

KIRKINTILLOCH BUSINESS GATEWAY DRAFT MASTERPLAN FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION NOVEMBER 2021

BACKGROUND PAPER: LANDOWNER, DEVELOPER AND BUSINESS CONSULTATION

1 INTRODUCTION

This is one of a series of background papers prepared in connection with the draft Kirkintilloch Business Gateway Masterplan that is being published for public consultation in November 2021. This particular background paper refers to consultation undertaken with landowners, businesses and developers during preparation of the masterplan.

The **aim of the consultations** was to ensure that the masterplan is as deliverable as possible whilst also complying with planning policy requirements, in line with the overall intentions stated in the masterplan, before proceeding to public consultation.

The **purposes of this background paper** are to:

- Summarise comments received during meetings, discussions and correspondence with landowners and agents in the masterplan area in response to an initial draft of the masterplan circulated for discussion in June 2021. We are grateful to existing businesses, landowners, developers and their agents for supporting the process of developing the masterplan.
- Explain how those comments have informed preparation of the draft masterplan prepared by for public consultation in November-December 2021.

The masterplan which is subject to public consultation contains a number of changes from the initial June 2021 draft, including changes made in response to comments from businesses, landowners, developers and agents. Those comments, and related changes, are summarised in section 2 of this paper. They reflect:

- An aspiration from landowners and developers that the masterplan retains flexibility, maximises development income and minimises development costs, given the challenges of bringing forward business and industrial development in the masterplan area in recent years.
- The need to avoid new development impacting negatively on existing business operations within the masterplan area.
- A desire on the part of landowners and developers to understand the financial implications of the masterplan's requirements, noting that developer contributions will be determined at the planning application stage and that the Council wishes to work with developers to support delivery.

2 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

This section contains a summary of comments from landowners, businesses, developers and agents, and responses from the masterplan team. Comments and responses are categorised into ‘general’ comments which apply to the masterplan as a whole, followed by comments which apply to individual masterplan plots.

| | comment | response |
|--|--|---|
| GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE INITIAL DRAFT MASTERPLAN AS A WHOLE | | |
| 1 | Support for Council approach of engaging with landowners | n/a |
| 2 | Support for overall approach and focus on deliverability, given that the area the period the sites have been marketed for employment uses – although some concerns that the masterplan in its current form is not yet viable and deliverable | <i>The Council is committed to preparing a deliverable masterplan and to promoting development of the site within the framework of LDP2 Policy 4.R (Kirkintilloch Gateway Regeneration Area), and wishes to work with landowners and developers to that end. The Council has potential external funding sources in mind in order to support delivery, as explained in the updated masterplan. See also detailed comments below on specific items.</i> |
| 3 | Support for ‘20 minute neighbourhood’ concept | n/a |
| 4 | The masterplan should enable flexibility of uses and layouts to ensure deliverability and for developers to respond to technical constraints in different ways, and should state the details will be addressed through planning applications | <i>Noted. Layouts are described as illustrative in the masterplan. Uses should however comply with the parameters set by LDP2 Policy 4.R.</i> |
| 5 | There should be a broader range of uses than business and employment | <i>The masterplan reflects LDP2 Policy 4.R, which prioritises existing and new business and employment development and states that some housing (including affordable housing and housing for older people, particularly where it provides employment) will be acceptable on part of the site.</i> |
| 6 | Clarification of acceptable uses would be helpful; some landowners suggested referring to use classes, others suggested not doing this | <i>Greater clarification has been provided in the updated draft masterplan, within the policy framework provided by LDP2 Policy 4.R. Referring to specific use classes would be unnecessarily prescriptive for some parts of the masterplan area.</i> |
| 7 | Reduce number of vehicular access points to reduce costs | <i>The proposed access points are needed for a number of purposes: increasing resilience of the network in case of closures for utility works etc, creating green corridors and active travel routes, and separating development blocks. Road access layouts within blocks are illustrative. Please also refer to comments in relation to plots B and E below.</i> |
| 8 | Reduce number of proposed pedestrian/cycle routes and crossings along and over the A806 | <i>The proposed pedestrian and cycle accesses are needed to link the masterplan area with adjacent neighbourhoods and the town centre is a specific objective of LDP2 Policy 4R and of the masterplan, to support modal shift to active travel and carbon emissions reduction.</i> |

| | comment | response |
|----|---|--|
| 9 | Sustainable surface water management seems to be a constraint everywhere with ever more onerous requirements | <i>A surface water management report and plan have been prepared and has been shared with landowners, together with other technical reports undertaken as part of the masterplan.</i> |
| 10 | Technical studies undertaken in connection with the masterplan should be reflected in the masterplan document as a combined services/ infrastructure plan. | <i>Technical studies will be made available as background papers, and have informed the content of the masterplan. The background papers include a combined services/ infrastructure plan as suggested. This plan shows indicative site loading estimates for water, electricity and gas for each masterplan plot.</i> |
| 11 | The proposed floorspaces and numbers of units are too prescriptive for an indicative masterplan. | <i>These figures have been removed from the masterplan. (NB: they were not intended to be prescriptive, but to illustrate what level of development could be achieved with the masterplan's illustrative layouts.)</i> |
| 12 | <p>Questions over delivery and particularly cost apportionment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost apportionment is premature in the masterplan and should be addressed through development management. • Plot-by-plot analysis of cost apportionments is too prescriptive. • How have the apportionments been calculated? How do they relate to the Council's existing policies and guidance on developer contributions? • Different suggestions on the calculation of apportionments. Some suggest higher value developments should support those of lower value, and say this is an established masterplan principle elsewhere; others say that this would be contrary to Circular 3/2012 as amended. • Approach to apportionment is contrary to the Circular tests on Planning Obligations (3/2012), for example infrastructure costs must relate in scale and kind to the developments proposed. • There is no indication of the scale of costs to be apportioned. Can actual costs be made available? | <i>The draft cost apportionment was a tool for discussion with developers and will not be included in the masterplan. A new delivery section in the masterplan contains more information about the proposed approach to infrastructure costs.</i> |
| 13 | Questions about the status of the masterplan for development management purposes | <i>Following public consultation and Council approval, the masterplan will then be used by the Council to promote development and as a material consideration for development management purposes.</i> |

.../continued overleaf

| | comment | response |
|---------------|---|---|
| PLOT A | | |
| A1 | Concerns about deliverability and cost of road access from A806 (suggested that public subsidy would be required) and proximity of proposed housing to adjacent business uses. Suggests an option to revert back to all housing if business use proves unviable. | <p>LDP2 Policy 4.R (Kirkintilloch Gateway Regeneration Area) prioritises existing and new business and employment development, but states that some housing, including affordable housing and housing for older people (particularly where it provides employment) will be acceptable on part of the site.</p> <p>The draft masterplan shows options for different combinations of housing and business uses.</p> <p>Housing and business areas are separated by landscape corridors between masterplan plots.</p> <p>Points about cost and deliverability are noted; the Council wishes to work with developers to support delivery.</p> |
| PLOT B | | |
| B1 | Landscape corridors between plots B and E subdivide existing landholding in an arbitrary manner; this landholding should not be split into two plots | The proposed landscape corridors reflect LDP2 requirements (Policy 4.R) and existing established habitats and developments. Policy 4.R requires that there is no loss of biodiversity on the site, and that priority habitats and the green network are enhanced. |
| B2 | There should be a north-south pedestrian/cycling link between plots B and E. | This is included in the masterplan. |
| B3 | Proposed indicative layout is inefficient, for example proposing unnecessary vehicular access direct from Woodilee Road | <p>The proposed access points are needed for a number of purposes: increasing resilience of the network in case of closures for utility works etc, creating green corridors and active travel routes, and separating development blocks.</p> <p>The level of traffic is likely to be too great for a single southern access for both plots B and E.</p> <p>Road access layouts within blocks are illustrative.</p> |
| B4 | Plot B should be identified for residential use, one landowner claims there being no demand for the level of business uses proposed. Another landowner suggests that they have a business model for starter units for local businesses, but plot B needs to be laid out more efficiently for it to be viable. | <p>LDP2 Policy 4.R prioritises existing and new business and employment development, but states that some housing, including affordable housing and housing for older people (particularly where it provides employment) will be acceptable on part of the site.</p> <p>Comments about layout are addressed in B3 and B5.</p> |
| B5 | Proposed layout showing 36 industrial starter units has been provided for inclusion in the masterplan | The masterplan supports the proposed use in the principle. Whilst it is helpful to understand the landowner's aspirations for employment use, we have concerns about the layout proposed and it would not therefore be appropriate to include it as an illustrative layout in the masterplan. |
| B6 | Proposed uses should be more specific than 'business use', for examples use classes 4-6 plus sui generis uses such as trade counters. | Potential uses are defined in existing planning policy (LDP2 Policy 4.R). Within those parameters, the masterplan has been refined to provide more detailed definitions for specific plots where appropriate. |

.../continued overleaf

| | comment | response |
|---------------|--|--|
| PLOT C | | |
| C1 | Concern that PW Hall Ltd operates 24 hours a day / 5 days a week and emits some environmental noise which may result in noise complaints from new residents on Plot D in certain conditions (e.g. at night in calmer weather). | <p>The onus will be on the developer of Plot D to demonstrate in their planning application that there will be no adverse impact.</p> <p>An acoustic report has suggested that adequate noise mitigation measures could and should be put in place as part of any development proposals, such as appropriate building layout, uprated sound insulation ratings on glazing, and a 3 metre high acoustic fence.</p> |
| PLOT D | | |
| D1 | Layout should be labelled as indicative, as there are some technical constraints which still need to be understood and addressed | Noted. Where appropriate, masterplan layouts are described as illustrative. |
| D2 | Concern about use of term 'care home' as it is associated with a specific use class for residential institutions; would prefer more flexibility | Description for plot D amended to: Older people's accommodation with ancillary facilities and care provision, in accordance with LDP2 Policy 4.R (paragraph A). |
| PLOT E | | |
| E1 | Retail use should be incorporated in the masterplan to reflect current planning application and the contribution that a new supermarket would make to realising masterplan objectives | Retail use would be contrary to LDP2 Policy 14 (Network of Centres) and undermine the intent of Policy 4.R. If however the current retail application is consented despite being against policy, the draft masterplan layout and access arrangements will still be workable. |
| E2 | Change from 'business use' to 'mixed neighbourhood uses' or similar, to facilitate development of the site for retail, business and community issues | Change to 'Mixed business and community uses' to support 20 minute neighbourhood concept – any greater focus on retail could lead to a proliferation of retail use which would be contrary to LDP2 Policies 14 and 4.R. |
| E3 | Two vehicular accesses are not required, there should be a single access from Woodcroft Drive to the south | <p>The proposed access points are needed for a number of purposes: increasing resilience of the network in case of closures for utility works etc, creating green corridors and active travel routes, and separating development blocks.</p> <p>The level of traffic is likely to be too great for a single southern access for both plots B and E.</p> <p>Road access layouts within blocks are illustrative.</p> |
| E4 | Landscape corridors between plots B and E subdivide existing landholding in an arbitrary manner; this landholding should not be split into two plots | Proposed landscape corridors reflect LDP2 requirements (Policy 4R) and existing established habitats and developments. Policy 4R requires that there is no loss of biodiversity on the site, and that priority habitats and the green network are enhanced. |
| E5 | There should be north-south pedestrian/cycling link between plots B and E. | This is included in the masterplan. |
| PLOT F | | |
| | [no comments] | |
| PLOT G | | |
| G1 | Landowner/developer is not in a position to make any contributions to the cost of delivering the masterplan | No contributions are expected in connection with plot G. |