



Report to the Scottish Ministers

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997

Report by David Buylla and Robert Seaton, reporters appointed by the Scottish Ministers

- Case references: CIN-GLW-001; CIN-RFS-001; and CIN-WDS-001
- Site address: site to the west of Greenlaw Court, Glasgow, Meadowside Street, Renfrew, and Dock Street, Clydebank
- Applications by Renfrewshire City Deal Team
- Applications for planning permission, refs: 17/01667/DC; 17/0486/PP and DC/17/177, called-in by notice dated 6 October 2017
- The development proposed: the Clyde Waterfront and Renfrew Riverside Project (CWRR) for the construction of an opening bridge across the River Clyde, the construction of the Renfrew North Development Road, new and improved cycling and walking infrastructure and associated landscaping and ancillary infrastructure, and the stopping-up of consequential redundant sections of roads, footpaths and accesses
- Date of site visit: 12 January 2018

Date of this report and recommendation: 19 September 2018



CONTENTS

Summary Report	2
Preamble	9
Chapters	
1. Background	10
2. Consultations and representations	15
3. Policy	27
4. Townscape	33
5. Socio-economic effects	36
6. Traffic and transport effects	43
7. Noise and vibration	46
8. Effects on natural and cultural heritage	51
9. Effects on the water environment	54
10. Cumulative effects	56
11. Other matters	58
12. Overall conclusions and recommendations	61
Appendices	
Appendix 1: List of application plans	
Appendix 2: List of conditions to be applied if planning permission is granted	

The Clyde Waterfront and Renfrew Riverside Project (CWRR) for the construction of an opening bridge across the River Clyde, the construction of the Renfrew North Development Road, new and improved cycling and walking infrastructure and associated landscaping and ancillary infrastructure, and the stopping-up of consequential redundant sections of roads, footpaths and accesses

• Case references	CIN-GLW-001; CIN-RFS-001 and CIN-WDS-001
• Case type	Called in planning applications
• Reporters	David Buylla and Robert Seaton
• Applicant	Renfrewshire City Deal Team
• Planning authorities	Glasgow City Council; Renfrewshire Council; West Dunbartonshire Council
• Other parties	Turnberry Commercial Limited, The Clyde Shopping Centre
• Date of applications	4 July 2017
• Date cases received by DPEA	16 October 2017
• Method of consideration and date	Written submissions and unaccompanied site inspection on 12 January 2018. Further written submissions sought on 22 January 2018 in respect of all three applications and on a second matter on the same date, in respect of CIN-GLW-001
• Date of report	19 September 2018
• Reporter’s recommendation	Grant planning permission in respect of all three applications.

Background

This report deals with the proposal for the Clyde Waterfront and Renfrew Riverside Project (CWRR). The project would comprise construction of an opening bridge across the River Clyde and the Renfrew North Development Road (RNDR), and incorporate new and improved cycling and walking infrastructure. It was called in because of its significance for the Glasgow City Region City Deal, nationally important in terms of employment and economic development.

Three separate planning applications have been made to the three planning authorities within whose areas the proposed development lies: Renfrewshire, Glasgow City and West Dunbartonshire. All three have been called in.

The bridge would connect Renfrew with Yoker and Clydebank. Associated infrastructure includes plant and control buildings and berths for waiting vessels. North of the Clyde, the bridge would connect to an extension of Dock Street. Cycle connections are included to Yoker Station and extending along the RNDR and Inchinnan Road to the White Cart bridge. Those parts of the proposed development below mean high water springs require a marine

licence, for which a separate application has been made. This report does not address that application.

The proposal would be funded from the Glasgow City Region Deal with the aim of regeneration of the Renfrew waterfront area. Benefits predicted by the applicant include reduction in journey times, reduced traffic through Renfrew town centre, improved cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, an initial reduction in carbon emissions, and provision of a new leisure area by the Clyde. It is also predicted to be a catalyst for private investment, additional jobs, remediation of contaminated land, development of vacant or underused land for new homes, offices and public realm. The applicant also predicts creation of new jobs, a higher level of skills and wages, cross-river access to jobs, housing and services, and a visitor attraction in the landmark bridge.

The proposal is environmental impact assessment (EIA) development and the application is accompanied by an environmental statement (ES).

Consultations and representations

Glasgow City Council accepted that the CWRR proposal found support in Clydeplan, the strategic development plan, and was consistent with the aims and objectives of its local development plan. It recognised the improvement in transport connectivity. It raised concerns about diversion of retail spending from town centres and the city centre to the Braehead shopping centre as a consequence of the new bridge and about compatibility between the proposed development and the residential development site east of Dock Street. It argued that the proposal should incorporate bus stops at the bridge heads and also pedestrian and cycle waiting facilities, that a variable messaging system was required to inform road traffic of bridge closures, that Dock Street's junction with the A814 should be compatible with the proposed North Clydeside Development Route (NCDR), and that consideration should be given to reducing predicted end-user carbon emissions.

Renfrewshire Council's City Deal Team is the applicant. The council also commented on the application as planning authority. It noted as benefits the delivery of the RNDR, regeneration of the Clyde waterfront, release of land for housing and business, the reduction of traffic flow in Renfrew town centre, the improvement of road connectivity to the airport and waterfront and of access to cycling, pedestrian and public transport networks, the reduction in air pollution on Inchinnan Road, and the high quality design of the bridge and associated works. It considered that the proposals were consistent with the National Planning Framework (NPF3), Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and with strategic and local development plans.

West Dunbartonshire Council objected to the proposed development. It accepted that the proposal was supported in principle by Clydeplan. It argued that the unsuitability of an opening bridge for timetabled public transport meant it would not provide sustainable transport or minimise its carbon footprint and so did not comply with the spatial strategy. It also meant the opportunities would not be maximised for Clydebank residents since car ownership there was lower. It also argued that the opening of the bridge would cause harm to Clydebank town centre owing to the reduction in journey time to the Braehead shopping centre, and that there would be a consequent adverse effect on the Clydebank Riverside Regeneration Area. It had with Renfrewshire Council commissioned a retail and economic impact assessment (REIA) which showed economic benefits for Clydebank. It acknowledged some economic benefits but argued that the study did not give a reliable picture of retail since

it took no account of qualitative factors in its assessment. Finally it expressed concern about the predicted increase in traffic, particularly upon Yoker Mill Road.

Yoker and Whiteinch Community Councils expressed support for the project.

The Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) did not object, subject to imposition of environmental management conditions, but expressed significant concern about the proposed road drainage system which it did not consider to be a sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS).

Historic Environment Scotland (HES), Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH), Transport Scotland, the Health and Safety Executive, the Northern Lighthouse Board, Glasgow Airport, the West of Scotland Archaeological Service and the Coal Authority did not object.

Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT) did not object, though considered the bridge likely to be unsuitable for timetabled bus services. It recommended provision of shelters for pedestrians and cyclists waiting to cross the bridge and suggested a requirement to provide a sustainable transport strategy. Scotways sought better integration of the proposed development with existing paths.

Turnberry Commercial Limited (TCL) the owner of a residential development site east of Dock Street originally objected that the proposals took inadequate account of their proposals for their site's development, but has since withdrawn its objection. The Inchinnan Cruising Club objected to the impact of a new cycle way upon their premises. The Clyde Shopping Centre objected in respect of the effect it considered the proposed development would have upon Clydebank town centre.

There were a number of objections from the public raising issues relating to retail, traffic, effects of traffic on amenity as a consequence of air pollution, noise, vibration, effects of construction on amenity, loss of woodland and green space, the quality of public consultation, and a number of other issues.

Planning policy

NPF3 includes policy favouring the progress of city deal projects. SPP includes a presumption in favour of development that contributes to sustainable development, and also favours development leading to sustainable economic growth.

Clydeplan includes policy supporting Clydeplan member authorities in the development of the City Deal programme, and refers to the CWRR as part of the programme. Its development corridor approach includes proposals to reconnect communities with the Clyde and create connections across it and supports recycling and reuse of vacant land. The spatial strategy makes specific reference to the Renfrew Riverside. The plan protects the city centre and other strategic centres, supports investment in Strategic Economic Investment Locations, including the Glasgow Airport Improvement Area, and encourages sustainable transport and sustainable walking and cycling. It includes policies protecting the natural and built environment and encouraging good design of new development.

Since the proposed development lies across three planning authorities, the proposed development's compliance with the development plan must be considered separately for each planning authority area. Clydeplan is part of the development plan across all three.

West Dunbartonshire's local plan was adopted in 2010 and therefore the SPP sustainable development presumption, if found to apply, would be a significant material consideration in respect of that authority's area. Renfrewshire and Glasgow's local development plans (LDPs) date from 2014 and 2017 respectively.

Visual amenity and townscape effects

The development would be screened by existing buildings and would have limited effects on townscape and visual amenity. We find the bridge design to be of high quality. Although construction of the RNDR would cause loss of 2.6 hectares of woodland in the Blythwood, we find that the proposed development's design minimises the impact and incorporates proposals for compensatory planting and woodland improvement.

Notwithstanding that the visualisations provided do not show the proposed development on the TCL residential site accurately, we are content there is sufficient information to make an assessment of its effect. Although the proposed development and associated regeneration is likely to affect visual amenity of the TCL site significantly, we consider that its replacement of existing poor-quality uses is likely to be positive.

Socio-economic effects

The proposal's aims are to bring about regeneration of the riverside, clearing away derelict land and unattractive uses, and providing attractive, accessible development land.

A retail and economic impact assessment (REIA) commissioned jointly by Renfrewshire and West Dunbartonshire councils examined this aspect of the proposal. Its general approach was not questioned by parties. It found the proposed development would generate 216 net temporary construction jobs and 564 net permanent jobs following its opening. It also examined retail effects, modelling the effects of public transport being present or absent.

Several parties, including West Dunbartonshire Council, suggested that there would be an adverse effect upon town centres north of the river as a consequence of diversion of retail sales to the out-of-town Braehead shopping centre, a centre that is in policy terms sequentially inferior to those town centres. However, the REIA predicted a very limited effect upon it as compared with a "no development" prediction. While further qualitative evidence might have improved the study, we do not find its absence a reason to reject the results.

We do not consider that there would be an adverse effect upon Glasgow City Centre as a result of journey times improving to Braehead in a small part of its catchment. Yoker and Knightswood town centres, which offer mainly convenience goods, are unlikely to be greatly affected by greater accessibility to comparison retail at Braehead.

Overall, we find that the proposal would have significantly positive socio-economic effects.

Traffic and transport effects

The ES predicts significant effects from increased traffic in the streets close to the proposed bridge, although these are predicted to dissipate quickly once away from the bridge. In order to prevent congestion when the bridge is closed to traffic, the applicant has proposed messaging system that would communicate bridge closures to traffic on main roads. We accept this assessment.

Journey times for non-motorised users (NMUs) travelling from the White Cart bridge to Yoker are predicted to be improved by the presence of the RNDR and proposed bridge.

The proposed development is predicted to improve access to key services, including for NMUs and those making cross-river trips. We acknowledge West Dunbartonshire Council's position that benefits from increased cross-river connectivity would be limited by the unsuitability of an opening bridge for timetabled public transport services. Nonetheless, we do not consider that this is a reason to resist the proposal.

We consider that the proposed development can be satisfactorily integrated with existing and proposed infrastructure. We do not find it would have any effect on the Inchinnan Cruising Club.

Noise and vibration

The environmental statement assessed noise in accordance with a methodology agreed with environmental health officers of the three councils. It found significant effects from construction noise and from increased traffic-generated noise and airborne vibration for dwellings to the south of Meadowside Street. Insulation would address the impact upon affected buildings and a scheme for its provision where not otherwise required by law can be provided by conditions. We also found a moderate but significant effect from increased traffic noise upon the approved TCL residential development east of Dock Street.

Effects on natural and cultural heritage

The ES found a significant adverse effect upon semi-natural woodland habitat in Blythswood from habitat loss and fragmentation; a significant but reversible effect upon bat populations from direct mortality, habitat fragmentation and disturbance; and significant positive effects from removal and treatment of invasive non-native species (INNS). The applicant proposes significant tree-planting to mitigate woodland loss and implementation of a species protection plan to mitigate effects on bats. The residual effects would still be significant.

No significant effect was predicted upon local designated heritage assets, including the White Cart bridge, the Argyll Stone and St Conval's Chariot and Ferry Inn, all listed buildings.

Effects upon the water environment

The proposed development involves construction work in the water environment. Although this involves a risk of contamination, we consider that the risks can adequately be managed by the implementation of a construction environment management plan along the lines proposed in the environmental statement. We also consider that the proposed design takes adequate account of predicted flood risk.

The applicant argued that site constraints including proximity to Glasgow Airport (and so the inadvisability of proposing an open drainage pond) justified its road-drainage proposals, notwithstanding SEPA's concerns. We consider this matter is best dealt with in the process of the licensing application to SEPA for the drainage works.

We note appropriate property rights must be secured for the proposed Yoker Burn realignment.

Cumulative effects

The applicant assessed the combined effects of the CWRR with the Glasgow Airport Improvement Area. It took account also of other reasonably foreseeable developments, including those proposed in LDPs, existing applications and, over the longer term, the development of the City Deal Masterplan sites.

This assessment found a significant positive temporary effects in terms of increased construction employment and temporary adverse in-combination effects on certain residential areas and NMU routes. It found significant adverse operational effects:

- upon semi-natural woodland as a consequence of habitat loss and fragmentation;
- upon bats from mortality and habitat fragmentation;
- upon dwellings south of Meadowside Street and upon Netherton Farm due to increased noise levels from increased traffic flow;
- upon landscape character at Netherton Farm and upon visual amenity for properties east of that area;
- upon archaeological remains at Netherton Farm and the surrounding area; and
- from in-combination effects of traffic noise and severance and amenity effects for properties at the east end of Meadowside Street.

Adverse effects upon Netherton Farm were mainly a consequence of the GAIA project and masterplan development, rather than the CWRR. The assessment found significant positive effects

- from removal and treatment of invasive non-native species;
- from increased employment
- from in-combination benefits for users of NMU routes.

Other matters

The ES predicted no significant effect upon air quality. No technical evidence was produced to suggest this prediction was incorrect. A small fall in carbon emissions was predicted upon the opening of the proposed development. A small increase was predicted in end-user emissions to 2037. Neither was predicted to be significant. The proposed development's infrastructure was also designed to take account of the predicted effects of climate change.

Although objectors suggested that there might be significant effects from the presence of unexploded ordnance on the site and from pests disturbed during construction, we do not find evidence of this. If fly-tipping from the proposed road were to cause an issue, we consider that the councils' statutory powers are adequate to deal with it.

Objectors referred to the proposed development's effect upon property values and the requirement to obtain rights over land to carry out the proposed development. We do not consider either of these matters to be a material consideration.

We have not found evidence of failure to comply with the statutory requirements for consultation on the application.

Assessment

By reconnecting the adjacent communities across the Clyde and the community of Renfrew with the Clyde, by supporting reuse of vacant and underused land, contributing to the regeneration of the Clyde waterfront, and supporting significant new economic activity, we consider that the proposed development would contribute to progress on Clydeplan's development corridor, the main focus of its spatial development strategy. Notwithstanding some adverse effects, we consider that it would represent an overall improvement in environmental quality. It would incorporate active-travel infrastructure, reduce journey times and support sustainable transport (notwithstanding that cross-river public transport is not secured), all in accordance with the development strategy. We therefore find that the proposed development has the support of Clydeplan.

The effect upon woodland and bats and the impact upon residents south of Meadowside Street would not be consistent with policies for protection of the environment and amenity in the Renfrewshire LDP. The LDP also provides support to the RNDR and regeneration of adjacent sites. We consider that, in the context of a large project, some such effects are to be expected. The small increase in carbon emissions would not be wholly consistent with policy CDP 5 on resource management in the Glasgow LDP, although it is not found to be significant. We have not found other inconsistencies with policy. Overall we find that the proposed development accords with the three development plans.

SPP: We consider that, notwithstanding the adverse effects upon woodland and residential amenity and the predicted increase it would cause in end-user carbon emissions, the proposed development would contribute to sustainable economic growth. The reduction of journey times and incorporation of active-travel infrastructure would contribute to achieving the Scottish Government's planning outcome of a low carbon place notwithstanding the predicted small increase in end-user carbon emissions. The proposed development would also contribute to achieving the other planning outcomes sought. We find that the proposed development would benefit from the presumption in favour of development contributing to sustainable development.

NPF3: We have found that the proposal is consistent with the four planning outcomes sought by the Scottish Government. These form the four elements of its vision for Scotland set out in NPF3. We find that the proposed development is consistent with the spatial strategy set out in NPF3.

We find that the proposed development accords with the development plan in each of the three planning authorities and that there are no material considerations that would indicate it should nonetheless be refused. Consequently we recommend its approval subject to conditions.

Scottish Government
Planning and Environmental Appeals Division
4 The Courtyard
Callendar Business Park
Callendar Road
Falkirk
FK1 1XR

DPEA case references: CIN-GLW-001; CIN-RFS-001 and CIN-WDS-001

The Scottish Ministers
Edinburgh

Ministers

On 6 October 2017, Scottish Ministers, in exercise of the powers conferred on them by Section 46 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, and of all other powers enabling them in that behalf, directed that Glasgow City Council, Renfrewshire District Council and West Dunbartonshire Council refer to them for determination three applications for planning permission (one within each council area). These applications propose the construction of a new bridge over the River Clyde, a new road and associated works – a project known as the Clyde Waterfront and Renfrew Riverside (CWRR) project.

The reason for calling in the applications was the CWRR project's significance for the Glasgow City Region City Deal, which is highlighted in NPF3 as nationally important in terms of employment and economic development.

Mr David Buylla, as the first appointed reporter, conducted an unaccompanied inspection of the site and its surroundings on 12 January 2018. On 22 January, he issued a procedure notice seeking the three affected planning authorities' formal views on the proposals and querying the status of an adjacent development site within Glasgow City Council's administrative area. On 30 July 2018, Mr Robert Seaton, a second reporter, was appointed.

On 16 May 2017, the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 came into force. The 2017 regulations revoked the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 with certain exceptions. The 2011 Regulations continue to have effect for an application for planning permission where the applicant submitted an environmental statement in connection with the application before 16 May 2017. That was done in these cases. The present applications should therefore be determined in accordance with the 2011 regulations as they applied before 16 May 2017.

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND

1.1 This report deals with three applications for planning permission that were called-in by Scottish Ministers. The applications relate to the same project – a proposed opening bridge over the River Clyde and a number of associated works including a new road. The project extends across the administrative areas of three local authorities, which is why three applications for planning permission were required.

1.2 The details of each of the three planning applications are set out below. In all cases, the applicant's description of the proposed development was:

“The Clyde Waterfront and Renfrew Riverside Project (CWRR) which will see the construction of a new opening bridge across the River Clyde and the construction of the Renfrew North Development Road. The design and operation of the bridge will ensure that the navigation rights of the river are maintained, and that the important role of the river to the regional economy is supported. The proposals also include new and improved cycling and walking infrastructure.”

However, each planning authority has described the proposal in its own terms, as set out below.

CIN-GLW-001 – submitted to Glasgow City Council on 4 July 2017.

The site address: site to the west of Greenlaw Court, Glasgow, G14 0PQ

The description of the development used by the planning authority: “erection of opening bridge, roads, footways, cycleways and associated works.”

CIN-RFS-001 – submitted to Renfrewshire Council on 4 July 2017.

The site address: Yoker Station, to the north of the Clyde, extending to Inchinnan Road, to the South of the Clyde, crossing the river immediately east of Rothesay Dock.

The description of the development used by the planning authority: “the Clyde Waterfront and Renfrew Riverside Project (CWRR) for the construction of an opening bridge across the River Clyde, the construction of the Renfrew North Development Road, new and improved cycling and walking infrastructure and associated landscaping and ancillary infrastructure, and the stopping-up of consequential redundant sections of roads, footpaths and accesses.”

CIN-WDS-001 – submitted to West Dunbartonshire Council on 4 July 2017.

The site address: Dock Street, Clydebank

The description of the development used by the planning authority: “erection of opening bridge over River Clyde, with new access road, upgrading and widening of Dock Street, junction improvements on Glasgow Road and formation of new shared footway/cycle way to Yoker railway station.”

The proposals

1.3 It is proposed to construct a new opening bridge over the River Clyde, linking Renfrew on the south side of the river with Yoker and Clydebank to the north. The cable-stayed bridge would provide a crossing point for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposal includes a new Renfrew North Development Road (RNDR) from the new bridge to Meadowside Street / King's Inch Road and Inchinnan Road, Renfrew. Also proposed is a series of improvements to walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure over the full length of the site, which extends from Yoker station in the north to the bascule bridge over the White Cart Water on Inchinnan Road in the south.

1.4 The proposed bridge would be 184 metres in length and would link Dock Street in Clydebank with Meadowside Street in Renfrew. It would have two traffic lanes with a combined width of 7.3 metres, a three-metre-wide cycleway on the western side and a separate two-metre-wide pedestrian footway on the eastern side. The cable-stayed bridge would maintain a minimum 5.5-metre clearance above high-water level and would also open by means of a swing arrangement in order to maintain river navigation for larger vessels. A plant room is proposed on the northern shore and a plant and control room on the southern. Layby berthing would be provided to the west of the proposed bridge, adjacent to the northern bank, for ships awaiting the opening of the bridge in the event that this was delayed by, for example, a traffic accident.

1.5 The proposed RNDR would connect Meadowside Street to Argyll Avenue. This would involve 750 metres of new 7.3 metre wide road accommodating 2 lanes of traffic and the upgrading of 400 metres of the existing Argyll Avenue, which is at present a no through road. A three-metre-wide shared footway / cycleway would be provided on both sides of the new and upgraded road.

1.6 Also proposed within the three applications are: the conversion of 100 metres of the existing northern footway of the A8 Inchinnan Road to provide a three-metre-wide shared cycleway connection between Argyll Avenue and the new off-road cycle link; the formation of a 420-metre section of new 2.5 metre wide cycle-only off-road link parallel to Inchinnan road, between Argyll Avenue and the bridge over the White Cart Water; the conversion of 400 metres of existing footway on Glasgow Road and Mill Road to provide a shared cycleway connection from Dock Street to Yoker Railway Station; the provision of links to existing cycle routes including National Cycle Route (NCR) 7; and new toucan crossings on Glasgow Road and Inchinnan Road.

1.7 Various junction improvements, drainage works and landscaping are also proposed. In total, the works would amount to approximately 2 kilometres of new road carriageway (including the length of new bridge), 0.8 kilometres of upgraded carriageway, 3.2 kilometres of new shared footway/cycleway and 0.5 kilometres of new cycle link.

1.8 Associated development would include control and plant buildings, a layby berth structure in the River Clyde, realignment of the Yoker Burn culvert and a retaining wall adjacent to Lobnitz Dock. The development would involve the demolition of existing buildings and landscaping and the required drainage for the new infrastructure.

1.9 The proposals are known as the Clyde Waterfront and Renfrew Riverside (CWRR) Project, which aims to regenerate the waterfront area for residential, commercial, retail and leisure uses. At present, this part of the southern riverside, known as the Meadowside Industrial Estate, features vehicle dismantlers, metal recyclers and areas of underused and derelict land. To the north of the river, further prospects for redevelopment and economic benefit are also predicted. It is proposed to use funding from the Glasgow City Region City Deal to provide the infrastructure needed to regenerate the area and to improve connectivity across the river. It is predicted this would then encourage developer investment in the area. The CWRR is predicted to be the highest-performing project funded by this City Deal in terms of its contribution to regional economic growth.

1.10 The applicant predicts the following could be delivered by the CWRR project:

- Up to £282 million of private-sector investment.
- Up to 629 permanent additional jobs as a result of new business creation with 1015 during construction of the project.
- New homes (1,690).
- Vacant and derelict land brought back into use (83.38 hectares).
- Land remediated (21.51 hectares).
- New business space (Industrial/Storage/Distribution) (27,480 square metres).
- Enhanced retail space (10,000 square metres).
- New office space (2,800 square metres).
- New public realm (2 hectares).

1.11 Benefits that would be realised by the project, according to the applicant, include the following:

- Reduction in journey times between the newly connected communities.
- Significantly reduced traffic flow through Renfrew Town Centre, particularly Inchinnan Road (east).
- Safer and significantly expanded cycleways.
- Cycle links extended to Yoker Railway Station, with a connection to NCR 7.
- Improvements to the Dock Street / Glasgow Road junction including provision for safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Opportunity for enhanced public transport on both sides of the river including enhanced reliability through Renfrew town centre.
- Potential for a significant area adjacent to the River Clyde to become an accessible area for leisure.
- Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles by over 500 tonnes in 2020.
- One of the first projects in the world to follow the new standard (PAS 2080) to minimise greenhouse gas emissions - directly contributing to the achievement of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals.

1.12 Three planning applications were required because the application site crosses the boundary of three planning authorities. However, as the three relate to the same proposal they can be considered in a single report.

1.13 The proposal is EIA development. Therefore the applications for planning permission were accompanied by an Environmental Statement (the ES). The ES also considered the likely environmental effects of the Glasgow Airport Investment Area (GAIA)

project, which is a separate City-Deal-funded project to the immediate south of the site of these applications. Although that project has already received planning permission and is not for consideration in this report, its inclusion within the ES has enabled us to consider the significance of any potential cumulative effects with the proposal we are considering.

Environmental impact assessment

1.14 In carrying out their environmental impact assessment of this proposal, Ministers are required to have regard to all of the environmental information, including the ES and the responses to it from consultees and other parties. We have compiled this report with a view to supporting Ministers in this process. We have identified, described and addressed direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on human beings, fauna and flora, soil, water, air, climate and the landscape, material assets and cultural heritage.

1.15 We deal with effects on human beings in the visual amenity and townscape effects chapter of this report and in the chapters that consider noise and socio-economic effects. Effects on flora and fauna were not main issues in any of the applications, as there was general agreement amongst the parties that any effects could be adequately mitigated. To the extent that such matters require to be addressed in this report, we do so in the chapter that considers cultural and natural heritage effects. Planning conditions are suggested to secure appropriate mitigation. Effects on soil, water and air were similarly not areas in which significant technical evidence was produced to dispute the ES's conclusions and, where necessary we have recommended planning conditions to ensure no significant effects would occur. The issues of climate, landscape, material assets and cultural heritage are dealt with in the policy background, visual amenity and townscape effects, socio-economic effects and cultural and natural heritage sections of the report respectively, and in the suggested planning conditions.

1.16 We consider our conclusions on the significant environmental effects of the proposed development are up to date at the time of writing of this report.

Habitats regulations

1.17 The application site is within one kilometre upstream of the Inner Clyde SPA/Ramsar site and within two kilometres of the Black Cart SPA. However, at the EIA scoping stage, Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) confirmed that, due to the nature of the development and / or the distance from the site, it was unlikely that the proposals would have significant effects on any of these Natura 2000 sites, either directly or indirectly. On that basis, we are satisfied that appropriate assessment of this proposal under the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 would not be required.

Marine licensing

1.18 Aspects of the proposal that are below mean high water springs are controlled by Marine Scotland, to whom an application for marine consent has also been made. That application is not addressed in this report.

Application plans

1.19 The applicant submitted a number of plans. Some of these are indicative such as those relating to landscape. In appendix 1, we have included a list of the plans not shown

on their face to be indicative and which we consider are the plans for approval, should planning permission be granted.

Conditions

1.20 We have provided a list of conditions in appendix 2 to this report to be applied to permission for the proposed development if planning permission is granted. In determining whether conditions are required to control the proposed development, we took into account that the construction of works in a water environment is regulated by the licensing process under the Controlled Activities (Scotland) Regulations 2011 and in a marine environment by the consents process under the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010. We did not, for example, consider that a condition was required to ensure best practice was adhered to in bridge and culvert design, although this was a mitigation measure specified in the ES. We also considered that conditions were not required to secure proposed mitigation measures relating to the operation of public roads where they fall within the duties of the roads authorities (such as the regular inspection and maintenance of road drainage).

Land ownership

1.21 If planning permission is granted and it becomes necessary for the developer to acquire rights over additional land, then that would be a matter for future discussion between the parties. The potential need for additional land or for agreement to be reached with other land owners or for compulsory purchase of land is not a matter for consideration in this report.

CHAPTER 2 : CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

Glasgow City Council¹

2.1 The council notes that there is support for the regeneration of the Clyde Waterfront in the strategic development plan (Clydeplan) and that the CWRR project is broadly consistent with the key aims and strategic objectives of the Glasgow City Development Plan.

2.2 The council accepts that the CWRR proposal supports Glasgow City Centre's role as the sustainable regional centre of the West of Scotland by improving accessibility to it from communities in Renfrewshire. However, the council is concerned that the proposal may also potentially cause some diversion of retail spending from the City Centre and from Yoker and Knightswood town centres, to Braehead Shopping Centre, as people living in communities north of the River (for example Clydebank, Yoker and Drumchapel) would have improved access to Renfrewshire via the new bridge. This may result in a negative impact on the designated centres. The council requests that the applicant's retail impact assessment is amended to include assessment of retail impact on Glasgow City Centre, Yoker and Knightswood.

2.3 The council expressed concern that the proposed bridge and associated works might be incompatible with an adjacent housing development site owned by Turnberry Commercial Ltd (TCL). TCL had originally objected on this basis (as set out below) but has since withdrawn its objection. The council believes that the applicant's ES could have considered the compatibility of the two adjacent land uses in more detail and that there is uncertainty over the possible need for the applicant to acquire land it does not currently own in order to implement the bridge proposals. The TCL site is identified for residential development in the City Development Plan and will be an important contributor to the city's housing land supply. As such, it must be ensured that the bridge is compatible with this adjacent land use. The potential for design incompatibility between the bridge and the adjacent housing site was recognised by Architecture & Design Scotland (A&DS) in a design workshop that was held with Renfrewshire Council, West Dunbartonshire Council and Glasgow City Council.

2.4 Glasgow City Council advise that a request is made to Renfrewshire Council to submit the following additional information:

(i) A rigorous compatibility assessment between the above TCL extant consents and CWRR; and

(ii) Evidence that the necessary extent of land has been acquired to construct and operate the bridge and approach roads, given the applicant acknowledges bridge construction cannot progress until such agreements with landowners are in place.

2.5 The council recognises that the bridge would greatly improve accessibility and connectivity between the riverside communities of Yoker, Clydebank and Renfrew. It should also provide a localised alternative route to the Erskine Bridge and Clyde Tunnel, which should have a positive benefit during peak periods on the A814 Dumbarton Road

¹ Glasgow City Council provided [written observations](#) on the proposed application and separately upon [transport](#) aspects of it.

corridor and the Clyde Tunnel (both of which can suffer congestion). However the opening nature of the bridge (on average four times per day) to facilitate prioritised river navigation does raise challenges that will require suitable mitigation / management measures and means that it cannot effectively carry scheduled bus services. The council suggests that bus termini (ideally with shelters) should be provided at either side of the bridge so as to enable separate bus services to be connected via a short walk over the bridge. Variable messaging system (VMS) signage will be required to re-route traffic to other crossings so as to minimise queue lengths on the bridge approach roads. Pedestrian / cyclist waiting shelters (with countdown timers) should be provided at both bridgeheads that will provide sufficient shelter and comfort for pedestrians / cyclists awaiting the bridge reopening during temporary closure periods.

2.6 The council accepts that the high-level traffic impact of the proposed bridge could be accommodated and mitigated on the existing road network but stresses the importance of ensuring that the connection between the bridge and Dock Street (and subsequently Glasgow Road) is compatible with the North Clydeside Development Route (NCDR) - a potential future solution to ease the predicted traffic and environmental pressures on the A814 Dumbarton Road corridor, and the adjacent TCL development site.

2.7 The council notes that in the longer term, it is predicted that there could be a slight increase in end-user carbon emissions as a result of the proposed development. This would be a consequence of the additional development that the proposal would enable. The council requests that thought be given as to how this could be avoided.

2.8 The council is content that the proposal is broadly consistent with the aims of the River Clyde Character Area, the key aims of which are to successfully integrate the river with the rest of the city and fully capitalise on the potential of the resource, for example by providing a mix of opportunities to live, play, work and study and by providing better access to open space, activating river frontages and improving continuous walking and cycling connectivity.

Renfrewshire Council²

2.9 Renfrewshire Council's City Deal team is the applicant for these proposals. However, the council is also the planning authority for one of the applications and has provided its response to the proposal in that role. Most of the land required to deliver the proposal lies within Renfrewshire Council's administrative area.

2.10 The council believes the proposals can draw support from NPF3's encouragement for business-related development in the vicinity of Glasgow airport. It also finds the proposals to be supported by SPP in that they would encourage business and industrial development – leading to net economic benefits, while prioritising sustainable and active travel choices.

2.11 The council finds the proposals to be supported by the local transport strategy and not to conflict with the regional and national strategies. It also notes the support given by the new strategic development plan (Clydeplan 2017) to City Deal projects, to the development of the Clyde waterfront and to the delivery of improved active travel routes, all of which are attributes of the current proposals.

² Renfrewshire council provided [observations](#) on the called-in application and, separately, on its [transport](#) aspects

2.12 The council notes that the focus for the Renfrewshire Local Development Plan Spatial Strategy is on the development of previously used sites, concentrating on existing built-up areas and key redevelopment sites, aiming to facilitate sustainable development. A key element of the plan's spatial strategy is the redevelopment of the Clyde waterfront. The plan also identifies Renfrewshire Economic Investment Locations where development such as the application proposals is supported in principle.

2.13 In accordance with LDP Policies E3 "Transition Areas" and I3 "Potential Transport Improvements", the proposal would deliver the RNDR to improve traffic flows within Renfrew town centre. By improving connectivity to and between the airport and waterfront areas, the council finds the proposals to accord with LDP Policies E1, E2 and E5. They would also comply with the expectations of Policy I1 by providing improved access to walking, cycling and public transport networks.

2.14 Flood risk, water management and ecological impact issues are all considered to have been adequately addressed in the proposals, in accordance with relevant LDP policies and as confirmed in the favourable responses from statutory consultees.

2.15 The council welcomes the reduction in transport-related air pollution along Inchinnan Road (within the Renfrew town centre air quality management area) that is predicted to be delivered by the RNDR. The proposals can therefore draw support from LDP Policy ENV5.

2.16 The council regards the design of the proposed bridge and associated works as high quality and consistent with the high standards of design that are expected within the sensitive River Clyde corridor.

2.17 The council concludes that, while the current proposals relate predominantly to roads infrastructure and a bridge crossing with associated land engineering, drainage and landscaping and ancillary cycleway, the core purpose of this and the linked components of the remaining City Deal projects is to create the optimum set of conditions for attracting future development investment and, crucially, employment. The proposals in isolation are considered to: enhance connectivity between strategic industrial investment locations (with particular focus on the Airport and Westway and inter-connectivity between these areas and the wider conurbation); provide the necessary infrastructure to release high quality, sustainably located land for business and industrial development, and for housing; and fully comply with national, strategic and local policy objectives and aspirations.

2.18 The council concludes that the greatest benefits would be derived from the enhanced attractiveness of the accessibility options and connections likely to be enjoyed by the surrounding industrial and business areas; both within the wider Renfrewshire area and with enhanced and direct connectivity to the north of the River Clyde and beyond; and in creating a set of conditions to positively influence future investment decisions with a sound focus on sustainable development principles.

2.19 It finds the proposals to be consistent with the provisions of NPF3, SPP and the strategic and local components of the development plan. It believes there are no other material considerations which outweigh the presumption in favour of development according with the development plan; nor matters which cannot be safeguarded through the imposition of appropriate conditions. The mitigation measures which have been identified in

the ES are considered by the council to address any other matters of significance that require to be addressed to make the proposals acceptable.

West Dunbartonshire Council³

2.20 West Dunbartonshire Council has resolved to object to the proposal.

2.21 The council accepts that the principle of development is supported by Clydeplan but notes that the proposals do not include public-transport provision at present and, as a result, it could be argued that the proposed bridge would not improve public transport access to West Dunbartonshire and Renfrewshire. It concludes that the likely absence of public transport over the bridge and its regular closure to traffic at unpredictable times both militate against West Dunbartonshire enjoying socio-economic benefits. It states that, arguably, if the bridge closure periods increase traffic delays, it could actually be to the detriment of existing public transport. Therefore, it could be considered that the bridge would not technically comply with the Spatial Strategy of Clydeplan as it would not provide sustainable transport nor would it minimise carbon footprints.

2.22 The council accepts that the proposed bridge would connect the communities of Clydebank and Renfrew, as expected by Clydeplan's Spatial Strategy. However it would not maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel between work and home. As car ownership is significantly lower in Clydebank than it is in Renfrew, the council argues that the proposed bridge, although expanding the economic development opportunities on the south of the river for both communities, also restricts access to these opportunities to the relative detriment of populations on the north of the river, by not providing, within the current proposals, public transport provision.

2.23 Clydebank town centre is recognised as a Strategic Town Centre. Clydeplan recognises that the town centre faces a series of challenges, in particular, the quality of retail offer compared to similar sized / format town centres and the quality of evening / leisure offer. The proposed West Dunbartonshire LDP places similar importance on the primacy of Clydebank town centre. The council is concerned that an effect of this proposal would be that the sequentially inferior Braehead Shopping Centre would benefit from trade diversion at the expense of Clydebank. The council has calculated that, if the proposed bridge is built, the distance from Braehead to Clydebank town centre would be only 2.6 miles. For comparison, Paisley town centre is 3.8 miles from Braehead and, the council states, this centre has experienced a marked reduction in retail expenditure since the Braehead shopping centre opened. The council is also concerned that any adverse impact on Clydebank town centre could also harm the prospects of the Clydebank Riverside Regeneration Area including Queen's Quay, which is a key aspiration of the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan 2010.

2.24 An independent retail and economic impact assessment was jointly commissioned by West Dunbartonshire and Renfrewshire. The council accepts that this predicts no significant adverse effect on Clydebank town centre even in a worst-case scenario. It also notes that this predicts that the proposals would deliver improved access to job opportunities - an increase in employment levels in the long term (from 56% to 59%). In the event of public transport being provided over the bridge there would be an increase in the

³ West Dunbartonshire council provided [written observations](#) on the called-in application and separately on [transport](#) aspects of it.

proportion of working age residents classified as “highly skilled” (from 31% to 33%), but this benefit would not arise if no public transport is available. However, the council has doubts that the assessment provides a reliable picture because it believes it relies on quantitative analysis alone and takes no account of qualitative factors.

2.25 The council believes that, while it is difficult to estimate the impacts, it is reasonable to assume that the construction of a bridge would result in a significant loss of comparison and leisure expenditure from Clydebank town centre to Braehead, leading to a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability in Clydebank.

2.26 The council accepts that the proposed bridge would have wider economic and regeneration impacts throughout Clydebank. It considers it possible that locations such as the Clydebank Business Park would become slightly more attractive for commercial uses due to the improved cross-river access. Additionally, it acknowledges that the bridge would improve access to employment on the opposite side of the river, giving Clydebank residents better access to jobs in Renfrewshire and conversely making jobs in Clydebank more accessible to residents of Renfrew.

2.27 Concern is expressed that the predicted 48% increase in vehicular traffic on Yoker Mill Road, primarily a residential street, would be likely to detract from residential amenity.

Yoker Community Council⁴

2.28 Yoker Community Council supports the proposal. It notes that, locally, there has been overwhelming support for the development shown by the local community, employers, and others hoping for the proposal to succeed. There is general agreement that the development is required to improve the area’s strategic infrastructure and that it could attract much needed inward investment on both sides of the river. It believes the investment will act as a catalyst in sustaining existing employment and creating much needed new jobs as well as training and upskilling for young people and other working age groups.

Whiteinch Community Council⁵

2.29 Whiteinch Community Council supports the proposal. It expressed hope that the bridge would redirect traffic currently using the Clyde Tunnel and so reduce impacts of that traffic on congestion at the tunnel and consequent effects upon the amenity of that area. It had concerns about delays caused to traffic when the bridge closed. It considered that the bridge ought to be designed to ensure it would remain open in high winds. It also considered that the bridge should be connected into the North Clyde Development Route as part of work to improve transport infrastructure north of the Clyde.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)⁶

2.30 SEPA has no objections in principle but has expressed significant concern that the proposed arrangements for surface water drainage do not satisfy the requirements of the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (the CAR) or represent best practice. This is because the bridge and most of the proposed roads are

⁴ Yoker Community Council [consultation response](#)

⁵ Whiteinch Community Council [consultation response](#)

⁶ SEPA [consultation responses](#)

proposed to be drained using vortex settlement chambers rather than a conventional sustainable drainage (SuDS) system.

2.31 SEPA expects a construction environment management plan (CEMP) to be prepared, which would set out pollution prevention measures and working practices and the appointment of an ecological clerk of works during the construction of the proposal.

2.32 SEPA identifies the potential that the proposed bridge could alter traffic patterns to the extent that it could require the creation of new air quality management areas (AQMAs) and points out that any residential development facilitated by the proposed works would be a sensitive air quality receptor. The need for site investigation (as opposed to desk based assessment) of geology, land contamination and other issues is also stressed.

2.33 There are no concerns from a flood-risk perspective. Modelling, with which SEPA agrees, suggests a negligible effect on flood risk.

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)⁷

2.34 SNH is satisfied that, as a consequence of the proposals, there would be no likely significant effect on the Black Cart Special Protection Area (SPA), Inner Clyde SPA or Endrick Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC). SNH is also content that the proposal would have no impact on the notified features of the Black Cart Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Inner Clyde SSSI/Ramsar site or the Endrick Water SSSI.

2.35 Further information was requested in respect of bats and barn owl, particularly in respect of the Christie's Scrapyard buildings, which are proposed for demolition. Following receipt of further bat information, SNH confirmed it was satisfied with the proposals subject to all trees with bat roosting potential being felled outwith the hibernation period of November to March.

2.36 SNH welcomes provisions aimed at encouraging walking and cycling, and requests that these be maximised. It notes that the route of the proposed relief road through Blythswood was selected so as to minimise the effect on trees.

Transport Scotland

2.37 Transport Scotland notes that, while there is estimated to be an increase in traffic volumes on local roads and that the new bridge would attract traffic into the area, the traffic modelling considered in the supporting documents shows that forecast traffic flows can be accommodated effectively through the local road network. Most notably, the reviewed documents assert that the proposed new bridge is not intended as a strategic alternative to the Clyde Tunnel or the Erskine Bridge, and the supporting modelling demonstrates this. It is inferred that the chosen location and proposed design reduces the likely diversion of traffic from the Clyde Tunnel, other than traffic which is moving between the communities of Yoker/Clydebank and Renfrew (it forms an effective route between these areas).

2.38 For strategic through-traffic, the new bridge route is not deemed attractive due to the number of junctions to be negotiated, and the lower speed limits on local roads. This aligns with the traffic and transport statements made in the planning application supporting

⁷ SNH [consultation responses](#)

documents. Overall, there are estimated to be only minimal changes in the performance of the strategic road network and arterial routes.

2.39 It is concluded that the supporting planning-application documents and modelling reports confirm that, for practical purposes, there would not be a negative traffic-flow effect on the trunk-road network because of the proposed Clyde crossing.

Historic Environment Scotland⁸

2.40 No objections.

Health and Safety Executive⁹

2.41 Does not advise against the grant of planning permission.

Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT)¹⁰

2.42 SPT notes that whenever the bridge is opened to allow river traffic through, it would be closed to road traffic for approximately 41 minutes, which would disproportionately inconvenience pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Due to the tidal nature of the river, the timing of any vessels wishing to navigate past the bridge would be variable. It is therefore essential that a comprehensive communications strategy is in place to alert bridge users of impending closures well in advance. Waiting shelters should be provided for pedestrians and cyclists. SPT consider that due to the nature of the swing bridge (with its lengthy and unpredictable closures to traffic) it is extremely unlikely to be suitable for use as a bus route. Nevertheless, road infrastructure should be designed to allow such use in the future. The traffic modelling indicates that the bridge should have minimal impact on existing bus journey times. However, some clarification of the methodology of the trip modelling is required. Disruption to existing bus corridors during construction should be kept to a minimum.

2.43 Proposed facilities to encourage active travel are welcomed, but SPT notes that the potential disruption caused by the opening bridge is likely to undermine the effectiveness of north – south active travel routes.

2.44 SPT notes that the applicant's traffic assessment looked at effects on public transport. SPT initially raised concern that there could be delays to bus traffic at the Dock Street / Glasgow Road and Kings Inch Road junctions although it accepted subsequently that modelling predictions are that this would be minimal.

2.45 SPT is unsure whether proper account was taken in the applicant's modelling work of either the potentially significant employment growth that could occur as a consequence of the proposed development or of the intermittent nature of the north–south link over the bridge.

2.46 It is suggested that a sustainable transport strategy is required to be produced as a planning condition. The aim of this would be to identify deliverable public transport options to facilitate cross-river journeys.

⁸ HES [consultation response](#)

⁹ HSE [consultation response](#)

¹⁰ SPT [consultation responses](#)

Glasgow Airport

2.47 The airport originally submitted a holding objection to the proposal on the basis that the proposed development could conflict with safeguarding criteria. It requested further information regarding the position of the bridge from the applicant and subsequently resolved to raise no objections subject to conditions.

Coal Authority¹¹

2.48 The Coal Authority initially submitted an objection to the proposed development on the basis that old mine workings may be present in parts of the application site. It withdrew this objection following the provision of further evidence from the applicant on the basis of which it was satisfied that investigations had been undertaken which indicated that the risk to the project was low and that no further works were required.

Turnberry Commercial Limited (TCL)¹²

2.49 TCL owns land to the immediate east of the route proposed for the road connection between the new bridge and Dock Street. TCL is planning to build 230 homes on a six hectare site.

2.50 TCL had originally objected to the application on the basis that it did not take proper account of TCL's approved proposals for the adjacent land, had objected to the proposed possible location of the construction compound on the TCL site, and to the inaccurate depiction of its proposals in visualisations provided for the proposed bridge and associated works. It has since withdrawn this objection.

Inchinnan Cruising Club¹³

2.51 The club advises that, as part of this planning application, Renfrewshire Council wishes to acquire via purchase / compulsory purchase Inchinnan Cruising Club (ICC) land for a cycle path which is being promoted as part of the Glasgow Airport Investment Area.

2.52 The club has the following concerns: safety in relation to the location of the cycle path at the driveway entrance to the club; that it could inhibit emergency services' response to incidents requiring access to the Rivers Clyde and Cart; and the negative impact the proposed cycle path would have on the future development / operations of the club.

¹¹ Coal Authority [consultation response](#)

¹² TCL original [representations](#). It has since withdrawn its objection

¹³ Inchinnan Cruising Club representations [to Renfrewshire Council](#) and [to Scottish Government](#)

The Clyde Shopping Centre¹⁴

2.53 The owner of the Clyde Shopping Centre notes that the proposed bridge would reduce travel time from Clydebank to Braehead by half - to 12 minutes. It is concerned that this would result in significant leakage of retail expenditure from Clydebank to Braehead, resulting in shop closures, job losses and lack of investment in Clydebank Town Centre. It believes the bridge proposal threatens the renewal and recovery of the town centre and conflicts with regional and local policies on regeneration. The bridge proposal, it believes, would not provide any benefits for Clydebank Town Centre and would undermine the benefits arising from recent investment and from the Queen's Quay development. It finds the proposal to be contrary to national and local "town centre first" policy and that the supporting information fails adequately to consider policies relating to town centres, employment and regeneration.

Northern Lighthouse Board¹⁵

2.54 No objections. Requests that the bridge has appropriate safety illumination.

The Royal Yachting Association Scotland¹⁶

2.55 No objections to the proposal but points out that the association encourages recreational yachts to make the journey to the city centre and that virtually all such vessels are of a height that would require the bridge to open. It will be important that such use is not curtailed by the proposed bridge, not just for the boat owners but in wider economic terms too.

ScotWays¹⁷

2.56 The proposal affects routes SR53 and SCL9/SC55. The former is recorded as a right of way. The latter forms part of National Cycle Route (NCR) 7. The prospect of a new crossing of the River Clyde is very welcome to the Society, as it has to the potential to improve public access network links between Renfrewshire and the north side of the Clyde in both West Dunbartonshire and Glasgow City.

2.57 The Society considers it essential that the configuration of the new access road to the north of the proposed bridge does not preclude the provision of aspirational improvements to non-motorised links along the north bank of the Clyde. It is disappointed that shelters for pedestrians and cyclists (while the bridge is open for shipping) have not been shown, and believes that better integration with SR53 could have been made. It regards the need for NCR 7 to cross four lanes of traffic on the upgraded Dock Street as more difficult and less satisfactory than the current situation.

West of Scotland Archaeological Service (WoSAS)¹⁸

2.58 No objections subject to archaeological investigation work during construction.

¹⁴ Clyde Shopping Centre [representations](#)

¹⁵ NLT [consultation response](#)

¹⁶ RYA [consultation response](#)

¹⁷ Scotways [consultation response](#)

¹⁸ WoSAS [consultation response](#)

Public representations

2.59 Publicity was carried out for all three applications. The following responses were received:

2.60 Six objections submitted to West Dunbartonshire Council¹⁹, raising the following concerns:

- the bridge would adversely impact on the economy of Clydebank town centre;
- the bridge would enable the Braehead Shopping Centre to have the same impact on Clydebank Town Centre as it has already had on Paisley Town Centre;
- Clydebank requires a new waterfront shopping centre to rival Braehead rather than a bridge to Braehead;
- the projected job creation figures appear to be an exaggerated guess to justify the project;
- the bridge would benefit Renfrewshire and Glasgow far more than Clydebank;
- if an additional Clyde bridge is to be built it should be built at Dumbarton to benefit tourism;
- traffic estimates understate the amount of traffic that would use the bridge;
- severe inconvenience would arise when then bridge is opened for ships;
- through-traffic from parts of Glasgow and East Dunbartonshire would overload local streets;
- there would be traffic chaos on Glasgow Road and Mill Road at peak times;
- consultation with local residents has been poor and more people would have objected if public engagement had been better.

2.61 Thirteen additional letters of objection submitted to Renfrewshire Council²⁰, raising the following concerns:

- the proposed development would cause loss of valuable green spaces, including woodland used for recreation;
- there would be an adverse effect on wildlife, including deer, badgers, bats, woodpeckers, and birds of prey, as a consequence of loss of woodland;
- new planting would not compensate for the loss of existing woodland and its wildlife;
- there would be an adverse effect upon river traffic on the Clyde;
- the proposed bridge would be ugly;
- the proposed bridge would have an adverse effect upon the existing historic ferry;
- the existing infrastructure would not be able to take the additional traffic and there would be congestion and an increased likelihood of road accidents;
- the bridge should be re-routed to the bottom end of the White Cart so as to make two access points into Renfrew, one bypassing the town centre;
- Campbell Street would become a rat run;
- the bascule bridge and other existing bridges cannot handle an increase in traffic;
- there would be dust, dirt, noise and vibration disturbances to residents;

¹⁹ [Representations](#) to West Dunbartonshire Council

²⁰ [Representations](#) to Renfrewshire Council

- there are concerns about the effect on human health, particularly to emissions to air, noise and vibration. Cars would be idling when waiting for the bridge to open. This may have an adverse effect on air quality and amenity in Meadowside Street and Inchinnan Road;
- there is an existing problem with property damage caused by vibrations from the concrete batching plant;
- there would be concerns about pest control during construction;
- the disturbance caused by the proposed development would have an unacceptable cumulative effect with that of other construction projects in Renfrew;
- there is unexploded ordnance in the area;
- the noise assessment did not take account of effects upon St James's Church on Inchinnan Road;
- the proposed development would be in an area of historic shallow mine workings;
- the development would cause disturbance of contaminated land at Christie's Scrapyard and other sites, creating a risk of contamination of the Clyde;
- there would be consequent adverse effects upon property values;
- there would be no benefit to local residents or to Renfrew in terms of increased business, there would only be a benefit to Glasgow;
- the public consultation was poor quality and did not genuinely engage with the public;
- no one in the Meadowside area was aware of the proposals.

2.62 Several other representations that did not object to the proposed development but raised the following additional issues:

- tree felling should be kept to a minimum in the tree preservation area and any trees felled should be replaced with trees of the same species;
- access to the public right of way on Fishers Lane and along the Clydeside and Cartside should not be impeded;
- damage to woodland understory should be kept to a minimum to maintain the integrity of the woodland as an important biodiversity site;
- some form of fence or embankment should be considered to reduce likelihood of fly-tipping in the woodland;
- impacts of a change in road layout on St James's Church should be considered.

2.63 No additional objections from members of the public to Glasgow City Council.

2.64 Two submissions in support, raising the following points:

- the bridge would be preferable to the existing ferry service which is expensive and unreliable, and the replacement minibus provided when the ferry is not operating does not cater for cyclists;
- the bridge would avoid long detours to reach the Erskine Bridge or Clyde Tunnel using congested and polluted roads;
- the bridge would provide a lifeline between communities on opposite banks of the Clyde and create opportunities from cross-river economic growth;

- the development would allow environmental improvements to the existing derelict land at the site of the bridge. Landscaping should provide appropriate wildflowers and habitat improvements.

CHAPTER 3 PLANNING POLICY

National policy

3.1 The Third National Planning Framework (NPF3) makes reference to Glasgow and the Clyde Valley - "Building on its economic strategy, the city is working with its neighbouring local authorities to develop proposals for a city deal to drive employment and economic development across the city region".

3.2 Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) has a focus on sustainable economic growth. It introduced a presumption in favour of development that contributes to sustainable development and certain specific measures that apply where a development plan is out of date.

Regional policy

3.3 When the proposals were submitted, regional policy was set out in the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan (Clydeplan) 2012. This has since been replaced by Clydeplan 2017, which was approved on 24 July 2017. This report refers solely to the current strategic development plan.

3.4 Policy 1: Placemaking requires new development to contribute towards the creation of high quality places, taking account of the plan's placemaking principles. These expect development to be: distinctive; safe and pleasant; easy to move around; welcoming; adaptable; and resource efficient.

3.5 Policy 3: Glasgow and Clyde Valley City Deal offers support to Clydeplan member authorities in the development of the City Deal programme and related projects. The plan identifies 19 such projects, of which the CWRR is one.

3.6 The plan's 'development corridor' approach seeks (among other things) to: reconnect adjacent communities with the River Clyde and create connections across it; and to recycle and re-use vacant and derelict land. The 'Clyde Waterfront' and 'River Clyde' components of the development corridor make reference to the Renfrew Riverside.

3.7 Within the plan's spatial development strategy is a commitment to maintaining the strategic, regional importance of Glasgow city centre. This will require consideration of how development proposals might affect the city centre and a commitment to (among other things) supporting and protecting the city centre's role and function at the apex of the network of strategic centres.

3.8 The plan defines a network of strategic centres with Glasgow city centre at the apex and 22 other strategic centres below that, all of which are required by Policy 4 to be protected and enhanced in line with their role and function and the challenges and future actions that are set out in the plan.

3.9 Relevant to these planning applications are Glasgow city centre, to which Policy 4 gives specific protection, Clydebank town centre and Braehead commercial centre.

3.10 For Clydebank, identified challenges include the quality of the retail and the evening / leisure offer and of the environment (in parts), along with public transport facilities and some areas of flood risk. Future actions identified in the plan for this centre include the development of key sites and buildings to enhance the retail and leisure offer and improved accessibility, particularly through an enhanced public transport interchange and linkages to Queens Quay.

3.11 For Braehead, the most relevant challenge identified is the need to ensure that Braehead is central to the ongoing regeneration of Renfrew Riverside delivering new development as well as investment within the context of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley City Deal. The most relevant future action is to consider planned investment within the context of a masterplan ensuring co-ordinated action in support of the Clyde Waterfront and Renfrew Riverside City Deal projects.

3.12 Policy 5 identifies Strategic Economic Investment Locations (SEILs), which are required to be safeguarded and promoted for development. Of relevance to these proposals is the Glasgow Airport Investment Area (GAIA), which is adjacent to the southern end of the application-site boundary. Reference is made to the use of City Deal funding to improve surface access to the airport and wider connectivity within the SEIL area.

3.13 Policy 13 requires that development proposals should, where appropriate, support retention and expansion of woodland and minimise the loss of existing trees.

3.14 Policy 16 requires that development proposals should protect and enhance the water environment by adopting a precautionary approach to the reduction of flood risk, supporting delivery of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Green Network, and safeguarding storage capacity of the functional floodplain and higher lying areas for attenuation.

3.15 Policy 17 recognises the importance of promoting sustainable transport and Policy 18, of the strategic walking and cycling network. Policy 17 schedule 13 and diagram 8 also refers to the creation of cross-river links north of Renfrew as a potential option in support of modal shift.

3.16 Policy 18 requires development proposals to maintain and enhance the strategic walking and cycling network, including where applicable the Glasgow and Clyde Valley City Deal Projects.

Local policy

3.17 Renfrewshire and Glasgow City councils have adopted local development plans (LDPs) dating from 2014 and 2017 respectively. West Dunbartonshire has yet to adopt a LDP. It has an adopted local plan, dating from 2010, which forms part of the development plan. A proposed LDP from 2016, which has not been adopted, is a material consideration to which some weight can be given. There is also a second emerging LDP, which has yet to reach the proposed-plan stage and to which we consider no weight should be given.

Renfrewshire LDP

3.18 Key policies in the Renfrewshire LDP of relevance to this proposal include the following.

3.19 Policy E1 'Renfrewshire's Economic Investment Locations' recognises the importance of SEILs and more locally important business locations. It requires development proposals within them to be assessed against supplementary guidance. Some of the land that is adjacent to the proposed RNDR is designated SEIL.

3.20 Policy E2 'Glasgow Airport Investment Zone' is identified as a key location for economic growth.

3.21 Policy E3 refers to 'Transition Areas' that are identified in Figure 9 of the plan. Much of the site is covered by this designation, which recognises the development potential of this land for a mix of uses. In respect of land within the applications site boundary, Figure 9 identifies the following opportunities: *"A flexible approach to development in this area to deliver regeneration of the older industrial area and failing retail park. Opportunity to improve public realm and strengthen residential offer in this area, improve links with neighbouring residential areas and deliver Renfrew Northern Distributor Road to improve traffic flows within Renfrew Town Centre."*

3.22 Policy I1 'Connecting Places' states that increased access and connectivity to walking, cycling and public transport networks is a key consideration for investment locations within Renfrewshire.

3.23 Policy I3 identifies and offers support to a number of potential transport improvements including the RNDR.

3.24 Policy I5 'Flooding and Drainage' requires development to avoid areas susceptible to flooding and to demonstrate promotion of sustainable flood risk management measures. The use of sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) is expected.

3.25 Policy P1 'Renfrewshire's Places' provides that new developments in uncoloured areas on the proposals map should be compatible and complementary to existing uses and it should be demonstrated that they would cause no significant harm to existing uses (applying criteria set out in supplementary guidance).

3.26 Policy ENV 2 'Natural Heritage' requires that developments should not have an adverse effect on the integrity of sites protected for their conservation interest.

3.27 Policy ENV 3 'Built Heritage' requires the built heritage, including the setting of any historic assets, to be safeguarded, conserved and enhanced where appropriate.

3.28 Policy ENV 4 'The Water Environment' offers support to proposals that encourage the protection of the existing water environment as well as improvement to the control and management of water.

3.29 Policy ENV 5 'Air Quality' requires that development proposals shall not individually or cumulatively have an adverse impact on air quality.

3.30 Renfrewshire's New Development Supplementary Guidance (2014) also forms part of the development plan. It provides further details of the council's policy on a number of these matters.

Glasgow LDP

3.31 Glasgow's LDP, adopted on 29 March 2017 and known as the City Development Plan, has the following policies of particular relevance to this proposal.

3.32 The plan's key aims are to create and maintain a high quality, healthy place and to develop a compact city form that supports sustainable development. It aims for a city that is vibrant, sustainable, connected and green.

3.33 Policy CDP 1 and its supporting supplementary guidance, require development to aspire to achieving the six qualities of place as defined in Scottish Planning Policy, and reinforced by Creating Places and Designing Streets.

3.34 Policy CDP 2 sets out the plan's spatial development strategy, which has a focus on the regeneration and redevelopment of the existing urban area. Of particular relevance to these applications is the support given to proposals that would: support the regeneration of the River Clyde Development Corridor; protect and promote the City Centre's role as the west of Scotland's regional centre; and protect and reinforce town centres.

3.35 Policy CDP 3 'Economic Development' seeks to promote economic growth by directing development in key growth sectors to the River Clyde Development Corridor and the city's SEILs. It directs economic and business uses to the city's Economic Development Areas. It supports investment in new infrastructure and environmental improvements to unlock the development potential of constrained economic development locations. It supports proposals that would ensure that Glasgow's town centres remain vibrant places and those which would support and improve the city's infrastructure.

3.36 Policy CDP 4 seeks to support the network of centres, giving priority to Glasgow city centre.

3.37 Policy CDP 5 'Resource Management' covers a wide range of matters including offering support to proposals that contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and overall energy use.

3.38 Policy CDP 6 'Green Belt and Green Network' is relevant, as the River Clyde is identified in the plan as an Existing Green Network.

3.39 Policy CDP 7 requires development to avoid unacceptable effects on areas designated for their landscape importance, sites and species important for nature conservation or geodiversity and important trees, woodlands and hedgerows.

3.40 Policy CDP 8 requires proposals to demonstrate a contribution to the water environment including through making satisfactory provision for sustainable urban drainage schemes (SuDS).

3.41 Policy CDP 10 deals with the housing land supply. Its potential relevance to this proposal is in regard to any effect it might have on the housing development site that is situated immediately adjacent to the northern end of the proposed bridge.

3.42 Policy CDP 11 requires development proposals, among other things, to deliver (where appropriate) benefits for pedestrians and cyclists in the streets surrounding the route

of any new road. It directs major development to locations well served by public transport and requires all new development to be designed to promote and facilitate walking and cycling.

West Dunbartonshire Local Plan

3.43 West Dunbartonshire's local plan is part of the development plan. However, it is eight years old and paragraph 33 of SPP confirms that where a development plan is more than five years old, SPP's presumption in favour of development contributing to sustainable development will be a significant material consideration. Potentially, this could permit development that would not accord with the requirements of the local plan.

3.44 The aims of the local plan are: to promote sustainable development and communities; to create economic well-being and a sustainable and competitive place through the development of strategic locations; and to maintain and enhance the natural and built environment.

3.45 Policy GD 1 requires development to be of a high quality of design and to respect the character and amenity of the area in which it is located. It includes a requirement that increases in traffic volumes and adverse impacts on air quality should be avoided or minimised by including provision for public transport and pedestrian and cycling access.

3.46 Policy RP 1 offers support to the redevelopment of areas identified as Regeneration Priorities. None of the application site lies within such an identified area. However, Queens Quay, to which West Dunbartonshire council refers in its objection to the proposal, does.

3.47 Policy LE 6 identifies Strategic Employment Locations. These include land adjacent to the northern end of the proposed bridge. In such locations, support is given to economic development uses and it is hoped that proposals will improve environmental quality and amenity.

3.48 Policy SUS 1 'Sustainable Development' seeks to balance social, economic and environmental considerations. Particular encouragement is given to provisions for waste minimisation, recycling and energy-efficient building design.

3.49 Policy RET1 applies a sequential approach to site selection for all town-centre uses, aimed at protecting the vitality and viability of identified centres within the hierarchy. This proposal incorporates no retail development, but is argued by West Dunbartonshire Council to have retail-policy implications due to the encouragement it could give to shoppers in Clydebank travelling instead to Braehead across the proposed bridge.

3.50 Policy E 2A protects international nature conservation sites, of which there are several in the locality, although no party has predicted any significant effect for any of these sites.

West Dunbartonshire proposed LDP 2016

3.51 Policy SC1 of the proposed LDP seeks to regulate retail development in accordance with the proposed plan's network of centres. Its relevance to this proposal is argued along similar lines to Policy RET1 of the local plan.

3.52 Land on the northern side of the river is identified as a business and employment area, where Policy GE2 supports development in uses classes 4, 5 and 6 and permits additional uses where compatible.

CHAPTER 4 VISUAL AMENITY AND TOWNSCAPE EFFECTS

4.1 The overall design of the redevelopment proposals including outline details of the form of subsequent phases that would be facilitated by the proposed bridge, road and associated works, is set out in a masterplan²¹.

4.2 During development of the masterplan, three different locations for a river crossing point and a number of alternative routes for the RNDR were evaluated. The masterplan explains that the location for the proposed bridge was chosen, in part, because it represents a narrow point on the river and also, because it would open up a significant stretch of underused riverfront land for redevelopment. The chosen route through Blythswood, an area of wooded open ground between the riverside scrap yards and the industrial area of Argyll Avenue, was selected so as to minimise effects on existing trees.

4.3 None of the consultee responses has raised concern over the overall design approach or its consequent effects on the townscape of this part of the Glasgow conurbation or on any particular views. TCL, which has permission to develop the adjacent housing site on the northern bank of the river, had originally expressed concern that inadequate attention may have been paid to the development's compatibility with that adjacent scheme and with its effect on future residents. It has since withdrawn this objection. Glasgow City Council, however, indicated that it shared TCL's original concerns about the compatibility of the proposed development with the approved development for the TCL site.

4.4 Due to screening from existing buildings, the proposed bridge is unlikely to be a prominent townscape feature except in close proximity. The applicant estimates that most of the townscape and visual amenity effects would be limited to a radius of 100 metres north and south of the river and up to a maximum of one kilometre up and downstream of the development when viewed from the river itself.

4.5 In recent years, redevelopment projects along the river have achieved high standards of urban design. The proposed bridge, which would provide a landmark feature, would be consistent with that high-quality design approach. The replacement of significant areas of unattractive scrap yards with sites on which future residential and employment development could be provided, would also represent a significant benefit to the appearance of this part of the riverside. The proposals incorporate green infrastructure in the form of street trees, open space, paths and shrubs, all as expected by national, regional and local policy.

4.6 One of the key design objectives was to maximise visibility of and access to the riverside. At present, it is difficult to access the river, as there are no public roads or footpaths and the existing land uses do not provide a safe or attractive environment in any event. The proposal would significantly increase riverside access in accordance with the expectations of regional and local planning policy.

4.7 The woodland at Blythswood provides a green backdrop to development in the area. It is protected by a tree preservation order, which suggests it is of local amenity value, although there is an apparent lack of maintenance / management, which limits its contribution to the townscape and visual amenity of the area.

²¹ [CWRR masterplan](#)

4.8 The RNDR would cut through woodland between the proposed bridge and Argyll Avenue. Although the chosen route aims to minimise tree loss, it is estimated that approximately 2.6 hectares of tree cover would be lost. In order to comply with the Scottish Government's policy on the control of woodland removal, compensatory planting is proposed within a woodland that is owned by Renfrewshire Council at Howwood. On-site roadside tree-planting of forest tree species such as oak, holly and rowan is also proposed, to enable the proposed road to assimilate with the retained forest.

4.9 Given the limited scale of the proposed tree clearance in comparison with the scale of the woodland, we are satisfied that Blythswood would continue to provide an effective buffer between the riverside townscape and its surroundings. The proposed woodland improvement package could also improve the condition of the remaining woodland and allow it to make a more valuable contribution to the amenity of the area.

4.10 The most sensitive existing visual receptors within the site's visual envelope are likely to be: residents of tower blocks in Yoker, who would have a view of the bridge; residents of the recent housing development off King's Inch Road, Renfrew, who would potentially see the easternmost extent of the upgraded road and the development plots that this proposal would facilitate; and those undertaking recreation in the locality including footpath users and users of the Renfrew Golf Course. These would all be high sensitivity receptors. However, the almost universally poor quality of the existing environment is such that we are satisfied that any significant townscape or visual amenity effects would be positive.

4.11 The visualisations that have been provided with the scheme have been criticised for not accurately portraying the layout of the housing development that Glasgow City Council has approved on land to the immediate east of what will become the northern approach road to the bridge. The concern expressed by the council was that this is indicative of an approach to the design of the proposed works that has paid inadequate attention the visual amenity of the future residents of this neighbouring site.

4.12 Future residents of this site are likely to be the most significantly affected by the proposed works. Given the high sensitivity of such receptors, we conclude that it is inevitable that there would be some significant effects on visual amenity. However, such is the poor quality of the existing surroundings of this site, and such are the improvements that are proposed (including improved road and footway surfacing and extensive landscape planting) that the nature of these effects would be positive. The applicant has assessed the visual-amenity effect of the proposed landmark bridge as neutral (neither positive nor negative) as it is consistent with the established river-corridor environment, where such features are already found. As the precise design of the bridge has yet to be finalised, we consider that this is a reasonable position, although we consider that there is the potential for the proposed bridge to have a positive visual-amenity effect. Given the visual context within which it would be built, we are satisfied that there is no likelihood that it would detract from the visual amenity of future residents of the adjacent site.

4.13 TCL had, in its original objection, pointed out that illustrative visualisations of the bridge's appearance include a layout for the adjacent housing development site that does not match the approved scheme for that land. However, we do not regard this as a significant failing in the proposal, or in the assessment of its likely environmental effects, as set out in the ES. Such visualisations are intended purely as illustrative material. Within

the ES, it is clear that the applicant was aware of the proposals for the adjacent land and we are satisfied that the spatial relationship between the two sites and the nature of the existing environment are such that the proposal poses no risk of unacceptable townscape or visual-amenity effects for that development.

4.14 Overall, we are satisfied that the proposal would provide significant improvements to the townscape of the locality and significant enhancement of visual amenity for land and river-based receptors. As such, it can draw support from Clydeplan Policy 1's expectations of high quality design and placemaking and Glasgow LDP Policy CDP 1 and its supporting supplementary guidance.

CHAPTER 5 SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS

5.1 One of the key aims of the proposed development is to regenerate the riverside area by clearing away derelict land and uses that do not typically make attractive neighbours such as scrap yards, and replacing them with attractive, accessible development land. As a consequence of that, it is predicted that there could be significant levels of new housing and business development, with attendant benefits in terms of employment numbers, skills and wage levels. Further potential benefits could be delivered by the cross-river access to jobs, housing and services that the bridge would facilitate, and the proposed landmark bridge could in itself attract visitors to the area.

5.2 A socio-economic disbenefit of improved cross-river connectivity, which is of concern to West Dunbartonshire Council, Glasgow City Council, the owners of the Clyde Shopping Centre and a number of representors, is the potential for shoppers to be drawn away from established town centres to the north of the river, to the Braehead shopping centre, to the detriment of those centres.

5.3 In order to predict likely socio-economic effects, Renfrewshire and West Dunbartonshire councils jointly commissioned a Retail and Economic Impact Assessment (the REIA). This is set out in full at Appendix 11.1 of Volume 2 of the EIA²². A non-technical summary²³ of that document was also provided, and Chapter 11 of Volume 2 of the EIA²⁴ describes the process and sets out the applicant's conclusions as to the significance of the predicted socio-economic effects.

5.4 The REIA examined potential effects on employment, economic activities, housing provision and regeneration. It used a defined Local Study Area covering Clydebank, Yoker and North Renfrew, and a Wider Study Area extending across the West Dunbartonshire and Renfrewshire Council areas. Effects on the River Clyde (upon which several important employers depend) were also considered. It modelled economic activity and retail expenditure separately – the latter being important given the concern that improving cross-river access could draw trade away from town centres to the north of the river in favour of Braehead.

5.5 The REIA's economic activity model considered:

- Direct, indirect and induced expenditure during construction and operational phases;
- Direct, indirect and induced employment / labour market effects during construction and operational phases; and
- Indirect and induced wider economic effects during construction and operational phases.

5.6 Chapter 11 of the ES sets out a conventional EIA approach to the identification of socio-economic effects. It describes baseline conditions within the local and wider study

²² EIA Volume 2 Appendix 11.1

²³ REIA summary

²⁴ EIA Volume 2 Chapter 11

areas, identifies receptors and defines their sensitivity, quantifies the magnitude, duration and nature of change, and determines the resultant significance of effect. It then considers mitigation and enhancement where appropriate, before providing conclusions as to residual socio-economic effects. No criticism has been expressed over this general approach, which we agree was appropriate.

5.7 In accordance with the Procurement Reform (Scotland) Act 2014, there is an expectation that community benefit clauses should be considered by public bodies in procurement contracts wherever there is an appropriate legal basis to do so. As the proposals would be developed and funded as part of the Glasgow City Region City Deal, the applicant has assumed that such clauses would be a requirement. It consequently took account of the potential for community benefits being delivered during the construction and operational phases of the proposal. We agree that this was a reasonable assumption.

5.8 During the construction phase, socio-economic receptors are predicted to be residents and businesses within the Local Study Area who might be affected, for example working age residents with skills in the construction industry who might work on the site and local businesses that might benefit from additional spending in the Local Study Area by construction workers. In addition, local construction supply chain businesses might benefit from construction contracts.

5.9 During the operational phase (that is, after the bridge, road and ancillary development had been opened), receptors would include development sites adjacent to the proposed development, which might be regenerated and/or enhanced due to the improved accessibility, connectivity and environmental quality of the area, and any spin-off benefits that might result from that.

5.10 In assessing the receptor sensitivity of potential employees in the construction of the proposals, the REIA looked at a range of factors including the availability of suitably skilled labour within the study areas, unemployment rates and training facilities. The study also considered the sensitivity of the housing and employment land markets by considering factors including the adequacy of land supply and any evidence of multiple deprivation.

5.11 The REIA found a potential shortfall in the supply on housing land in Renfrewshire to 2025 in the order of 1000 units. The housing development opportunities that could be facilitated by the proposed development could address that shortfall. It also found pockets of higher unemployment / lower skill levels and other indicators of deprivation (particularly to the north of the river), relatively high levels of out-commuting for employment but a very low level of cross-river commuting for employment. Again, these issues could be addressed by the proposal.

5.12 In order to translate estimates of gross socio-economic benefit into net figures, the model used by the REIA to forecast socio-economic effects took into account the additionality assumptions listed below.

- Deadweight - what would happen if the proposal did not go ahead;
- Leakage - the proportion of employment opportunities accessed by people living outside the study area;

- Displacement – the proportion of benefit from the proposed development that would be due to a reduction in benefit elsewhere; and
- Multipliers – to estimate further economic activity associated with additional income and supplier purchases (i.e. indirect and induced expenditure).

5.13 Taking account of the factors set out above, the REIA predicts that the proposals' construction phase would create 216 net additional temporary construction jobs across the wider study area. This is described as a moderate / substantial (significant) beneficial effect. A moderate (significant) adverse effect is predicted during the construction period for the maritime and industrial sector. Although the potential obstruction of shipping in the river during construction is predicted to be slight, the national importance of the maritime businesses that could be affected means they are regarded as sufficiently sensitive to any impact that the consequent effect should be regarded as significant. Other socio-economic effects during the construction period (on population and housing and retail / wholesale trade) are predicted to be negligible.

5.14 When assessing the proposed development's operational phase, the REIA credited it with the construction jobs that would be involved in building the residential and employment development that would be facilitated by the proposals and with the jobs that would then be created within the newly constructed employment premises. I regard this as a reasonable approach, because there is no evidence to suggest that such development would take place without the proposed CWRR scheme and because, by accounting for "deadweight" (the level of development that would be likely to happen within the study area if the proposed infrastructure works did not take place), the applicant has sought to quantify the net effect of the proposal.

5.15 As with the construction phase benefits, the REIA also applied the other additionality factors (leakage, displacement and multipliers) to its calculations of gross socio-economic outputs. This provides an estimate of the likely net effect, which was then assessed for significance. The additionality factors were considered separately for the West Dunbartonshire and Renfrewshire sides of the river to account for the fact that the distribution of land uses that is predicted to be developed if this proposal goes ahead is very different – land uses within Renfrewshire being predominantly residential (with some office accommodation) whereas those in West Dunbartonshire would be mainly industrial.

5.16 On that basis, the REIA predicts that the operational phase of the project (that is, following construction of the development sites that would be facilitated by the current proposals) an estimated 564 net additional full time equivalent (FTE) jobs are predicted to be supported within the Wider Study Area. 81 of these would be net additional FTE office type jobs for Renfrewshire and 483 would be net additional FTE industrial jobs for West Dunbartonshire.

5.17 Turning to the important category of retail / warehouse expenditure, the REIA's retail activity modelling considered likely effects on four centres - Braehead, Clydebank, Renfrew and Paisley. The assessment considered various alternative scenarios covering a time period up to 2035. One of these was if the proposed development did not take place - in order to account for changes in the vitality and viability of these centres that could be expected to occur in any event. The effects of public transport being present or absent were also modelled.

5.18 In planning policy terms, Braehead (as a designated commercial centre rather a town centre) is sequentially inferior to town centres such as Clydebank. If the proposal were likely to divert sufficient trade away from the town centres to Braehead that it affected their vitality and viability, this would be a significant disbenefit of the scheme and a clear conflict with the development plan.

5.19 However, in comparison with the “counterfactual” position (what is predicted to occur in any event), none of the centres analysed is predicted to experience any significant gain or loss of retail expenditure in the period to 2035 following completion of the proposed works.

5.20 For Braehead, it is predicted that, with public transport provision, there would be an increase in expenditure of 0.8 % over that which would arise in any event. Without public transport provision, the increase would be 0.5%

5.21 For the other three centres studied, the expected changes are even smaller. For Clydebank, scenarios were analysed where investors in the centre either did or did not make a “competitive response” to the challenges and opportunities presented by the proposed development. Even in the most pessimistic scenario (where public transport provision was made but where there was no competitive response, the expected expenditure change was only -0.6%.

5.22 We agree with the applicant’s categorisation of such small predicted expenditure changes as negligible to low, and well below the level that would typically be regarded as significant.

5.23 West Dunbartonshire Council does not challenge the validity of the REIA’s quantitative analyses, but questions whether it took adequate account of qualitative factors. It predicts that there is the potential for significant shifts in comparison retail and leisure expenditure patterns to the benefit of Braehead and the detriment of Clydebank. Because the REIA did not include a survey of shopping patterns and habits, the council believes it may have reached unreliable conclusions. It considers it incredible that improving access to an alternative shopping centre that is three times the size of Clydebank would have only the low level of impact that has been predicted.

5.24 It appears that a face-to-face survey of shoppers within Clydebank and a telephone survey of residents across a wider catchment was not undertaken as part of the REIA. This could have provided more information on existing shopping and leisure trip behaviour and how this could be expected to change. We agree with West Dunbartonshire Council (WDC) that this, would have added to the REIA. However, we do not agree that, in the absence of such data, one can assume (as WDC does) that there would be a significant loss of retail and leisure expenditure in Clydebank town centre.

5.25 West Dunbartonshire Council accepts that it is notoriously difficult to forecast changes in shopping habits. It also accepts (as we deal with later, in my consideration of effects on traffic and roads) that the opening nature of the bridge would reduce the accessibility of Braehead to residents north of the river (especially those relying on public transport).

5.26 Glasgow City Council was not involved in commissioning the REIA. Had it been, then perhaps the study would have included within its scope, the centres that the city

council fears could be adversely affected by the diversion of trade that the proposed bridge could facilitate. These are: Glasgow city centre (the region's pre-eminent centre), Knightswood and Yoker, which are designated town centres in the LDP (although, unlike Clydebank, are not of Clydeplan-recognised strategic significance).

5.27 Glasgow city centre has the highest level of policy protection in recognition of its regional importance. The city council's concern is that the proposed bridge could encourage some loss of comparison shopping and leisure business from the city centre to Braehead. Logically, this must relate to trade that is drawn from north of the river, as the only effect the bridge could have on trade from the south would be positive.

5.28 Assuming favourable traffic conditions, the heart of the city centre is approximately 25 minutes away by car from Dock Street, at the northern side of the application site. Public transport journey times are likely to be similar. At present, the journey time from that point to Braehead (via the Clyde Tunnel) would be approximately 20 minutes. If the proposed bridge were built (and assuming it was not open for shipping at the time) the journey time by car between this point and Braehead would be in the order of eight or nine minutes. Looked at in those terms and bearing in mind the importance of ensuring that the city centre retains its pre-eminence, one can understand the need for a cautious approach.

5.29 However, if one moves away from the immediate vicinity of the northern side of the proposed bridge, other factors must be taken into account. To the east, the Clyde Tunnel becomes a more significant consideration. For residents in much of Glasgow's West End and from the north of the city, (at least those travelling by car) this already offers access to Braehead as an alternative to the city centre. The proposed bridge would have no effect on the likely choice of shopping destination for such residents, as it would be a far less convenient route than the tunnel already provides. And for all of the city centre's catchment to the east and south of the centre, the bridge could not conceivably affect a choice between Braehead and the city centre, as it would not materially improve the accessibility of the former. For residents in settlements to the west of the Glasgow conurbation such as Dumbarton and Helensburgh, the Erskine Bridge already provides a choice between Braehead and the city centre that is unlikely to be materially influenced by the construction of the proposed bridge.

5.30 Where there could be a greater effect is in Clydebank and its immediate surroundings, perhaps as far east as Yoker and Knightswood. Residents here (assuming they have access to a car) currently need to use either the Erskine Bridge or Clyde Tunnel to access Braehead. This would probably involve a journey of around 25 minutes, although this is already likely to be a shorter journey than to the city centre (certainly for those to the west of this area). Upon completion of the proposed bridge (and assuming no delay from shipping traffic) the journey time by car to Braehead is likely to be reduced to something in the order of 10 to 15 minutes. I can appreciate that this might encourage more residents in this area to choose Braehead over the city centre, contrary to the expectations of policy.

5.31 However, when predicting the likely significance of this for Glasgow city centre, one needs to bear in mind the regional scale of that centre's catchment and the very small proportion of that catchment that is likely to be made up of residents within this limited area. We are satisfied that, even if a significant proportion of residents in this limited area were persuaded by the proposed bridge to favour Braehead over the city centre, this would not have a significant effect on the city centre's turnover or its vitality and viability.

5.32 Both Knightswood and Yoker are identified as ‘Local Town Centres’ in the Glasgow LDP, which is reflective of their scale and the type of retail offer they provide. Unlike Braehead, which is a significant comparison shopping and leisure destination, both centres offer predominantly convenience shopping to a local catchment. It seems unlikely that those who currently carry out their day-to-day convenience shopping in either of these local town centres would change their behaviour as a result of there being improved access to Braehead.

5.33 The proposed bridge could encourage some diversion of comparison shopping and leisure trade of residents local to these centres. However, Yoker and Knightswood centres are already lacking in such facilities, and it is reasonable to predict that existing leisure and comparison shopping needs are being met elsewhere – either in the city centre, as stated above or possibly in either Clydebanks town centre (which was considered in the REIA) or the Great Western Retail Park (which does not have town-centre status).

5.34 Given the above conclusions, we are satisfied that, although the REIA did not look at these centres specifically, its findings provide sufficient information for it to be reasonable to reach a conclusion that significant effects on these centres would not arise. Given this finding, we reject West Dunbartonshire Council’s claim that there would be an adverse effect upon the redevelopment of Queen’s Quay for housing, which it states is closely linked to the town centre.

5.35 Looking at the potential effects on the settlement hierarchy and on the vitality and viability of all of the town centres that could potentially be affected by the proposal, we agree that the REIA would have benefitted from considering effects on additional settlements including the city centre and if it had incorporated some interview-based assessment. However, we are confident that the absence of such evidence does not impair our ability to conclude with confidence that there is no likelihood of significant adverse effects. As such, we are satisfied that, in this respect, the proposal complies with Clydeplan’s spatial development strategy and would not conflict with the aims of either Policy 4 of that plan, Policy CDP 4 of the Glasgow City LDP or Policy RET1 of the West Dunbartonshire local plan.

5.36 The other identified potential adverse socio-economic effect was as a result of disruption to businesses that depend on the river. Due to the opening nature of the bridge, the level of disruption to river traffic would be minimised once the bridge is operational. However, during the construction process, some temporary disruption to shipping and of access along the edges of the river would be inevitable. Nevertheless, there is no reason to conclude that the level of any adverse effect would be unacceptable.

5.37 Overall, we agree with the findings of the REIA that the proposal would have significantly positive socio-economic effects overall and would accord with the expectations and aspirations of NPF3, Clydeplan and the local tier of the development plan, all of which seek to promote socio-economic benefit, regeneration and investment. It finds support, in particular, from Policy 3 of Clydeplan, which offers support to City Deal projects such as this, and Policy 5, which recognises the value of development that would improve access to Glasgow Airport. Within Renfrewshire, the riverside housing development land that would be delivered by the proposal would be supported by the Renfrewshire LDP due to its assistance in meeting the housing supply target. It would also find support in Policies E1 and E3 of that LDP. In West Dunbartonshire, the proposal has the potential to facilitate

employment land delivery and the socio-economic benefits that would flow from that, in accordance with local plan policy LE 6.

CHAPTER 6 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT EFFECTS

6.1 Traffic and transport effects were considered in Chapter 12 of the ES²⁵. The study covered effects on motorised and non-motorised users (NMUs). The study looked at traffic flows, journey times and speeds to key destinations, together with an accessibility analysis.

6.2 The proposal is likely to alter quite significantly the movement of traffic around the locality. Indeed, one of the aims of the project is to reduce traffic congestion in Renfrew town centre. The ES found that there would be some temporary traffic effects during the construction period but that these could be mitigated by a traffic management plan. During the operational phase, significant effects are predicted close to the bridge because at present, those locations experience very low levels of traffic. However, the ES concludes that the predicted significant increase in traffic could be accommodated by the proposed infrastructure. Away from the bridge it is predicted that traffic levels would quickly dissipate so that significant effects would be very localised.

6.3 Tables 12.8 and 12.9 in the ES compare predicted traffic levels in 2020 after the bridge was opened with those that would be expected to arise in any event. By far the most significant predicted traffic increase (+2300% during the PM peak period) is at Meadowside Street East. However, at present, this is a no-through road, serving only a few businesses so the extent of the predicted increase is understandable. Elsewhere, traffic increases are typically in the range +300% to +850% close to the bridge and significantly lower elsewhere. We do not find the evidence to support a predicted increase in traffic of 48% on Yoker Mill Road. For locations where traffic levels are predicted to decrease, this is predicted to be up to a maximum of around -35%.

6.4 In order to avoid traffic congestion in the vicinity of the bridge (possibly extending far enough that it affected strategic routes such as the A814 Dumbarton Road) while the proposed bridge is open to shipping, the applicant proposes a communications system, using variable message signage, to ensure sufficient warning is given and alternative routes are relayed to all non-motorised and road traffic prior to opening of the bridge. Such facilities could be secured by a suspensive planning condition.

6.5 Despite this, it is likely that some pedestrians and cyclists would realistically have no choice but to await the reopening of the bridge, due to the length of any detour. It is predicted that the opening and closure period would last approximately 41 minutes, during which time pedestrians and cyclists would (at least in poor weather conditions) benefit significantly from some form of shelter at either side of the bridge. Given the emphasis that is placed upon the encouragement of active travel in the SDP and LDPs, we consider that the provision of such shelters would be both necessary and reasonable, in order to maximise the attractiveness of such travel options. This could be secured by condition.

6.6 A key benefit of the proposal that is predicted in the ES is significantly improved accessibility to key services such as employment, health, education, transport and leisure, including for NMUs and particularly by those making cross-river trips between the Renfrew, Clydebank and Yoker areas. The applicant has referred to a number of developments in the locality, including Queens Quay, Glasgow Airport Investment Area, Queen Elizabeth University Hospitals Campus and the Golden Jubilee Hospital - where the staffing levels are

²⁵ [ES Volume 2](#) part 2

expected to double within the next 10 years, as being particular beneficiaries of this improved connectivity.

6.7 Concern has been expressed by West Dunbartonshire Council that the opening nature of the bridge will reduce cross-river connectivity benefits and that this would be particularly significant for public transport users, as bus operators are unlikely to be able to provide a service across the bridge due to uncertainty over access and consequent timetabling difficulties.

6.8 While the points raised by West Dunbartonshire Council are understood, they are an inevitable consequence of balancing the needs of land-based and river-based users. It is essential that access upstream of the bridge is maintained for large vessels. This means that some disruption to cross-river road traffic will occur. In our view, the relevant comparison is between what is proposed and the existing situation rather than with a theoretical ideal solution that has no prospect of delivery. When assessed in those terms, there is no reason to conclude that there would not be a significant improvement in connectivity between Clydebank and Yoker when compared with the existing very limited arrangements.

6.9 The proposed bridge approach roads would both feature roundabouts so that, if it were considered desirable in the future to provide bus services serving each side of the bridge (connected by a short walk across it) this would be possible. However, due to the uncertainty over whether an operator would wish to provide such services, it would be premature to require bus shelters to be provided at this stage.

6.10 Apart from the proposed bridge, other elements of the proposal are considered to be of significant benefit to NMUs. It is calculated in the ES that the proposed RNDR would cut the journey distance for NMUs between the White Cart bridge and the ferry terminal approximately in half – at present, the only identified route for such users that avoids vehicular traffic is around the edge of the Renfrew golf course. As part of the proposal, NMUs would have safer and quicker access between the riverside and the GAIA. Once the proposed development is complete, pedestrian access would be maintained along the existing route by Fisher's Road to Clydeside and Cartside.

6.11 Parties generally agree that it may prove difficult to operate a bus service across the proposed bridge due to the predicted length of time it may be open each day for shipping traffic and the unpredictability of the timing of such events. We agree that this is regrettable and would not fully support the region-wide commitment to improving public transport provision. However, we disagree that this is a reason to resist the proposal or to conclude that it conflicts with the expectations of planning policies.

6.12 Neither the assessment of transport effects nor the councils' professional transport officers suggested that in any other respect road infrastructure (such as the bascule bridge) was inadequate to accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development.

6.13 Both Glasgow's City Development Plan (policy CDP 11) and the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan safeguard land for the North Clydeside Development Route (NCDR). Glasgow City Council questioned whether the indicative design of the junction between Dock Street and the A814 would most easily accommodate the NCDR. We consider that the details of the junction and its compatibility with the later construction of the NCDR can be approved under conditions.

6.14 Similarly we consider that details of how the proposed development is to be connected with the approved layout of roads, footpaths and cycle routes for the development east of Dock Street can be approved under conditions. This should include a crossing north of the bridge to allow a continuation of the approved path on the north bank of the Clyde onto the Rothesay Dock.

6.15 Although we acknowledge that the cycleway about which the Inchinnan Cruising Club has stated it is concerned is a development associated with the proposals under consideration, it is not the subject of the present application. We therefore can consider the matters they raise in respect of it no further in this report.

6.16 Overall, we agree with the assessment of traffic and transport effects of the proposed development set out in Chapter 12 of the ES. Notwithstanding that there is no present commitment to providing a bus connection across the bridge or to the bridgeheads, the proposal is not incompatible at least with provision of the latter. The construction of the RNDR is supported by Renfrewshire LDP policy I3 as noted above. We consider that, in providing cross-river links and in its integration into the strategic cycle network, the proposal has the support of Clydeplan policies 17 and 18 and of related aspects of policy 3. Similarly, it is compatible with policy I1 of the Renfrewshire LDP, with the transport policies of West Dunbartonshire's local plan, including T1 and T2, and with Glasgow's City Development Plan policy CDP 11 on sustainable travel.

CHAPTER 7 NOISE AND VIBRATION

7.1 Noise and vibration impacts of the proposed development were assessed in Chapter 8 of the ES and the technical report appended to it²⁶. The assessment examined the effects of noise and vibration caused by construction, road traffic noise-level changes and changes in the level of road-traffic-induced airborne vibration associated with operation of the proposed development.

7.2 The assessment scoped out the effect of construction-generated traffic noise, of traffic noise or vibration generated by diversions, of ground-borne vibration generated by increased traffic noise during the proposed development's operation, and of noise generated by the opening or closing of the bridge (both mechanical noise and warning sounds).

7.3 The applicant consulted environmental health officers of each of the three planning authorities upon the study area and the methodology it identified for assessment of noise and vibration. None of the authorities took issue with the either or with the report's findings. Glasgow City Council²⁷ and (originally) TCL²⁸ raised a specific issue about the impact upon the residential development site east of Dock Street in respect of which permission reference 15/02921/DC has been granted (although TCL has since withdrawn its objection). The applicant's agent provided responses to each²⁹. No other technical or expert evidence has been submitted that would cast doubt upon the methodology applied for assessment of noise and vibration.

7.4 The applicant described a method for assessment of construction noise based upon standard methodology. It assessed four construction phases for noise impacts upon sensitive properties at five locations, which it considered to be the worst-case for construction noise. It identified threshold values related to measure background noise levels. The assessment deemed a significant effect to occur if predicted construction noise exceeded the threshold values by 5 decibels or more. The assessment made assumptions about noise generated by construction on the basis of plant expected to be used in each construction phase. It made worst-case assumptions about noise attenuation and location of plant in respect of the assessment locations.

7.5 The assessment predicted that at one assessment location (dwellings on Meadow Lane to the south of the proposed Meadowside Street improvement works), for the first three phases, construction noise would exceed the limit value. The ES points out that this is a worst case, when works are in proximity to the assessment location, although for most of the period of construction works, they would be further away. This prediction took no account of proposed mitigation measures.

7.6 A live construction-noise monitoring programme was proposed for dwellings south of Meadowside Street. This would inform appropriate working times and methods and aid in compliance with construction noise limits. The noise assessment identified a significant, although moderate, impact from construction noise on the basis of such mitigation being in place.

²⁶ For ease of downloading, the ES is split in two parts. Chapter 8 on noise can be found at the end of ES [part 1](#) and beginning of ES [part 2](#).

²⁷ [Glasgow City Council submission](#)

²⁸ [TCL submission](#) (since withdrawn)

²⁹ Sweco responses [to Glasgow City Council](#) and [to TCL](#) original representations

7.7 The applicant has proposed that measures for mitigation of construction noise would be incorporated in the construction environment management plan (CEMP). I note that the local authority may impose or agree measures to control construction noise under sections 60 or 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

7.8 The applicant's assessment of ground-borne construction vibration examined a number of elements of construction work that might cause ground-borne vibration. These included use of vibratory rollers, rotary-bored piling, impact piling and heavy goods vehicles. It proposed the implementation of a monitoring programme where vibratory rollers were used within 23 metres of residential property. This would be required in respect of dwellings south of Meadowside Street. The monitoring programme would inform working practices so that vibration effects were kept to a low magnitude. It found that, with such a programme in place, there would be no significant effect from ground-borne vibration caused by construction. The requirement to implement a monitoring programme may be secured by condition as part of the CEMP.

7.9 The applicant assessed the effect of both short-term and long-term change in road traffic noise. It identified a study area encompassing both proposed new and improved routes and also other routes where there was a possibility of a change of 1 decibel or more in the short term or 3 decibels or more in the long term as a consequence of changes in the level of road traffic. The assessment of short-term change assessed the predicted change in noise levels in the year of the proposed development's opening as a consequence of the proposed development. The assessment of long-term change did the same for the 17th year after proposed opening. The assessment considered the degree of change and the absolute level of noise resulting as a consequence of the change and assessed the impact in relation to the sensitivity of the receptor to determine significance.

7.10 The assessment found significant short-term effects upon 19 dwellings and one other receptor (the Rothesay Dock to Whiteinch cycle path). A major effect was predicted at 8 of the dwellings. Significant long-term effects were found for 17 dwellings. Of these, a major effect was predicted at 6 dwellings. All the dwellings predicted to be significantly affected were to the south of Meadowfield Street, at its eastern end. No significant effects were predicted at night.

7.11 The applicant notes that there is a statutory requirement for noise insulation as a consequence of the effects of road development under the Noise Insulation (Scotland) Regulations 1975. It carried out a separate assessment relating to the statutory criteria under which the requirement applies. Its assessment indicates that certain tenement flats at the eastern end of Meadowside Street are likely to be the only properties that would qualify for noise mitigation measures under the statutory scheme.

7.12 The application also proposes that noise mitigation measures should be considered for other properties. We consider that a scheme to provide insulation in cases where nuisance might otherwise arise can be secured by conditions.

7.13 TCL had originally objected that the noise assessment was insufficient in respect of the approved development on its site east of Dock Street. The ES acknowledges that there would be a short-term change in noise level exceeding 5 decibels for most of the residential development site east of Dock Street (for the development of which permission 15/02921/DC has been granted). This assessment relates to the vacant site before

permission 15/02921/DC is implemented. It can therefore be regarded as a conservative estimate of change in noise levels as compared with the change that would occur once the approved development was built.

7.14 In determining the significance of the effect, however, the absolute noise level following the change must be taken into account. The ES identifies 57 decibels as the absolute noise level at which a major significant effect would occur. Predicted absolute noise levels are shown in figures 9.3 and 9.4 of the technical report appended to the ES's chapter 8. These indicate that absolute noise levels would be less than this level over most of the site, although there would be higher noise levels at its western edge.

7.15 Paragraph 8.2.19 of the technical report indicates that, although the application for the proposed development was submitted before the approval of the residential development, the applicant did assess plans for the residential development in considering the effects of noise. It states further that the closest of the proposed dwellings would be more than 30 metres from the realigned Dock Street, that main gardens would generally be to the rear of the dwellings, that the 57 decibel noise contour would only just reach the closest of the dwellings, and that noise in all the proposed gardens would be less than 57 decibels. It concludes that the proposed development would not represent a significant constraint to future residential development of the Dock Street site.

7.16 The noise assessment was carried out before planning permission 15/02921/DC was granted. Therefore the fact that the ES stated in its assessment of the site that planning permission had not been granted cannot be characterised as inaccurate. This is the case even although the council had previously determined it was minded to grant permission subject to the conclusion of a planning agreement, and has since granted permission. We do not have reason to believe the assessment was inaccurate in any other respect.

7.17 Chapter 8 paragraph 8.4.50 of the ES indicates that road traffic noise generated by the proposed development may have a moderate significant effect in the short term if there is a high degree of change (over 5 decibels) at a receptor of high sensitivity and the consequent absolute level of noise would be between 52 and 57 decibels. This criterion is applied to an assessment of the proposed development's effect upon existing development at ES paragraph 8.7.37.

7.18 The assessment of the Dock Street site in the ES considers solely the question of whether absolute noise would exceed 57 decibels. It is evident from noise contour plans forming figure 9.3 of the technical report that between a quarter and a fifth of the Dock Street site would have absolute noise levels of 51 decibels or above following the proposed development. The ES also acknowledges that the 57-decibel noise contour would reach the closest dwellings facing Dock Street. We find therefore that there would be a significant, although moderate, effect upon the closest dwellings approved for the Dock Street site.

7.19 Although we have found that there would be a significant adverse effect upon the proposed development as a consequence of road noise, the absolute noise level predicted at the Dock Street site following the proposed development would be well below the level at which a statutory requirement to offer noise insulation would apply. For all but a limited part of the site, it would be less than the level of 57 decibels at which the technical report indicates the applicant would consider offering noise mitigation measures.

7.20 At the time of Mr Buylla's site inspection, no significant development had commenced. Although the residential development at Dock Street has received planning permission, that would not restrict the developer of that site in taking steps to provide noise insulation of the approved buildings suitable to their environment following construction of the proposed bridge and road. We consider in the circumstances that it would not be reasonable for the applicant to be required to provide or to offer noise insulation for buildings of the approved residential development. We do not consider that there should be a separate requirement for mitigation imposed by condition upon permission for the proposed development.

7.21 The ES assesses the effects of airborne vibration caused by the change in the level of road traffic for residential receptors within 40 metres of the proposed development and other affected routes within one kilometre of the proposed development at which traffic noise levels of 58 decibels were predicted. It identified that there would be moderate to major effects for a small cluster of dwellings south of Meadowside Street.

7.22 Objectors raised the question of whether the effects of noise and vibration at St James's Roman Catholic Church should have been considered. The methodology set out in the ES indicates that the effect on sensitive receptors was to be considered. These included not only residential receptors, but also others, including places of worship. The applicant has acknowledged that St James's Church was not included in the list of receptors, although it was within the identified study area. However, the applicant has also pointed out that the noise maps provided as figures 9.1 and 9.2 of the technical report indicate that noise would be reduced at the church. This would also be the case in respect of airborne vibration.

7.23 Although one local objector from Renfrewshire raised the issue of the cumulative effects of vibration caused by road traffic with that caused by a concrete-batching plant, this was not an issue the environmental health officers of any of the three planning authorities raised in the scoping of the noise and vibration assessment. No substantial technical evidence was proved to demonstrate the existence of such an effect. We find therefore that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate that any such effect would be significant.

7.24 Renfrewshire LDP policy P1 requires that new development in areas such as Meadowside Street should be compatible and complementary with existing uses and should demonstrate it would cause no significant harm to those uses. Although the proposed development would have significant adverse noise effects on relatively few properties, it would have such effects at some in Meadowside Street. We consider that the proposed development does not fully accord with policy P1.

7.25 Glasgow's City Development Plan policy CDP 1 sets out the council's expectation that new development should provide high-quality amenity to existing and new residents to the city and should ensure that new activity does not introduce unacceptable additional noise. Although we have identified a moderate but significant adverse effect in respect of the approved development 15/02921/DC, we do not consider that the additional noise would be unacceptable. Therefore the proposed development would comply with policy CD1.

CHAPTER 8 EFFECTS ON NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

8.1 Chapter 6 of the ES examined natural heritage / ecological effects and Chapter 7 effects on cultural heritage³⁰. No party has challenged the applicant's findings on the likely effects within these areas. None of the planning authorities or statutory consultees suggested that the proposed development would have unacceptable effects upon the natural or historic environment.

8.2 The ES considered a wide range of potential ecological receptors although effects on breeding and wintering birds and great crested newts were 'scoped-out' of the EIA, following consultation with SNH. Following mitigation, the ES predicts that the following significant ecological effects would remain:

- a negative irreversible effect to semi-natural woodland habitat from habitat loss and fragmentation at a Local Level (considered moderate adverse);
- a negative irreversible (to the individual) / reversible (to the populations) effect to bats through direct mortality and a negative irreversible effect through habitat fragmentation and disturbance, all at a Local Level (considered moderate adverse); and
- positive effects through the removal and treatment of invasive non-native species at a Local Level (considered minor beneficial);

8.3 As was set out in chapter 4, the applicant proposes to carry out significant tree-planting in order to mitigate the effects of removing 2.6 hectares of woodland at Blythswood. Nevertheless, the proposed RNDR would sever the woodland, leading to a degree of habitat fragmentation. We agree that this would constitute an adverse ecological effect of moderate significance.

8.4 The applicant predicts that the demolition of buildings within the metal-recycling site (some of which are known to be occupied by bats) would have a moderate (significant) adverse effect on that species due to habitat loss / fragmentation and disturbance. A European Protected Species (EPS) licence would be required for such works. To mitigate effects on bats, a species protection plan is proposed. The applicant also proposes to inspect all buildings to be demolished and trees to be felled by an ecologist prior to demolition / felling and to provide alternative roosting habitat in the form of bat boxes within Blythswood, outwith any areas of potential light disturbance.

8.5 The applicant predicts some modest positive effects through the removal and treatment of invasive non-native species.

8.6 Overall, the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any site that is protected for its natural conservation interest, as is required by Renfrewshire LDP Policy ENV 2. However, that policy also expects a precautionary approach to be taken to considering effects on a number of issues including protected species and trees. As there would be some adverse significant residual effects in this regard, there is some conflict with this policy.

³⁰ [ES volume 2 part 1](#)

8.7 We found in chapter 4 that the proposed development's design would minimise the impact upon the woodland and that tree-planting was incorporated in the proposed development to compensate for the loss of woodland. We consider that these proposals would meet the requirements of Clydeplan policy 13.

8.8 Turning to heritage assets, the ES identifies three designated assets in the immediate vicinity of the site: the category A listed rolling lift (basculle) bridge over the White Cart Water; a pair of carved stones known as the Argyll Stone and St Conval's Chariot, which are category B listed; and the Ferry Inn, a category C listed public house beside Renfrew Ferry.

8.9 It is necessary, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In this instance, none of the listed buildings would be directly affected by the proposals.

8.10 The bascule bridge over the White Cart Water is adjacent to the south western corner of the application site. The only part of the development that could be regarded as falling within, or close to, the setting of this nationally important asset is the proposed cycleway on the south side of Inchinnan Road. This would be formed within an existing grassed area to the front of houses in Kirklandneuk Road. The cycleway would be of modest scale in relation to the existing urban infrastructure and would weave between existing trees so as to minimise its visual impact. We are satisfied that it would succeed in preserving the setting of the bridge.

8.11 Argyll Stone and St Conval's Chariot are two fragments of a cross that are situated close to Inchinnan Road, between the bascule bridge and the Normandy Hotel. The proposed cycleway would have no effect on what could reasonably be described as the setting of these remains, as it would be on the opposite side of Inchinnan Road and well screened by trees.

8.12 Ferry Inn is situated at the junction of Ferry Road and Clyde Street. It is approximately 200 metres from the proposed works on Meadowside Street and about 800 metres from the proposed bridge. At these distances, we are satisfied that no element of the proposed works would affect the setting of this listed building. Some of the land that would be released for redevelopment as a consequence of the proposed works would be much closer to the listed building and could potentially affect its setting. However, such development is not part of the current proposal and is not within the application site boundary (the nearest edge of the site boundary being approximately 150 metres away). we are satisfied that the current proposal would have no effect on the setting of this listed building.

8.13 The ES looked at other potential sources of impact on the historic environment including effects on archaeology and the potential for the proposed bridge to cause the closure of the Clyde Ferry. We accept the applicant's conclusion that none of these effects would be significant, subject to a scheme of archaeological investigation prior to construction.

8.14 Taking all matters into account, we are satisfied that the proposal would have no significant effects on cultural heritage and that it would satisfy the requirements of Renfrewshire LDP policy ENV 3.

CHAPTER 9: EFFECTS ON THE WATER ENVIRONMENT

9.1 The location of the proposed works (being within and immediately adjacent to a watercourse) is such that they will be subject to very detailed licensing requirements from SEPA and Marine Scotland. In such circumstances, it would be unnecessary and potentially counter-productive to seek to control such matters through the planning system. However, it is necessary to consider the key issues that have been identified in order to determine whether any is of such significance that planning permission should not be granted.

9.2 During the construction process, particularly that which takes place within, or immediately adjacent to the Clyde and the White Cart Water, there is a risk of pollution to the water environment either from the disturbance of sediment (which could potentially be contaminated) or by accidental spillages, for example of diesel. All of these potential effects on the water environment were modelled in the ES and it was concluded that they could be highly significant for the Clyde and of moderate significance for the Cart. In order to minimise the likelihood of there being significant adverse effects, the applicant proposes a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) and will require the contractor to employ an environmental site manager and an ecological clerk of works. Subject to this, SEPA is content that the proposal can proceed without unacceptable effects.

9.3 SEPA has raised no objections with regard to pollution of the water environment and SNH has confirmed that significant effects on the ecological interest of the watercourses is unlikely. We agree with these findings and consider that, subject to the approval and implementation of the CEMP, adequate control over this issue is available through the licensing processes.

9.4 SEPA has expressed concern over the proposals for carriageway drainage because it is not satisfied that they would meet the requirements of the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (the CAR) or represent best practice. The drainage system proposed for all new carriageway, including the proposed bridge, would involve use of a proprietary treatment system such as a vortex separator rather than using the typical SuDS approach of open ponds or settlement basins prior to outfall to the River Clyde and White Cart Water. The applicant considers this to be the most appropriate option due to the existing site constraints including proximity to Glasgow Airport, the risk of attracting birds to 'open' systems, and the relatively small footprint compared to more conventional SuDS. It argues that vortex systems would be effective at separating contaminants and sediment-bound pollutants from the remaining runoff and that, overall, the benefits of employing SuDS technology across the development land that would be enabled by the proposed works should not be ignored.

9.5 Areas of open water that could attract birds are typically required to be avoided in proximity to airports, so we can understand the applicant's preference for an alternative approach. Ultimately, SEPA will be responsible for licensing the surface water drainage approach and we are content that the detailed design of an appropriate system is best left to that process.

9.6 The development would be built within the tidal and fluvial floodplain, but has been designed to accommodate the risk of flooding, including the incorporation of 300 mm (or 600 mm within 30 metres of the River Clyde) clearance above the design flood level for all new and upgraded roads. Due to the small extent of the works in comparison with the

size of the floodplain and with the volume of water involved in tidal movement, no significant effects on flood risk at the site or elsewhere are predicted. SEPA is satisfied with this aspect and we concur with those conclusions.

9.7 Yoker Burn runs in a culvert and discharges into the River Clyde through an opening in the northern bank. That opening and the line of some of the existing culverted watercourse lie under the position of the proposed northern bridge access road. It is proposed to realign Yoker Burn to the east into the residential development land that is owned by TCL. No objections to this element of the proposal have been raised by SEPA and would be covered by the licensing process already referred to. However, it is necessary to consider the implications this might have for the development of the adjacent approved housing site.

9.8 The applicant accepts that the works associated with the realignment of the culvert would disturb this area temporarily, although, following construction, it notes that the area of land above the culvert would be restored. It also accepts that, due to maintenance requirements, no development will be able to take place on top of the line of the culvert to ensure access for maintenance is retained.

9.9 Although the technical regulation of this element of the scheme is a matter for SEPA, any implication the proposed culvert realignment may have for the adjacent residential development land is a material planning consideration and must therefore be considered as part of the assessment of these applications.

9.10 The proposed culvert realignment would appear to involve land that is within the control of a third party and to have implications for how that party uses its land. No party has objected expressly to the culvert's realignment or suggested that the realignment would prejudice the approved housing development.

9.11 It would not be possible, through the grant of planning permission, to oblige the adjacent land owner to accommodate any off-site works that were needed in order to facilitate the proposed bridge and approach road or to modify its proposals in order to be compatible with them. That being the case, it would also be impossible to require, via planning conditions, the applicant for this proposal to deliver these off-site elements as part of the scheme. In such circumstances, which are far from uncommon, the solution, if permission is to be granted, would be to use suspensive or "Grampian" conditions that would prevent development taking place unless and until the off-site issues had been resolved.

9.12 Taking all water environment considerations into account, it is clear that some matters of detail remain to be finalised. However, for the reasons we have set out above, we consider that these can be left for negotiation as part of the licensing processes and / or between the proposed developer and the adjacent land owner. We are satisfied that the proposal complies with Clydeplan policy 16, with Policies I5 and ENV 4 of the Renfrewshire LDP and with Policy CDP 8 of the Glasgow LDP. On the basis that it would not prejudice the delivery of the adjacent housing development site, we are satisfied that it would also comply with Glasgow LDP Policy CDP 10, which seeks to maintain the housing land supply.

CHAPTER 10: CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

10.1 The ES's fourth volume³¹ considers the combined effects of the construction and operation of both the proposed development and the other Renfrewshire City Deal proposed development: the Glasgow Airport Improvement Area (GAIA). It took account of other developments in the area that it identified as reasonably foreseeable. These included the development of sites identified in the local development plans (LDPs). For an assessment of effects in 2020 it also included the effects of development of other existing planning applications, while for an assessment of effects in 2037 it included the effects of development of City Deal Masterplan sites.

10.2 The assessment found the following temporary significant effects of construction of the proposed developments:

- A cumulative, moderately beneficial socio-economic effect on employment, including the creation of 3,192 person-years of construction employment over the years 2018-2020; and
- In-combination effects of construction on certain residential areas and routes for non-motorised users.

10.3 The assessment found the following significant effects of operation of the proposed developments:

- A major adverse effect upon semi-natural woodland as a consequence of habitat loss and fragmentation;
- A moderate adverse effect upon bats from mortality and habitat fragmentation;
- A moderate beneficial effect from removal and treatment of invasive non-native species;
- A moderate adverse effect from increased noise levels at Meadowside Street and Netherton Farm due to increased traffic flow levels;
- A moderate adverse effect upon landscape character at Netherton Farm and moderate adverse visual effect for properties east of that area (although this was primarily a cumulative effect of the GAIA project and related masterplan development, rather than a cumulative effect of those projects with the proposed development);
- A moderate adverse effect upon archaeological remains from masterplan works affecting Netherton Farm and the surrounding area (again, primarily an effect of the GAIA project and masterplan development);
- A moderate beneficial socio-economic effect on employment from development of future masterplan sites, including the direct creation of approximately 6,134 full-time equivalent jobs and over 5,000 net additional full-time jobs within the areas of West Dunbartonshire, Renfrewshire and over the wider Clyde Valley;
- An in-combination effect from traffic noise and severance and amenity effects for properties at the east end of Meadowside Street; and
- In-combination beneficial effects for users of non-motorised routes.

10.4 For mitigation of cumulative effects, the applicant relies upon measures proposed in the ES's parts 2 and 3, which related to the proposed development and GAIA project respectively. It does not propose any additional mitigation measures to address adverse cumulative effects.

³¹ [ES Volume 4](#)
CIN-RFS-001
CIN-GLW-001
CIN-WDS-001

10.5 We found above in respect of the residential development approved for land east of Dock Street (reference 15/02921/DC) that there would be a moderate though significant adverse effect as a consequence of noise. The cumulative noise assessment³² predicts that the absolute noise level at the facades facing Dock Street would be 60 decibels both for 2020 and 2037. We consider that this represents a significant effect.

10.6 The assessment also found, on the basis of an examination of plans for the proposed development, that no unscreened garden would be subject to an absolute noise level of more than 57 decibels. As regards the impact upon the façades facing Dock Street, the applicant indicated that it could be mitigated through appropriate façade design to achieve an appropriate internal living environment. As we found in respect of the noise assessment in this report's chapter 7, we do not consider it would be reasonable to require the applicant for the proposed development to provide this mitigation.

10.7 We note the significant adverse in-combination effects for residential properties at the eastern end of Meadowside Street. The concerns expressed by a number of residents of Meadowside Street and Meadow Lane are understandable³³. We consider that, given the combined extent of the development comprised in the GAIA project and masterplan as well as the proposed development, such in-combination effects are limited. However, we conclude, given the existence of such significant adverse effects at Meadowside Street that the proposed development would not fully accord with Renfrewshire LDP policy P1.

10.8 Overall, we find nothing else in the cumulative effects that would change the policy assessments we have already made in chapters on individual effects above.

³² [ES volume 4](#) chapter 5 and accompanying technical report

³³ [Representations](#) to Renfrewshire Council

CHAPTER 11: OTHER MATTERS

Air quality

11.1 None of the planning authorities or their environmental health officers considered that impact upon air quality represented an insuperable barrier to the proposed development.

11.2 ES chapter 9³⁴ reported upon an assessment of the effect of the proposed development on air quality. As regards dust and particulates generated by construction operations, the assessment was that, if good construction practice was applied, the degree of adverse effect upon neighbouring sensitive uses would be negligible or minor. As regards traffic emissions associated with the completed development, the assessment predicted a minor adverse effect at two locations, in Love Street in the Paisley air quality management area (AQMA) and at the residential development site east of Dock Street. The latter prediction arises from the presence of a road at the site where there was none previously and absolute levels of pollution remained below a level at which they would be significant. Minor beneficial effects were predicted in the Renfrew AQMA and on Dumbarton Road between Yoker and Scotstoun.

11.3 Objectors expressed concern about air pollution caused by vehicles idling when the bridge was closed to allow river traffic to pass. The variable message system is proposed to prevent vehicles from waiting. The applicant has also proposed that there should be a prohibition of waiting at the bridge, and signage at the link road to the bridge to discourage engine idling.

11.4 We consider that, subject to the proposed mitigation measures, the proposed development meets the requirements of Renfrewshire LDP policy ENV5, Glasgow City Development Plan policy CDP1, and West Dunbartonshire local plan policy GD 1.

Climate change mitigation

11.5 The design and access statement³⁵ states that the proposed development follows the new standard, PAS 2080: Carbon Management in Infrastructure, and would be one of the first projects to do so. It claims this as one of the direct benefits of the project. The standard addresses the reduction of whole life carbon emissions for an infrastructure project (therefore emissions both from construction and operation).

11.6 The ES's volume 2 chapter 10³⁶ predicts that the effect of opening the proposed development in 2020 upon the baseline network traffic flows would be a reduction of 567 tonnes CO₂ equivalent. Over the life of the project to 2037, it predicts there would be an increase in end-user carbon emissions as compared with local development plan growth without the proposed development of 1156 tonnes CO₂ equivalent. While the ES sets out the methods used in calculating these figures, there is limited information upon the details of the calculation made. Nonetheless, no party has suggested the figures are incorrect.

11.7 The ES points out that an assessment of the significance of carbon emissions and their mitigation involves assessing significance of an effect upon a global receptor. We note

³⁴ [ES Volume 2 part 2](#)

³⁵ [Design and access statement](#)

³⁶ [ES Volume 2 part 2](#)

the applicant's comparison of the proposed development's carbon emissions with the emissions in a single year on Scotland's roads. In these contexts, the assessment made in the ES is that the emissions from the proposed development would not be significant. No party has suggested that the assessment is incorrect, and we accept it.

11.8 The applicant has undertaken to incorporate a number of mitigation measures into construction and operation of the development, including establishing a baseline for carbon reduction and encouraging the use of PAS 2080 principles in procurement and future project stages. It has also undertaken to promote the use of sustainable transport and in particular active travel options to minimise end-user carbon emissions. We consider that provision of a sustainable transport strategy as recommended by SPT could incorporate such measures.

Climate change adaptation

11.9 We note that the applicant took account of the predicted effects of climate change in the course of project design. This included designing infrastructure to accommodate predicted increased levels of flooding.

Soils

11.10 No significant effect upon soil was identified in the ES that could not be mitigated³⁷. We consider that suitable mitigation can be secured through a construction environmental management plan approved under conditions. No technical evidence has been produced to suggest the ES's conclusions are incorrect.

Unexploded ordnance

11.11 One objector referred to risks arising from the presence of unexploded ordnance, presumably from the bombing of Clydeside during the Second World War. While we do not rule out that unexploded ordnance may be found, this is not an issue that was raised by the planning authorities or consultees. Insofar as unexploded ordnance might be a hazard, we consider that this can be addressed by good health and safety practice in the construction of the proposed development. Given that the concern expressed by the objector is generalised, rather than specific to any particular location, we do not consider that it causes any constraint upon the proposed development.

Pests

11.12 Several objectors suggested that the construction might disturb pests, such as rodents, and cause them to enter residential property. This is not an issue that was raised by the planning authorities or statutory consultees. Given the generalised concern expressed and the lack of specific evidence that would suggest a problem would arise in this case, we consider that any significant problem from pests could be prevented by good construction practice.

³⁷ [ES volume 2 part 1](#) chapter 3

Fly-tipping

11.13 The creation of a new road through the Blythwood may increase the possibility of fly-tipping (which, it is evident, already occurs). One objector suggested that a roadside fence might be required to prevent fly-tipping. However, the issue was not raised by Renfrewshire Council. As the local authority, it has statutory powers to deal with fly-tipping and also, as roads authority, to erect roadside fences. We do not consider it would be appropriate to impose specific requirements to address the possibility of additional fly-tipping through a planning condition.

Property values

11.14 The effect of the proposed development on property values, adverse or otherwise, is not, by itself, a material planning consideration.

Land ownership and acquisition

11.15 Whether the applicant presently has all the land it requires to carry out the proposed development is not, by itself, a material consideration in the decision on the application.

Consultation

11.16 A number of objectors criticised the standard of the consultation, and some suggested that there would have been more objections if more people had known about the proposals.

11.17 There are statutory requirements for pre-application consultation for a major development. These include consultation with the community councils in the area, the holding of at least one public event and the publication of a notice in a local newspaper at least seven days in advance of the event. The planning authorities have the power to require more than these minimum arrangements. The applicant has submitted a report indicating that it met the requirements placed on it for pre-application consultation³⁸.

11.18 There are also statutory requirements for neighbour notification by the planning authority and advertising of the application itself, when it is made.

11.19 None of the evidence submitted by objectors indicates to us that any of the statutory requirements were not in fact met. While we understand that the objectors might consider that more should have been done by way of publicising the application, and that more objections would have been forthcoming had more been done, we note that the number of objections to an application is not, by itself, a material consideration in its determination.

³⁸ [Pre-application consultation report](#)

CHAPTER 12: OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Clydeplan

12.1 By reconnecting the adjacent communities of Clydebank and Yoker with Renfrew, reconnecting Renfrew to the Clyde riverside, supporting the reuse of vacant and underused land, contributing to the regeneration of the Clyde waterfront, and supporting significant new economic activity, we consider that the proposed development would contribute to progress on Clydeplan's development corridor, the main focus of its spatial development strategy.

12.2 As regards the principles of the spatial development strategy, notwithstanding some adverse environmental effects, we consider that the improvement in townscape quality that the proposed development would bring about either directly or through the regeneration it would encourage, would represent an overall improvement in environmental quality. The proposed development would incorporate active travel infrastructure, would improve its cross-river connection without preventing passage of river traffic, would reduce journey times and thereby would support sustainable transport, notwithstanding that public transport provision across the proposed bridge has not been secured. This is all in accordance with the strategy.

12.3 Although we note that a small reduction in carbon emissions is predicted in 2020 as a consequence of the proposed development, we acknowledge that there would be a small (non-significant) increase in end-user emissions by 2037 over a "do-nothing" prediction. Nonetheless, we consider that other predicted impacts of the project, including increased productivity, reduced unemployment and economic inactivity, and lower levels of social deprivation, together with higher levels of inward investment and development and increased spend in local businesses would mean it would promote sustainable economic growth.

12.4 It would be consistent also with the plan's vision, in particular, of making the Glasgow city region the largest and most dynamic such region in Scotland for sustainable and inclusive growth, of ensuring it is well connected to UK, European and global markets, of its communities being more sustainable and resilient.

12.5 Policy 1, Placemaking Principle: We found in this report's chapter 4 that the proposed development could draw support from Clydeplan Policy 1's expectations of high quality design and placemaking.

12.6 Given our findings in this report's chapter 6, we consider that the proposed development supports the provision of active travel and facilitates safe and convenient movement from one part of the city region to another. The proposed development would support redevelopment of brownfield locations and, with its improvement of cycle and pedestrian connections, the delivery of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Green Network. We consider therefore that it would support the compact city model. The proposed development and the development it would support would be aligned to the plan's spatial development strategy. They would be compatible with the town-centre-first principle and would maintain air quality. The bridge incorporated in the proposed development would be well designed, and would strengthen the community's sense of place.

12.7 We have acknowledged the proposed development's significant adverse effect on existing semi-natural forest, individually and cumulatively. We do not consider, however, subject to implementation of the replanting proposals and the provision of the walking and

cycling facilities incorporated in the design, that it is inconsistent with the delivery of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Green Network.

12.8 The proposed development would have significant adverse effects upon existing housing to the south of Meadowside Street East. However, we consider that, overall, the proposed development is likely to improve the urban environment, making it safer, more pleasant and more welcoming.

12.9 Although we acknowledge that the provision of public transport has not been secured, we nonetheless consider that the inclusion of active travel facilities, the reduction in local journey times and the potential for integrating public transport in future is consistent with the policy aim of creating a connected city region.

12.10 Overall, we consider that the proposed development is consistent with policy 1.

12.11 Policy 3, Glasgow and Clyde Valley City Deal: Although improving public transport is one of the purposes of the City Deal's infrastructure fund, it is not the only purpose. Even if no public transport can be provided across the proposed bridge and the proposed development's compatibility with a future improvement in public transport is discounted, we consider it would meet other purposes of the infrastructure fund.

12.12 We have found that the proposed development is consistent overall with Clydeplan's spatial development strategy. It is supported by policy 3.

12.13 Policy 4, Network of Strategic Centres: We found in this report's Chapter 5 that there would be no significant adverse effect upon the long term health of Glasgow City Centre or other strategic centres as a consequence of the proposed development. The proposed development is consistent with policy 4.

12.14 Policy 5, Strategic Economic Investment Locations: We noted in this report's chapter 5 that the proposed development would improve surface access to Glasgow Airport and that it is accordingly supported by policy 5.

12.15 Policy 13, Forestry and Woodland: We found in this report's chapter 8 that the proposed development would, subject to the proposed replanting of trees, meet policy 13's requirements.

12.16 Policy 16, Improving the Water Quality Environment and Managing Flood Risk and Drainage: We found in this report's chapter 9 that the proposed development would meet this policy's requirements.

12.17 Policy 17, Promoting Sustainable Transport, and policy 18, Strategic Walking and Cycling Network: We found in this report's chapter 6 that the proposed development found support in these policies.

12.18 Overall, we consider that the proposed development is supported by Clydeplan.

Local policy

Renfrewshire LDP

12.19 Policies E1, E2 and E3: We found in this report's chapter 5 that the proposed development would be supported by policies E1 (Renfrewshire's Economic Investment Locations) and E3 (Transition Areas). We also find that it is consistent with policy E2, which promotes the area around Glasgow Airport.

12.20 Policy I1 (Connecting Places) and policy I3 (Potential Transport Improvements): We found in this report's chapter 6 that the proposed development was consistent with policy I1 and delivered the Renfrew North Distributor Road, supported by policy I3.

12.21 Policy ENV2 (Natural Heritage), ENV3 (Built Heritage), ENV4 (Water Environment) and ENV5 (Air Quality): In this report's chapter 8, we found that the proposed development was not wholly consistent with policy ENV2 on account of the fragmentation it would cause to the Blythswood. The proposal would safeguard the built heritage in accordance with ENV3, protect the water environment in accordance with ENV4, and not have a significant adverse effect upon air quality in accordance with ENV5.

12.22 Policy P1 (Renfrewshire's Places): We have found that, given the significant adverse noise and vibration effects of the proposed development upon properties south of Meadowside Street and the in-combination effect arising from traffic noise and severance upon the same properties, the proposed development is not fully consistent with policy P1. However, some mitigation of noise effects is possible and we have also found that, for a project of this type on the proposed scale, these effects are relatively limited in extent.

12.23 The proposed development is not inconsistent with any other element of the plan. It complies with and would represent progress on the plan's spatial strategy, key elements of which include the Clyde Waterfront, Inchinnan and Westway Strategic Investment Locations and the Glasgow Airport Zone.

Glasgow City Development Plan

12.24 Glasgow City Council has acknowledged in its written submission that the proposed development is consistent with the key aims of the City Development Plan³⁹. It also addressed the project's consistency with relevant policies in the plan. We have the following comments.

12.25 CDP 1, the Placemaking Principle: We note that Glasgow City Council considers the proposed development's placemaking process has met the policy requirements. We agree. The council raises no other issue in respect of the policy. We consider its design would create a development demonstrating the six qualities of place set out in Scottish Planning Policy. It would be consistent with policy CDP 1.

12.26 CDP 2, Sustainable Spatial Strategy: We have considered in this report's Chapter 5 the effect of the proposed development on Glasgow City Centre and other town centres in Glasgow as a consequence of diversion of retail spending. We have not found any likelihood of a significant adverse effect, individually or cumulatively.

³⁹ [Glasgow City Council written submission](#)

12.27 We consider that the proposed development meets the aims of this policy by supporting regeneration of the Clyde Waterfront, supporting regeneration and redevelopment of housing investment areas, utilising a brownfield site, and supporting improved access to the city's waterways. We also consider that details of the proposed development's connections to Rothesay Dock and to the approved development in Dock Street can be approved under conditions, as can the provision of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists waiting for the bridge to open. With these matters addressed, we consider that the proposed development would contribute to creation of accessible neighbourhoods and to integrated green infrastructure.

12.28 Overall, the proposed development would be consistent with policy CDP 2.

12.29 CDP 3, Economic Strategy: The proposed development would improve the city's transport infrastructure. We have found it would promote economic growth by supporting and encouraging existing employment-generating business and industry and it would not adversely affect the vibrancy of Glasgow's town centres. It would therefore be consistent with policy CDP 3.

12.30 CDP 4, Network of Centres: We found in this report's Chapter 5 that the proposed development would be consistent with the policy CDP 4.

12.31 CDP 5, Resource Management: Since the proposed development is predicted slightly to increase end-user greenhouse gas emissions, we find that it is not fully consistent with policy CDP 5.

12.32 CDP 6, Green Network: The proposed development integrates infrastructure for active travel and opens up the Clyde waterfront. We consider that, subject to approval of details of the integration of this infrastructure with approved and proposed neighbouring infrastructure, the proposed development is consistent with policy CDP 6.

12.33 CDP 7, Natural Environment: Although the proposed development would have significant adverse effects upon semi-natural woodland and upon bats as a protected species the significant effects would occur in Renfrewshire, rather than in Glasgow. We consider that the proposed development is consistent with policy CDP 7.

12.34 CDP 8, Water Environment: We found in this report's chapter 9 that the proposed development complied with policy CDP 8.

12.35 CDP 9, Historic Environment: We do not consider that the proposed development would have any significant adverse effect upon the historic environment in the Glasgow area.

12.36 CDP 10, Meeting Housing Needs: We have not found any reason to believe that the proposed development would prejudice the proposed housing development to the east of Dock Street. We do consider that details of the integration of the transport connections and of the realignment of the Yoker Burn require to be approved under condition.

12.37 CDP 11, Sustainable Transport: We found that the proposed development would be compatible with policy CDP 11 in this report's chapter 6.

West Dunbartonshire

12.38 GD 1, Development Control: We consider that the design and access statement and masterplan demonstrate that the proposed development is appropriate to its local area. The council acknowledges that it would involve upgrading Dock Street in a manner similar to that envisaged by the local plan.

12.39 We have rejected West Dunbartonshire Council's claim that there would be an adverse effect upon the Queen's Quay housing development, which it states is supported by policy RP 1.

12.40 We also concluded in this report's chapter 5 that the proposed development would be consistent with policies LE 6 (Strategic Employment Locations) and RET 1 (Retail and Town Centre Strategy).

12.41 We therefore reject the council's claim that the proposed development might be contrary to policy SUS 1 on sustainable development. The claim was made on the basis that the proposed development could compromise the area's future well-being. We have found no significant adverse socio-economic effect upon West Dunbartonshire as a consequence of the proposed development.

12.42 We consider that the proposed development is consistent, overall, with the overarching development strategy of the West Dunbartonshire Local Plan. It would, within West Dunbartonshire, promote sustainable development and communities, contribute to economic well-being and the creation of a sustainable and competitive place, and maintain and enhance (overall) the natural and built environment.

12.43 As regards the proposed West Dunbartonshire local development plan, we have not found the proposed development to be inconsistent with any of its policies.

Consistency with the development plan

12.44 We have found that the proposed development would not be fully consistent with Renfrewshire LDP policies ENV2 and P1 or with the Glasgow City LDP policy CDP 5. However we consider that overall, the proposed development accords with and is supported by the thrust of policy in these plans.

12.45 We have not found any inconsistency with the development plan in West Dunbartonshire.

12.46 We find that the proposed development would be consistent with the development plan in each of the three council areas in which it lies.

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)

12.47 We have acknowledged a number of significant adverse effects, including those upon amenity of certain residents to the south of Meadowside Street, from road traffic noise upon the approved development at Dock Street, upon the semi-natural woodland of the Blythswood through habitat loss and fragmentation, and upon bats.

12.48 We have also found that these effects are relatively limited given the scale of the proposed development and are outweighed by the socio-economic and other benefits we have found that it would bring. We therefore agree with the applicants that the proposed development would contribute to sustainable economic growth and would contribute to achieving three of the planning outcomes sought by the Scottish Government: creating a more successful and sustainable place, a more resilient place, and a more connected place.

12.49 In the longer term there is predicted to be an increase in end-user carbon emissions as a consequence of the proposed development. However, the predicted increase is small and not assessed as significant. The proposed development would encourage active travel and reduce journey times. We consider therefore that it is also consistent with achieving the outcome of a low carbon place.

12.50 As regards the principles that apply in determining whether the proposed development contributes to sustainable development, we find:

- it would have a net economic benefit;
- its creation of a cross-river connection, its improvement of access to Glasgow Airport, its creation of new jobs on both sides of the Clyde, its creation of new jobs, the support it would provide to the regeneration of the riverside and to meeting housing supply targets all respond to economic issues identified in the Glasgow City Region economic action plan;
- the proposed bridge and road is well designed;
- the local connection provided would allow more efficient use of existing capacities of land by connecting communities to public services, labour and property markets and by encouraging redevelopment opportunities;
- it would support the development of transport infrastructure;
- it takes account of increased flood risk caused by climate change;
- notwithstanding some significant adverse effects, for the most part it protects amenity of new and existing development, protects and promotes access to natural heritage and takes account of impacts upon water, air and soil quality.

Overall, we consider that the proposal does benefit from the presumption in favour of development contributing to sustainable development.

National Planning Framework (NPF3)

12.51 As set out above in respect of SPP, we consider that it contributes to or is at least consistent with the four elements of the Scottish Government's vision for Scotland set out in NPF3. In dealing with the Glasgow and Clyde Valley city region, NPF3 refers to the City Deal as building upon the region's economic strategy, provides support to the development corridor policy set out in the strategic development plan, supports regeneration as a central focus of planning across the region, supports the provision of sustainable infrastructure networks and the incorporation of resilience to climate change in new development, and supports continuing work to improve surface access to Glasgow Airport. We consider that the proposed development is consistent with these policies.

Conclusion

12.52 We therefore find that, overall, the proposed development is consistent with the development plans in the three planning authority areas in which it is located, and that there are no material considerations that indicate it should nonetheless be refused. Consequently,

we recommend it should be granted permission subject to the conditions set out in schedule 2 below.

David Buylla
Robert Seaton
Reporters

Appendix 1: List of application plans

GENERAL LAYOUT PLAN	117086-SWECO-HGN-00-DR-D-40001 rev P01.7
INCHINNAN ROAD CYCLE LINK PLAN AND PROFILE SHEET 1 OF 2	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40001 rev P01.5
INCHINNAN ROAD CYCLE LINK PLAN AND PROFILE SHEET 2 OF 2	17086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40002 rev P01.6
MEADOW SIDE STREET ACCESS 1, 2 & 3 PLAN & PROFILE	17086-SWECO-HSR-00-DR-D-40004 rev P01.3
MEADOW SIDE STREET ACCESS 4 PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HSR-00-DR-D-40005 rev P01.4
MEADOW SIDE STREET ACCESS 5 PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HSR-00-DR-D-40006 rev P01.5
MEADOWSIDE STREET EAST PLAN & PROFILE SHEET 1 OF 2	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40007 rev P01.6
MEADOWSIDE STREET EAST PLAN & PROFILE SHEET 2 OF 2	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40008 rev P01.6
MEADOWSIDE STREET EAST RETAINING WALL SHEET 1 OF 1	117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40014 rev P01.3
MEADOWSIDE STREET WEST PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40009 rev P01.7
NEIL STREET REALIGNMENT PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HSR-00-DR-D-40001 rev P01.4
NORTHERN APPROACH & DOCK STREET NORTH & SOUTH PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40011 rev P01.8
CWRR PLANNING APPLICATION LOCATION PLAN	117086-SWECO-HGN-00-DR-D-40003 rev P01.4
PROPOSED CLYDE CROSSING PLANNING ARRANGEMENT - 1 OF 2 DECK OPEN TO ROAD	117086-SWECO-SSP-00-DR-S-00001 rev P02.2
PROPOSED CLYDE CROSSING PLANNING ARRANGEMENT - 2 OF 2 DECK OPEN TO SHIPPING	117086-SWECO-SSP-00-DR-S-00002 rev P02.2
CROSS SECTIONS SHEET 1 OF 2	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40013 rev P01.3
CROSS SECTIONS SHEET 2 OF 2	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40014 rev P01.3
YOKER STATION CYCLE LINK PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40012 rev P01.8
ROTHESAY DOCK ACCESS ROAD PLAN AND PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HSR-00-DR-D-40007 rev P01.7
NORTH BANK LAYOUT PLAN PLANNING	117086-SWECO-SBR-00-DR-S-45000 rev P03.2
SOUTH BANK LAYOUT PLAN	117086-SWECO-SBR-00-DR-S-44000 rev P03.2

CIN-RFS-001
CIN-GLW-001
CIN-WDS-001

PLANNING	
ARGYLL AVENUE PLAN & PROFILE SHEET 1 OF 4	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40003 rev P01.7
ARGYLL AVENUE PLAN & PROFILE SHEET 2 OF 4	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40004 rev P01.5
ARGYLL AVENUE PLAN & PROFILE SHEET 3 OF 4	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40005 rev P01.5
ARGYLL AVENUE PLAN & PROFILE SHEET 4 OF 4	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40006 rev P01.5
LOBNITZ DOCK RETAINING WALL GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANNING	117086-SWECO-SRW-00-DR-S-42000 rev P01.4
NORTH SIDE CONTROL BUILDING LAYOUT	117086-SWECO-SBR-00-DR-S-00415 rev P01.1
NORTH SIDE CONTROL BUILDING ELEVATIONS	117086-SWECO-SBR-00-DR-S-00416 rev P01.1
SOUTH SIDE CONTROL BUILDING LAYOUT	117086-SWECO-SBR-00-DR-S-00405 rev P01.1
SOUTH SIDE CONTROL BUILDING ELEVATIONS (SHEET 1 OF 2)	117086-SWECO-SBR-00-DR-S-00406 rev P01.1
SOUTH SIDE CONTROL BUILDING ELEVATIONS (SHEET 2 OF 2)	117086-SWECO-SBR-00-DR-S-00407 rev P01.1
YORKER BURN CULVERT REALIGNMENT GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANNING	117086-SWECO-SBR-00-DR-S-41000 rev P02.2
BRIDGE CONTROL ROOM ACCESS ROAD PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HSR-00-DR-D-40002 rev P01.9
BRIDGE PLANT ROOM ACCESS TRACK PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HSR-00-DR-D-40003 rev P01.12
BUILDINGS TO BE DEMOLISHED WITHIN CHRISTIE & SON LTD	117086-SWECO-HSC-00-DR-D-40001 rev P01.4
CLYDE CROSSING & SOUTHERN APPROACH PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HML-00-DR-D-40010 rev P01.7
FUTURE DEVELOPMENT ACCESS ROAD PLAN & PROFILE	117086-SWECO-HSR-00-DR-D-40008 rev P01.7

Schedule 2: List of conditions to be applied if planning permission is granted

1. The development's construction shall not be commenced until the following have been submitted and approved in writing by the planning authorities:
 - a. a geotechnical interpretative report including measures to mitigate the risks of dewatering or alteration of the groundwater regime and of contamination of the water environment based upon or fulfilling the same purpose as those set out in the environmental statement, volume 2, paragraph 3.7.7;
 - b. a construction environment management plan (CEMP) based upon the outline provided at volume 2 appendix 1.2 of the environmental statement;
 - c. measures to protect retained trees during construction;
 - d. a construction traffic management plan (TMP) incorporating measures set out in paragraphs 12.8.1 to 12.8.12 of the environmental statement volume 2;
 - e. details for the provision of shelters at either side of the bridge for pedestrians and cyclists waiting to cross the bridge;
 - f. written scheme of archaeological investigation, including the measures set out in paragraph 7.7 of the environmental statement;
 - g. variable message sign system to provide information for those using and accessing the bridge incorporating details similar to those provided in the general layout plan of variable message signs submitted with the application 117086-SWECO-HMC-00-DR-E-40001;
 - h. details of the bridge, including details of road closure barriers;
 - i. measures to discourage vehicles from waiting in the area of the bridgeheads and from leaving engines idling in those areas;
 - j. a scheme to optimise traffic signal operation at junctions along Dumbarton Road, Ferry Road and Abbotsinch Road;
 - k. details of the Yoker Burn culvert's realignment;
 - l. details of the roads, footpaths and cycleways to connect the development with land lying to the east of Dock Street, including details of a connection for a cyclepath running east-west along the bank of the River Clyde with a cycle crossing over the road north of the bridge approved as part of the proposed development, and also details of the connection of the east-west path along the Clyde to the Rothesay Dock;
 - m. details of the A814 Glasgow Road / Dock Street junction;
 - n. details of the programme for removing invasive non-native species in the course of construction works;
 - o. measures to be taken to protect retained trees during construction;

- p. design of lighting columns;
- q. a report showing finalised carbon values associated with the specified design, setting out the arrangements to be included in the tendering and procurement process to ensure that the ability of contractors to reduce carbon emissions will be a determining factor in the process, and how reduction of carbon emissions will be encouraged throughout procurement and future project stages;
- r. a sustainable transport strategy;
- s. arrangements for continued air quality monitoring at the junction of Kelso Street and Dumbarton Road during the development's operation;
- t. details of hard and soft landscaping, water landscaping and landscape planting, including the species, number and spacing of trees and shrubs and incorporating details based upon those provided in the indicative plans of landscape planting supplied with the application, including:
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40003 Argyll Avenue Indicative Landscape Layout Sheet 1 of 3
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40004 Argyll Avenue Indicative Landscape Layout Sheet 2 of 3
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40005 Argyll Avenue Indicative Landscape Layout Sheet 3 of 3
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40006 Meadowside Street East Indicative Landscape Layout Sheet 1 of 2
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40007 Meadowside Street East Indicative Landscape Layout Sheet 2 of 2
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40008 Meadowside Street West Indicative Landscape Layout Sheet 2 of 2
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40009 Clyde Crossing & Southern Approach Indicative Landscape Layout sheet 1 of 1
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40010 Dock Street North & South Indicative Landscape Layout Sheet 1 of 1
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40016 Indicative Landscape Cross-Sections Sheet 1 of 2
 - 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40017 Indicative Landscape Cross-Sections Sheet 2 of 2

The details submitted for approval shall include a timetable for their implementation. The details shall then be implemented as approved.

Reasons: This condition provides a list of matters that are still to be determined before the project can proceed. The reasons for requiring these further details to be approved and then implemented are for each of the items above as follows:

- a. to ensure that measures mitigating the risk of dewatering or alteration of the groundwater regime or contamination of groundwater are fully adapted to the geotechnical context;
- b. to ensure measures to manage and mitigate the adverse environmental effects of construction are considered in advance and secured, including effects on amenity, soil, water, air quality, and upon flora and fauna;

- c. to ensure that trees proposed to be retained are protected during construction so as to minimise the development's effect upon existing trees and woodland;
- d. to ensure that the movement of materials and staff during construction is managed so that these operations are carried out safely while minimising the impact upon the flow of traffic, disturbance to residents and impact upon their amenity and other environmental impacts;
- e. to ensure suitable facilities are provided at the bridge to allow passengers and cyclists reasonable protection from the weather while waiting for the bridge to open, so as to maximise active travel;
- f. to ensure that any archaeology in areas to be disturbed in the course of development is identified, investigated and recorded;
- g. to advise drivers and other bridge users in advance so that they know when the bridge is closed. This is both for the convenience of bridge users and to minimise congestion and related adverse consequences arising from vehicles queuing at the bridge;
- h. to ensure a high standard of design in finalising the details of the bridge and that road barriers are of a suitable standard of design to match the quality of the bridge's design;
- i. to prevent adverse effects of vehicles waiting at the bridge (and, particularly, of leaving their engines idling while waiting) including congestion, noise and adverse effects upon air quality;
- j. to ensure traffic signals are modified to take account of the new development and availability of the bridge and so maximise the benefits of the bridge in terms of improving traffic flow;
- k. to ensure suitability of the realigned culvert for management of the Yoker Burn and compatibility with development of the site east of Dock Street for housing;
- l. to ensure connectivity of roads, footpaths and cycleways formed on the north side of the Clyde as part of the development with existing or proposed routes, including with the proposed east-west pedestrian and cycle path along the Clyde's north bank, and to ensure compatibility in particular with development of the site east of Dock Street;
- m. to ensure compatibility of the development with the development of a North Clyde Development Route;
- n. to ensure that invasive non-native species proposed to be removed in the course of the development are properly removed and disposed of;
- o. to ensure that trees to be retained are not harmed during the course of construction and the impact upon protected trees in Blythswood in particular is minimised;
- p. to ensure that the lighting standards are of a suitable standard of design and that the adverse impact particularly of artificial light on visual amenity and on wildlife, including bats, is kept to a minimum;
- q. to monitor that the PAS 2080 process for carbon management in infrastructure development continues to be followed in the course of development and to ensure that processes to secure reduction in carbon emissions are incorporated in procurement and future project stages;
- r. to maximise modal shift from car use to active travel and, where possible, to public transport in the operation of the proposed development and to minimise adverse effects arising from the increase in end-user carbon emissions predicted in the environmental statement as a consequence of the development;
- s. to monitor changes in air quality as a consequence of the proposed development and thereby to inform the local authority in subsequent performance of its duties in respect of air quality in response to those changes; and
- t. to ensure that landscaping associated with the development is of a suitably high quality and that it is compatible with the context of the development.

2. Landscaping details submitted for approval under condition 1 must comply with Advice Note 3 *Potential Bird Hazards from Amenity Landscaping & Building Design* published by the Airport Operators Association (AOA). Any sustainable urban drainage system must comply with Advice Note 6 *Potential Bird Hazards from Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems* published by the AOA. Following approval, no subsequent alterations to landscaping may be made unless according to details submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that landscape is designed in such a way that it does not endanger the safe movement of aircraft or the operation of Glasgow Airport through the attraction of birds and an increase in risk to aviation from bird strikes.

3. The four masts of the bridge hereby permitted shall not exceed 44.98 m AOD at mast reference points in the open and closed positions as follows:

Closed to river:

NW1 = E = 250467.9005 N = 668884.1615
NW2 = E = 250468.1969 N = 668884.5642
NW3 = E = 250468.4932 N = 668884.9668
NE1 = E = 250486.0357 N = 668844.8995
NE2 = E = 250485.7394 N = 668844.4968
NE3 = E = 250485.4430 N = 668844.0941
SW1 = E = 250388.4671 N = 668776.2433
SW2 = E = 250388.7635 N = 668776.6460
SW3 = E = 250389.0598 N = 668777.0486
SE1 = E = 250406.6023 N = 668736.9813
SE2 = E = 250406.3060 N = 668736.5786
SE3 = E = 250406.0096 N = 668736.1759

Open to river

NW4 = E = 250460.0729 N = 668851.0341
NW5 = E = 250459.6111 N = 668851.2257
NW6 = E = 250459.1493 N = 668851.4172
NE4 = E = 250493.8633 N = 668878.0269
NE5 = E = 250494.3251 N = 668877.8353
NE6 = E = 250494.7870 N = 668877.6437
SW4 = E = 250380.3221 N = 668743.5232
SW5 = E = 250379.8650 N = 668743.7257
SW6 = E = 250379.4078 N = 668743.9282
SE4 = E = 250414.7473 N = 668769.7014
SE5 = E = 250415.2045 N = 668769.4988
SE6 = E = 250415.6616 N = 668769.2963

No subsequent alterations to the approved location plans or elevations may take place unless submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: Development exceeding this height, or at an alternative location, may penetrate the Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) surrounding Glasgow Airport. To allow for changes that may arise in design and construction, the condition allows for alteration in the mast reference points. In determining whether any alteration would be acceptable with regard to aviation

safety, the planning authority may find it necessary to consult with the operator of Glasgow Airport.

4. The development's construction shall not be commenced until the following have been appointed:

- a. an environmental site manager, with responsibility to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the CEMP are fully implemented and activities are carried out in such a manner as to prevent or reduce impacts on the environment.
- b. an ecological clerk of works (ECoW).

Before either person is appointed, the terms of reference under which they are to be appointed must be approved in writing by the planning authorities. The ECoW's terms of reference shall include authority to halt works on site for reasons relating to his or her remit. If either of these posts falls vacant, a person shall be appointed to fill them again without delay.

Reason: to ensure performance of the requirements of the CEMP and other environmental protection measures set out in the conditions and to ensure that the development's construction is managed in a way that minimises its adverse effects upon the environment.

5. The construction of that part of the development lying within Renfrewshire shall not commence until Renfrewshire Council has approved in writing the following:

- a. a scheme for providing an offer of insulation or other suitable noise mitigation to those properties likely to be significantly affected by noise or airborne vibration from additional road traffic generated by the development and that would otherwise be likely to suffer nuisance as a consequence of that noise or vibration;
- b. details of at least five hectares of compensatory tree planting and its subsequent maintenance and details of woodland improvement works, incorporating proposals based upon those shown in the indicative plan of compensatory planting and woodland management proposals 117086-SWECO-ELS-00-DR-L-40013.

The details submitted for approval shall include a timetable for their implementation. The details shall then be implemented as approved.

Reasons: This condition provides for two matters that are still to be determined before the project can proceed but relate exclusively to the Renfrewshire Council area. There are separate reasons for requiring these two matters to be approved then implemented:

- a. The environmental statement estimated that a number of dwellings south of Meadowside Street would be significantly adversely affected by noise and airborne vibration caused by additional traffic generated by the proposed development. It proposed a scheme of noise mitigation in addition to the statutory scheme requiring noise insulation to be provided to certain dwellings. A scheme is therefore required to identify specific properties that are likely to suffer nuisance and to offer insulation or other noise mitigation for those properties.
- b. Compensatory planting and woodland improvement works in Blythswood are required to compensate for loss of 2.6 hectares of woodland in Blythswood as a consequence of the proposed development.

6. The development's construction shall not be commenced unless ecological surveys have been carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist at an appropriate time of year to update the baseline information provided in chapter 6 of the environmental statement and a report on the updated surveys has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authorities.

Reason: to identify whether there are protected species on the site before construction commences and to inform the protection of individuals of those species during construction and more generally to inform the ecological mitigation measures incorporated in the CEMP.

7. Site clearance and demolition work shall not be undertaken during the breeding bird season (between 1 April and 31 August) except with the consent in writing of the planning authority for the area in which such works are proposed.

Reason: to prevent disturbance of breeding birds.