

**PLANNING BOARD – 28 APRIL 2021**

---

**Planning Board**

**Wednesday 28 April 2021 at 10am**

**Planning Board Councillors present:** Councillors Clocherty, Crowther, Dorrian, J McEleny, McKenzie, McVey, Moran, Murphy, Nelson, Rebecchi and Wilson.

**Councillors observing:** Councillors Ahlfeld, Brennan, Brooks, Curley, McCabe, Quinn and Robertson.

**Chair:** Councillor Wilson presided.

**Officers in attendance:** Interim Service Director Environment and Economic Recovery, Interim Head of Legal Services, Planning and Building Standards Manager, Mr D Ashman and Mr J McColl (Planning Services), Mr G Leitch and Ms E Provan (Roads and Transportation), Mr J Kerr, Ms D Sweeney, Ms L Carrick and Mr C MacDonald (Legal Services), ICT Services Manager and Mr P Coulter (Corporate Communications).

The meeting was held by video-conference.

**The following paragraphs are submitted for information only, having been dealt with under the powers delegated to the Board.**

**191 APOLOGIES, SUBSTITUTIONS AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**191**

No apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Planning Board members.

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Councillor C. McEleny and Councillor MacLeod as non-Planning Board members.

Councillors Wilson and Clocherty declared an interest in Agenda Item 2 (Pre-Determination Hearing).

Prior to the commencement of business, the Chair highlighted Workers' Memorial Day and requested that attendees observe a one minute silence to commemorate those who have been killed or injured at their place of work.

**192 PRE-DETERMINATION HEARING**

**192**

There was submitted a report by the Interim Service Director of Environment and Economic Recovery on an application by Taylor Wimpey (West Scotland) Limited for a proposed residential development of circa 100 units including 25% affordable and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space at land at Planetreeyetts, Kilmacolm (18/0322/IC).

Councillors Wilson and Clocherty declared a non-financial interest in this item as members of Clydeplan (Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Planning Authority). They also formed the view that the nature of their interest and of the item of business did not preclude their continued presence or their participation in the decision making process.

The Chair referred to the Pre-Determination Hearing Procedure included with the agenda papers and to extracts of the Remote Meeting Procedure which, for the benefit of those present, Mr Kerr read aloud.

The Chair then invited the applicant and objectors who had indicated they wished to address the Board to speak and the Board heard presentations from:-

PLANNING BOARD – 28 APRIL 2021

---

a) Mr David Wardrop (Director - Wardrop Strategic Planning Limited) on behalf of Taylor Wimpey (West Scotland) Limited (applicant) who made reference to: the shortage of land for housing in Inverclyde; how that shortage should be met; whether the extent of that shortage provides justification for the approval of this planning application; how the best site should be selected if there is only to be one development opportunity in Kilmacolm; the consequences of the quashing of Chapter 7 'Our Homes and Communities' of the Inverclyde Local Development Plan 2019; how this site was treated in the Main Issues Report; perceived flaws in the new Proposed Local Development Plan; the deliverability of the sites at Smithy Brae and Balrossie; whether the Council's repopulation agenda would be undermined by the refusal of this planning application; the uncertainty in the planning application for land to west of Quarry Drive because of the Council's ownership of part of that site; the potential impacts of this site as compared to the land to west of Quarry Drive site; the unexpected nature for refusal number 8 contained in the report; and the absence of objections from any consultees.

(b) Mr Bill Crookston on behalf of Kilmacolm Residents' Association (objector) – issues raised: the terms of the Association's written objection to the planning application; the denial of a shortage of housing land in the Renfrewshire Housing Sub-Market Area; as a consequence, the categorisation of the proposed development as unnecessary; the ongoing planning appeal in relation to a site in Quarriers Village; and options open to the Council – the approval of this planning application, the refusal of this planning application and the deferral of a decision on this planning application pending the outcome of the planning appeal in relation to a site in Quarriers Village.

(c) Mr Mike Jefferis on behalf of Kilmacolm Community Council (objector) – issues raised: the conflict between the proposed development and the Local Development Plan provisions on the Green Belt; the narrowness of the roads network in the vicinity of this site; concern at the increase in traffic from this proposed development and generally in the village; and the infrequent bus services serving the village.

(d) Mr R. Nicol Cameron on behalf of Kilmacolm Civic Trust (objector) – issues raised: the consistency of the Trust's opposition to Green Belt development around the village; the opposition to this proposed development in the Green Belt on the village edge; the position of the Inverclyde Local Development Plan on residential development in the Green Belt; the absence of exceptional or mitigating circumstances in respect of this planning application; the approach to strategy for new development in all planning policies, in particular in Clydeplan; the policy preference for brownfield development; the sustainability of the proposed development with particular reference to the use of private motor vehicles and the infrequent bus services; the pressure in the village on parking, doctors and dentists; the distances to the nearest railway stations; the surplus of housing land in the Renfrewshire Sub-Market Housing Area; the policy position of Clydeplan on development in the Green Belt; and developer contributions to the village centre in the event that it is proved that development of this Green Belt site is proved conclusively.

The Interim Service Director of Environment and Economic Recovery then presented his report and recommendations to the Board.

Thereafter, Members asked a number of questions which were answered by the Interim Service Director of Environment and Economic Recovery, Mr Wardrop and Mr G Leitch, Team Leader (Consultancy), Roads and Transportation.

**Decided:** that the Planning Board recommend to the Inverclyde Council that the application be refused for the following reasons:

(1) That due to unacceptable tension with the principles set out in paragraph 29 of Scottish Planning Policy it cannot be concluded that the proposal constitutes sustainable development.

(2) The proposal would undermine the plan-led process and result in a cumulative impact with the proposed plan-led and proportionate expansion of Kilmacolm with a resultant inappropriate level of new housing development, contrary to the Vision and Spatial Development Strategy of the 2017 Clydeplan Strategic Development Plan.

**PLANNING BOARD – 28 APRIL 2021**

---

(3) The proposed development is contrary to the Spatial Development Strategy of the 2017 Clydeplan Strategic Development Plan as it is an unjustified urban development which is outwith the development corridor identified in the Plan and it fails accord with the Green Belt objectives.

(4) The proposal is contrary to Policy 14 of the adopted 2019 Inverclyde Local Development Plan and Policy 15 of the 2021 proposed Inverclyde Local Development Plan in that it fails to accord with the objectives of the Green Belt.

(5) The proposal is contrary to the aims of Policy 10 of the adopted 2019 Inverclyde Local Development Plan and Policy 11 of the proposed 2021 Inverclyde Local Development Plan in that it will generate significant traffic demand by private car, would not constitute low carbon placemaking and would be inappropriately located.

(6) The proposal fails to have regard to the six qualities of successful places as required by Policy 1 of the 2017 Clydeplan Strategic Development Plan, Policy 1 of the adopted 2019 Inverclyde Local Development Plan and Policy 1 of the proposed 2021 Inverclyde Local Development Plan.

(7) The proposed development cannot be held to protect the quality, character, landscape setting and identity of the village which results in it being incompatible with the requirements of Policy 34 of the proposed 2021 Inverclyde Local Development Plan.

(8) The loss of trees, which have a significant landscape value, are not justified with reference to each of the criteria set out within Policy 34 of the adopted 2019 Inverclyde Local Development Plan and Policy 35 of the proposed 2021 Inverclyde Local Development Plan.