said that there was no reports/record that this might be a problem on the Whitlawburn site. CCC responded by noting that knotweed had been encountered withdrawn in the past few years on land either adjacent to or in Holmhills Wood Community Park which is not far from the development site.
- d) In response to questions about drainage on and from the site, the Agent reported that SLC was looking into the relevant concerns and their advice on this would be followed.
- e) SLC was reportedly also studying the implications of traffic flow on and adjacent to the development site, and its recommendations would also be followed when available.

Notwithstanding the above reassurances, we disagree with the lack of requirement by SLC for an Environmental Impact Assessment, and we recommend that the developer follows EU legislative requirements in this area carries out an EIA themselves to address the above concerns and all other relevant local environmental issues.

10. A range of other potential issues to do with the implementation of the development in the middle of a thriving community (not on the edge of town) were discussed. Inter alia, these included on-site noise from construction machinery, and possible dust and noise pollution and traffic disruption from heavy vehicles accessing the site. When questioned whether the contractor would comply with the 'Considerate Contractors' Code of Practice, the Agent gave assurances that the contractor was aware of this scheme and would adhere to its spirit.

CCC is aware that SLC Planning will attach to its planning approval their normal conditions based on British Standards for all contracted works of this type. Nevertheless, the Code of Practice referred to will add value to the development in particular regarding workforce issues. The agent confirmed that the development will bring work and training opportunities particularly to young people in the area. This is a needed and laudable objective

We would welcome a commitment that the 'Considerate Contractors' Code of Practice' will be followed as well as further detail on how employment and training will be provided for local people, especially young people.

Cambuslang Community Council
Cambuslangcomco@aol.com

21 January 2019