

Waterside Community Council
Public ASN Consultation Meeting of Tuesday 12 June 2018

WCC:

Chair: Janice Herriot; Vice-chair: Chic Whiteford; Treasurer: Karen Chesney-Bathie;
Former Chair: Bill Lapping; Interested Tenant: Elspeth Carlin; Website Coordinator: Cordy Lilly

Council:

Thomas Glen, Depute Chief Executive; Fraser Robb, Capital Programme Manager;
Jacqueline MacDonald, Chief Education Officer;
Samantha Burke, Primary School Improvement Programme Project Officer
& Members of the Public

Apologies: WCC Secretary: Janice Whyte

1. Meeting started just after 7.30 pm with a welcome and introduction by JH, who said that Waterside Community Council (WCC) had had meetings with the council over the previous two weeks; there had been four public consultation meetings on the proposed ASN school, all based on its offering in terms of education, facilities etc, and focused on what it would mean for parents, teachers and students. There had been no mention of the effects of siting it on Waterside football park for Waterside villagers and the Rosebank community, hence this public meeting to give residents a chance to voice opinions and concerns and to ask questions before the consultation deadline of midday on Friday 15 June.
2. JH summarized WCC views following its meetings with the council:
 - WCC agreed the ASN school was needed but on the right site. WCC did not believe the playing field was the right site.
 - Building the school on the playing field (designated as **open space** and **green belt** under the Local Development Plan) would not only contravene the Local Development Plan but also numerous Scottish government planning policies.
 - During the options appraisal stage, reference had been made to the possibility of resident objections in the case of the other sites, but this possibility was not mentioned for Waterside.
 - There were many brownfield site that could have been redeveloped, one of which was the site at the back of Whitegates/Monklands. This site, bordering the Deafblind school, would simplify traffic management because of access via Initiative Rd. It was also within easy access of both Kirkintilloch High School and St Ninian's.
 - Auchinairn was discounted because of its topography. But if funds were not an issue, why not spend a little more to develop on the footprint of Auchinairn school? Services were already in place. Developers could get round topography issues spending a bit extra.
 - WCC felt that EDC was offering mere crumbs. They had not approached WCC till latter stages; crumbs they were offering were new 5-aside/7-aside football pitches, but these would come at an additional cost to hire for the community, out of the reach of ordinary families and the clubs that use Waterside football pitch now.
 - One of main hirers of the football field was Rosebank United Football Club (with its approx. 200 children). They could not afford the hire fees of other facilities [Astroturf pitches] and were reliant on cheaper grass pitches. If the school proposal went ahead and Waterside football park were lost, this might result in the club folding.
 - Over the last couple of years WCC had worked tirelessly to improve the village and had had success in applying for funding, some from EDC, which had allowed it to plant fruit trees, wild flowers, etc. The gala day on 11 August was benefiting from grant funding. If Waterside lost that field, where would it be able to hold such events in the future? This was another reason why it was so crucial to keep the field.

3. JH requested that participants not interrupt one another despite feelings running high. Forms were available in the hall to send feedback on the ASN proposal by the deadline of 15 June.

4. **Q&A session**

[NB in the account below, **TG** = Thomas Glen; **FR** = Fraser Robb; **JMacD** = Jacqueline MacDonald; **W/R** = a speaker from Waterside or Rosebank.

Waterside comments are recorded more or less verbatim, if shortened, for the record.

Council responses are in reported speech]

W/R: Rumour has it that the council has actually voted and agreed to the site being used. How would EDC answer this?

TG said he would first respond to a couple of JH's points. Re the options appraisal, in which 13 sites had been considered, he said Auchinairn could not provide all the facilities on one level – critical to a school like this; it was not a question of cost; the Whitegates site was not owned by the council and was already in the process of being sold subject to conclusion of missives. Re the previous four consultation meetings, while they had taken place on Campsie View and Merkland premises, they had not been exclusively for the school community, and representatives of WCC had been at each. He agreed it had been an omission that the Waterside community had not been consulted sooner. He also agreed that the football field was designated as green belt and that planning was a risk to this project (as highlighted in the options appraisal). He also wanted to respond to the suggestions, which he said were inaccurate, that football facilities on the site would be limited to a 5-aside or 7-aside area and that the development would stop local community events. He said although the council did not yet have a design for the school, they could accommodate a full-sized pitch on the site; that they'd asked designers to look at requirements for buildings and ancillary needs and it was clear it could be done; they would also look at ensuring there were facilities where the community could host events, including the gala.

W/R: Would such facilities be inside or outside?

TG said there was no design yet so he couldn't say. Re the previous question, no decision had yet been taken about the site. This would follow the consultation process, and the decision would be taken later in 2018.

W/R: Is it true that after Friday we can do nothing, that it's the closing date for the comments for all of us (though we've only known about this for a month), while the council has had some two years to consider this project?

JMacD said that the consultation had started on 23 April and had been extended by a week till 15 June. After that, the council would summarize views, Education Scotland would make a report, and the council would take stock.

W/R: This process of choosing a site has been going on for two years. During that time, the St Agatha's school site has been sold though it could have been used along with Gartconner, which the council was already looking at developing. Was this considered, or did the council go ahead and sell anyway?

FR said that the options appraisal had been undertaken towards the end of the previous year [2017]; it had not been going on for two years. The St Agatha's site had been sold some time before. St Agatha's would have been too small, and there would not have been enough space even using both. He said there was no proposal for Gartconner at the moment.

Lynne (Campsie View teacher) said she had been to every consultation meeting. The school was consulted about having a new school, and that consultation had been going on for a while. It was not consulted about a specific site. Staff, parents and children had only heard about the Waterside plan at exactly the same time as Waterside.

W/R: I was told by one of your colleagues at the Merkland consultation (a teacher from Campsie View) that they chose Waterside as their preferred site.

Lynne (Campsie View teacher) said that at the end they had chosen Waterside in preference to Auchinairn, but the site had not been discussed till Waterside heard about it too.

[Note from minute taker: a parent mentioned to a WCC meeting attendee in November 2017 that they were going to have a school on the playing field in Waterside, so some of the school community did know before we had official news of this.]

Lynne (Campsie View teacher) said she was sure she spoke on behalf of both schools when she said the schools worked really hard with the communities where they were; they didn't want to see it as "you and us". There would be a pitch. She said that as a mother of boys it was clear to her that modern children liked to play football on Astroturf these days. She said the council had already said they would work with the community to provide the facilities Waterside needed.

W/R (WCC chair): This meeting is not to discuss what EDC has now said they will offer. EDC should have been at the table with Waterside a long time ago, when the pitch was considered. EDC has failed to work with the community.

ASN school parent: How often are these playing fields actually used?

W/R (WCC chair): Look at the wall posters. These fields are used all the time. Every Saturday during the football season there is a junior and a senior match. When they're not being used for football, kids play on them. Kids were playing there this evening. There were bikes on the fields. There were toys on the field.

Parent: My kids like to play on Xboxes [?]

W/R (WCC chair): Every child is different, but perhaps your children need to get out more.

W/R: As part of the consultation, we put some questions to EDC and received answers. I'm confused by EDC's answer to one of the questions. The question was 'How can you propose to build on a site (Waterside playing fields) designated as open space when five other sites (including brownfield sites) scored higher in the options appraisal?' Their answer was that some of the sites had been discounted as being a) too small or b) because they were to be used for something else or c) they weren't within council ownership. Clearly, any such site could not be used. So why were sites that were too small ever on the shortlist? You knew they had to have a minimum of 14,000 m². If they were already committed to another use, why were they on the shortlist? Why were these sites ever in the options appraisal if they did not fit the criteria? If the sites were not within the council's ownership, when was this criterion agreed? Before the options appraisal or after? If before, why were they in the appraisals document if they didn't meet this criterion? When were the criteria agreed and by whom? If after the options appraisal, what a waste of time and resources not to outline these criteria from the outset. Cynical people would say that there were sites on that shortlist that didn't stand a chance of being considered. Wasn't this in fact just a box ticking exercise?

FR said that the purpose of the options appraisal had been to inform council officer recommendations. Thirteen sites had been included that either met the criteria or because they had to be included since the sites of the existing schools had to be considered. Campsie View was much too small. The decision to include sites that were outwith council ownership had been taken from an assets point of view to make sure the process had considered all possible options. After the process it was decided that these were too risky for this particular proposal. There was a risk if the council proactively acquired a site as this could undermine consultation process. If it didn't acquire a site before the consultation, it could effectively be held to ransom by a third party afterwards.

W/R: How could it undermine the consultation process to price land?

FR said that for example, Hilton would only work if EDC acquired adjacent green belt land. The council had taken a principled view that they couldn't proceed with a recommendation where the land was outwith council ownership.

W/R: This consultation seems to be around two very different issues. If the consultation had been around the closure of the two schools to suit the children, no one would have had an issue with it. We would have said yes. Surely only once this was decided would it have been appropriate to look at where to put it? The way this has been done, with these two issues mixed up, it makes it look as if Waterside is stopping a replacement facility.

TG said that legislation required the council to identify a potential site for the consultation.

W/R: So if our response stops the school happening here, what happens? Does it just mean the merger doesn't go ahead?

JMacD responded that it would have been difficult to tell parents the school was going to close without a replacement site having been identified; once the consultation was over, EDC would review all the comments before putting the outcome to elected members. The whole point of this consultation had been to consult on the closure of the schools together with the Waterside site. Council officers had to wait for the outcome before it could be taken to elected members.

W/R: So the outcome could be that everyone has agreed to the merger but it isn't going to happen because of the concerns over the site?

JMacD said she thought in that case EDC would have to consult on a different option.

W/R: What about Woodhead Park?

W/R: WCC held a closed meeting to discuss what Waterside needed to do before consultation deadline so as to be able to provide tools to help the community respond to consultation. (Feel free to photograph information posters on the walls. These are there to help you. Information will also be available on the WCC website.) I was initially delighted that there was going to be a school in Waterside, but then I heard where it was going to be and I realized it was going to take away too much. Perhaps not everyone is aware of the regeneration that has been going on in the village? When you talk about mitigation for loss of open space, are you aware of this, that there are plans for a gala/festival, which will end up being a one-off event if this school proposal goes ahead? As a community we have a lot going on. The field is being used. This consultation should be looking at more sites.

W/R: There would be a massive impact on transport. The roads department probably don't know how many coaches are coming in and out of the village and how many businesses there are here. There are 27 coaches coming out of Waterside every morning thanks to the three coach businesses. There are ten businesses in the industrial park. We have so much traffic, and the impact of having this school on the village would be enormous. Additionally, although we're not against the school – we hope the children will get a great school – we only have one park. If we lose that, there's nothing else.

W/R: Why wasn't the 'cornfield' site [field between playing field and Gartconner] put into the options appraisal (as it was for St Ninian's; fell through because of traffic)? It's been unused for 20 years.

FR said that the council didn't own it, but he didn't know the background referred to.

W/R: Why not use money gained from purchase of St Agatha's to buy it? Why not make a compulsory purchase?

FR said they had already explained about not buying sites from a third party.

TG said that receipts from St Agatha's had been used in the funding of Holy Trinity and Lenzie Meadow.

W/R: Aren't these schools leased from the company that builds them for 10 years?

TG said that they weren't. This was the case for secondary schools but not primary schools.

W/R: Fraser [Robb] spoke about the legal requirements for statutory consultation, but the consultation was already prejudiced by selecting sites in the options appraisal that you

didn't own. Doesn't it mean the list of 13 was already invalid before the start of the consultation? You also set the statutory requirements. You've said already you can purchase sites/make agreements for different types of development subject to planning permission (very normal activity). Why not for this one? I don't understand. You could have drafted an agreement to buy land next to the Hilton depot and had it ready to be activated subject to getting planning permission. You could have spent £1K getting an agent to talk to a farmer about a field. You have an obligation to use our money wisely; what we're asking you to do is to use proper due diligence when looking at the options appraisal. We understand there's a process, but surely spending £1K on an agent's fees talking to a farmer about potential site purchase is money well spent? At the moment you'll be spending £20,000 on architect's fees if you go ahead trying to get planning permission on Waterside football field. Isn't that more of a risk?

TG said that it changed the dynamic once the council said it wanted to buy a site. The council needed to try to deliver best value for money for the whole of East Dunbartonshire, not just for Waterside. It would be a real challenge if they had to say there were possible sites [i.e. Waterside] within council ownership where they thought the proposal could be developed. They could then be asked why they were spending millions of pounds on sites they didn't own if so. He asked if this were really the best use of public money and then answered his own question suggesting that it wasn't.

W/R: But it's green belt.

TG said that the wider community could argue that it was not good use of public money to buy elsewhere. Audit Scotland could make the same argument over public sector resources.

W/R: What about the massive site at Luggie Park (the ash football park off Waterside Road)? It's never used; I've never seen an event on it. It's a big piece of land. This isn't about you and us. This is about Waterside and the Waterside community trying to protect the only thing we have left: our football park.

TG said the council could deliver a full-size football pitch on the school site.

W/R: We don't want any building on that site. We want it as it is.

FR said the developable part of the Luggie Park area was not big enough.

W/R: Please measure it. There's a car park there too. It's massive.

W/R: As a physio I had a discussion with a deputy head of an ASN school. I'm told transport is the biggest expenditure, with many children requiring taxis. One particular child costs £40,000 a year in transport. Is this cost a feature of the proposal? Transport costs for Waterside could be £8m a year (worst case scenario for 200 children @ £40K) at this rate. £40,000 is evidently not an unusual bill for a child for an academic year. This hasn't featured in the consultation. There will be at least 80 different vehicles coming into Waterside.

JMacD said the council had a requirement to meet transport costs for children with additional support needs. This did not feature in the consultation since the council was already covering this cost for Campsie View and Merkland.

W/R: It's the amount of transport coming into Waterside. How are you going to get 80 vehicles into the village? Has the roads department looked at this? There's only one road in and one road out.

TG said that if it were decided to take Waterside to the planning stage, this aspect would be looked at. The council was aware of traffic issues around the junction. One option was to look at access options for where to bring the traffic into the school.

Lynne (Campsie View teacher) said that most of their children came by bus, not by taxi.

W/R: They come by taxis. I know how they run it.

W/R: I live on Waterside Rd, where I have been for nearly 50 years. The traffic has tripled in that time. During the bad weather, traffic couldn't even get into the village. Villagers had to clear the road. Do you realize how many schools there are on the Waterside Road now?

Traffic at peak times is ridiculous. Why here? Is Kirkintilloch the only area for an ASN school?

East Dunbartonshire is a big area. If they travel by bus/taxi, why not Bishopbriggs, Milton of Campsie, Milngavie? I agree with the village. I see children playing on that field, the green belt. It's ridiculous that the government talks about the need for children to be active but you actually want to take that one space away. Crazy to think of building there. I've nothing against the ASN school in the right place.

W/R: I'd like to go back to process. You'll have seen from our initial letter/questions that we are giving objections on grounds of policy. We've seen from your replies that you would mitigate losses. As part of consultation, can there be enhanced advice from the planning department on some of the policy contraventions? For instance on roads, parts can be widened, bits stolen. As a community, we're worried about Waterside losing its character because of the loss of the green space. It's not just about the loss of a pitch that is used a lot; Waterside looks like the village it is because of this green buffer zone. Yes, there's the potential to plant trees, but they'd take 50 years to grow. Looking at the scale of what is a significant building, there's no setback that you can design that would act as a proper buffer zone. I don't think some of these policy contraventions can be mitigated under those planning policies. It would therefore be reasonable to get planning advice at a higher level. Some of the mitigation measures just don't wash. If you try to put in a full-size pitch, the density of the school will be affected. It will need to be on more than one level, stacked, so you will lose the advantage that Waterside supposedly has over Auchinairn. So as part of the consultation, can you take enhanced planning advice?

TG said the council had been keen to ensure this was not seen as a done deal, so they had not taken enhanced planning advice. Clearly they have looked at whether they could accommodate all of this school development on one level as well as the associated parking, all while creating a buffer plus a full-sized pitch. If the school were close to the village, it would have a more difficult impact on the village. If the school were positioned towards the road, the pitch and play facilities could be accommodated behind it. But there had not been enhanced planning.

W/R: You've just targeted Waterside.

W/R: I fully appreciate it is not a done deal...yet. But there are national documents (Scottish Planning Policy) and the Local Development Plan that would be contravened; and local planning guidance notes. A draft air quality planning consultation is also going on, and this needs to be brought in. Having read all the documents, my question is, if this proposal goes ahead and you build on the football park, will you please point me to any national and local guidance that's worth the paper it's written on?

TG said that the council had to balance a great many statutory responsibilities. They needed to provide education facilities for young people. He agreed there were planning issues associated with the site, and he said the council would have to demonstrate that this was the best place out of the available options.

W/R: What about your obligations to Waterside?

W/R: Would the council like to hear suggestions for other sites?

TG said that suggestions could be submitted as part of the consultation responses.

W/R: I worked in the ASN sector for 25 years, including at Merkland, where there were very good links with the old folk's community and local nurseries, with people coming in for drama days, for instance. When I worked in Glasgow, I was involved in moving children on to independent supported living. In my humble but not uninformed opinion, Waterside would not be the right place; it would not provide a stimulating environment. There's only one very small shop. There's not a buzz of people. It would not be an environment to help prepare these children for other things.

W/R: Why not use Merkland? There is lots of space there to extend it. Why take our green space away when there's more than enough green space to go round there?

FR said that EDC had included Merkland. The reason it wasn't an option was the problem of what to do with the pupils during construction. This made it a non-starter.

Lynne (Campsie View teacher) said that at one of the consultation meetings, there had been a question about play facilities for pre-school children. The council had already suggested a park area. She said the school's job was to integrate with the community. What the staff had suggested was that the play park be on the edge of the community so that local residents and toddlers could use it. She said the schools wanted to work with the community. There could be a 24-hour access gate on to this shared facility, and a fence. They would assess the children, whether they were able to cope, something they did all the time.

W/R (WCC chair): I appreciate what you're saying. However, you say you'd need to risk-assess kids. How would this impact on the community? Would we have access to facilities only during school hours? If gated, we don't have access. What about costs/hours of access?

W/R: My wife and I are disabled. Would we have 24-hour access to facilities without paying?

TG said there were six examples of schools in Scotland with community facilities integrated in them. If the ASN school proposal were to go forward in Waterside, yes, 99% or 99.9%, or maybe even 100% of the community would be against it. But part of the process would be to work with the community on how to create a resource with daytime/evening access, whether for children or anyone else with or without disabilities. Part of the conversation would be about how to create a resource for the community in the building. Clearly there would be elements just for the ASN children. It was all a process of design. The community of Waterside would need to help shape this.

W/R: This is all discussion about the school. But the primary feeling here is that we do not want any building of any shape or form to take away our safe play area, our football field and our green belt. The school would be a marvellous thing but not in this location. We in Waterside want to retain our green belt. We do not want to compromise. We do not want a café or whatever. We want our green belt. And I think I speak for the majority.

W/R: I utterly sympathize with the school communities. I was shocked at the dilapidation of the building at Merkland. The accommodation is inappropriate, appalling. Portakabins. I tried to say this at a consultation meeting but was shouted down. We feel very strongly you should have what you are owed. We're with you on that. You've worked in substandard accommodation for a long time. But please don't think we are twisted or malign or wanting to harm you in saying we love our place. Please give us the same consideration.

W/R: You said Merkland was not feasible as there's nowhere to decant the children. What about using Auchinairn as a temporary measure? It's open. Why not send them there till the school is built?

JMacD said that the council had considered it, but any transition for ASN kids was very difficult. If they were moved temporarily, many would not cope. Many were also attending Gartconner/St Ninian's. The head at Merkland was managing the school across three sites. Many were on the autistic spectrum. All had to be very carefully managed.

W/R: They're only at Gartconner two days a week.

W/R: You should never have picked Waterside. Health and safety.

W/R: There's been lots about mitigation. Why not mitigate on other sites?

I don't understand why other sites aren't being considered. The link road site, at 28,000 m², is much bigger than Waterside. There's plenty of space for all. It could be school in a nice neighbourhood, equidistant from St Ninian's and Kirkintilloch High. Good for other educational facilities in East Dunbartonshire too. There would be space there for other facilities on this site too. If you put the school on the playing fields in Waterside, we've lost our community area, our open space. We would no longer have an area to come together. We'd just be buildings. Is it not clear that you'd be removing a multipurpose open space – space for dog walking...any event can go there, which wouldn't be the case if the school

were built. We'd lose our facility to have a village festival forever. And open space is so important for mental health. We've already lost our swing park.

Lynne (Campsie View teacher) asked when Waterside had last held a gala. She believed it was a long time ago.

W/R: Why are you asking that?

W/R (Lynne C.): I'm the manager of the events team. We put our events team together two years ago and revived the duck race. We decided then that the gala would come back, and it would happen every single year.

W/R: We have a beautiful village, trees, deer, foxes. This green space is a real resource and combats obesity. You have only two days to fight political power. People who make these decisions don't come from Waterside or Kirkintilloch. Nothing I'd like more than for Merkland and Campsie View schools to come together – phenomenal – they need the resource. But you're going to forsake the green space in the village.

W/R: I use the park every day. During bad weather, we were snowed in. And the playing fields were where all the children went to play when the schools were closed. Where will they go if you build this school?

W/R: If you put in a full-sized pitch, will it be fenced? Will it be grass or Astroturf?

TG said the council did not know yet as there was no design. The community would have to say which was more important: a full-size pitch or a seven-a-side pitch and so on.

W/R: Leave Waterside alone.

W/R: You said we haven't told you what we want. I think we have. We don't want a building of any kind on that park. It's nothing to do with what type of building it is. It's to do with any building.

W/R: We don't want to look at a building. We're not opposed to the children. I know we have no entitlement to a view.

W/R: Everyone has spoken about everyone else's children. What about our kids? And their kids? They'll have nothing. We have one wee shop. Our kids will have to cross roads. But it would not be safe for them to go to another park.

W/R: What we do have here is community spirit – something you don't find very often elsewhere across East Dunbartonshire. Waterside is an ancient village. It was here well before all of us here; it's over 1000 years old. This village should be protected. Its integrity should be protected. That's within Scottish government statutes (protection of villages). Open space protects us. Developers who own land on the other side of Bankhead Rd were refused planning permission because it compromised the integrity of a village. What example does it set if the council chooses to ignore open space when they've knocked back planning for others? It doesn't say much for the decision-making process. What we have here is quite unique in terms of the community asset. Waterside is a small community. Look at how many people are here to represent a small community. You might get this number in Bearsden to represent thousands upon thousands more. In terms of commitment to this community, we have a fantastic sense of commitment. I think you ignore this at your peril.

TG agreed it was a fantastic response. This wasn't about the council wanting to be at odds with the community. They knew this proposal was not supported by a large section (maybe all) of the community. They had put forward what they considered to be the best proposal for ASN provision. He thought the way the community council had led the process in terms of mobilizing the community and everyone deciding to take part was a fantastic example of community engagement. He wished people did this more often. Unfortunately this kind of reaction was often about people disagreeing with a proposal. He still believed Waterside was the best site for the school, but he thought it was a fantastic show of the community coming together.

W/R: What you're saying is that you value your opinion, your decision and your decision-making process more highly than the voice of the people.

W/R: WCC must be the only community council I've been to in the course of my work where there are 20 people plus regularly there at monthly meetings working tirelessly to improve the village. We're very engaged.

TG said he wished there were more community councils like Waterside. He commented that it was not about valuing council officer opinion more than Waterside's. Having carried out a technical exercise, they believed it was the best site for the school. They accepted the community might disagree. He thought there would be a negative reaction anywhere they tried to put the school.

W/R (JC for Luggiewatch, local environment group): We are against the proposal, not because of the football field and so on, though these are valid points. One of our reasons is that every field in this area is about to be built on, including the land around this very building. At the moment, this looks like a semirural setting. In two to five years' time, this area will be swamped by development and housing schemes everywhere, with traffic and the related complications arising. Think about the effect on our very diverse wildlife. It will be impacted by the loss of green sites. There will be a loss of biodiversity. This might be one little opening of green space to help to maintain the diverse wildlife that we have here. Otherwise it will be all Tarmac and brick.

W/R: There is a suspicion that this site has been chosen because you can't sell it for development as it's green belt, unlike the brownfield sites, which you can sell to developers.

TG said that had not been part of the consideration.

W/R: Parkburn Avenue [?] ash park has not been used in 20 years. Has it been considered? It's bigger than our football park. It isn't green belt. We could point out other sites too.

W/R: What about land at Tom Johnson House?

TG said people should feel free to send in suggestions for sites.

W/R: You said it was a technical exercise – based on cold, hard figures and facts. So let's delve into the numbers. Waterside scored sixth in the options appraisal. Hilton came first. Each topic had a weighting. There were eight topics each with a weighting. At 7, the planning score was the same for Hilton as for Waterside, yet Waterside contravenes so many more planning policies. Hilton only required one change of designation. It's a flawed system (particularly with regard to planning) when you scratch the surface as it gives them both the same score. Waterside should have been far further down the list. Is there a mechanism to discuss this with you during the consultation?

FR said he was not able to discuss this issue then. He said he would be happy to give more details about the process. Hilton was still contrary to the planning policy, hence its score.

W/R: Comment: Keep in mind when filling in your responses what we are, and the importance of the Heritage Trail to Waterside, which we hope will take in the playing field.

W/R: You said something earlier about different access options. Does this mean coming into the school via Waterside Road instead of Bankhead Road, for instance?

TG said that access options would have to be looked at.

W/R: Thank you for coming. This is your community. It is crucial that you have your say in the response, whether you're for or against the proposal.

W/R: What happens if they go ahead anyway?

W/R: We can object at the planning stage.

W/R: This is more than a football field. Someone said football isn't played on the park all the time. It isn't at Hamden either. No matter what building you put there, it will destroy it; it's a dear green place.

5. The meeting ended at 9 o'clock.