

Minutes of Meeting held at invitation of Tesco with community group representatives

on Thursday 26th May 2011

Proposed amendments are shown as indented italics

Name	Representing	Abbreviation
HOSTS		
Gloria Coats	Tesco	GC (TSL)
Ben Train	Tesco	BT (TSL)
Andrew Perrie	Manson Architects	AP (MA)
Lindsay Manson	Manson Architects	LM (LM)
Kirsty Leiper	MHP Communications	KL (MHP)
Ken Richardson	KRG Associates	KR (KRG)
Anne Lloyd	Tesco Milngavie	AL (TSL)
Phil Pritchett	Pritchett Planning	PP (PPC)
OBSERVERS		
Mahlon Fautua	East Dunbartonshire Council	MF (EDC)
Thomas Glen	East Dunbartonshire Council	TG (EDC)
Graeme Macfarlane	East Dunbartonshire Council	GM (EDC)
Margaret Dunn	Milngavie Community Council	MD (MCC)
Eve Gilmore*	We Like Milngavie	EG (WLM)
GUESTS		
Fiona Risk	Milngavie Community Council	FR (MCC)
Keith Small	Bearsden North Community Council	KS (BNCC)
Carol Hewitt	Bearsden East Community Council	CH (BECC)
Alison Hazell*	Baldernock Community Council	AH (BCC)
Rona Hooper*	Mains Estate Residents Association	RH (MERA)

Nick Holland	Baljaffray Residents Association	NH (BaIRA)
Victor Budas	Burnbrae Residents Association	VB (BurRA)
Dr Josie Beeley	Mosshead Residents Association	JB (MRA)
Ian Ferguson	Milngavie Civic Trust	IF (MCT)
John Edwards	Milngavie Heritage Centre Group	JE (MHC)
Jenny Overton (accompanied by Heather Lindsay)	Milngavie in Bloom	JO (MIB)
Bob Diamond	Bearsden and Milngavie Ramblers	BD (BMR)
Ian Lavrie*	Milngavie Town Centre Steering Group (BID)	IL (BID)
Tom Friel	East Dunbartonshire Access Panel	TF (EDAP)
Rona Miller*	Milngavie Traders Association	RM (MTA)
Alastair Ewen*	Bearsden West Community Council	AE (BWCC)
Peter Swinson	We Like Milngavie	PS (WLM)

* denotes spelling correction by WLM

1. Introduction:

- 1.1 KR opened the meeting to explain his role as chairman, organised introductions of all present and presented an agenda. He also made key points throughout the meeting, which would be summarised and distributed by KL (MHP).
- 1.2 He said that this meeting was called for the Tesco Design team to discuss the Reporter's findings on Tesco's last application with community groups. He said this would be a first stage in consultation with community groups, and that there would later be consultation with Tesco customers. EG (WLM) interjected with the observation that the groups here represented are Tesco's customers.
- 1.3 The agenda as given was queried by FR (MCC) who said that the groups did not want to concentrate on consideration of details of the Reporter's findings from the previous application as this is a new application.
- 1.4 PP (PPC) said that this is part of a continuum, therefore it was necessary to consider items from the Reporter's report. He considers that any new application will need to address these issues.

2. Timescales:

- 2.2 A timeline of Tesco's applications was presented by PP (PPC). EG (WLM) requested a copy of the timeline in the slide. It was agreed that this would be provided following the meeting.
- 2.3 PP (PPC) highlighted that Tesco is dedicated to ensuring that there is a full consultation and any application would not be made until after a public exhibition – which would likely be in August because of the school holidays. PP (PPC) confirmed there would be an exhibition both in the store and Milngavie Library to allow the wider community to comment on the proposals.

3. Reporter's Findings and Community Feedback:

- 3.1 Following the presentation by PP (PPC), KR (KRG) introduced LM (MA) as the chief architect for the plans, who would be providing an overview of the Reporter's conclusions. LM (MA) highlighted during his presentation the key conclusions that Tesco had taken from the findings, including national policy, design, listed buildings and conservation areas.
- 3.2 LM (MA) highlighted that the design team had considered the Reporter's findings to great extent, and listed the paragraphs which he felt had significant bearing on any proposals moving forward (these were listed as paragraphs 32,35,40,42,20 45 46 and 46). LM (MA) added that the scale of the store was discussed at the inquiry and the Reporter agreed that the scale was in keeping with national policy and identified two key points as being the Woodburn Way elevation and the proximity to Gavin's Mill. JE (MHC) highlighted that he felt the Reporter's report was at times often ambiguous.

The repeated reference to paragraph 46 should probably read 46 and 48. (JE)

- 3.3 PP (PPC) responded that the Reporter highlighted that the space requires a proper and thoughtful application. PP (PPC) asked JE (MHC) as to how he felt the space is important and what aspects of the space are priorities – in order to consider these in the forthcoming application. JE (MHC) responded that the open aspect and Main Street were a priority.

Should read “the open aspect from the end of Main Street was a priority” (JE)

- 3.4 PS (WLM) said that there are other key issues to those mentioned by PP (PPC). PS (WLM) highlighted that the Reporter didn’t understand the route of the Allander Water and is referring to the fish ladder, and felt that the Reporter dismisses Allander Way as an issue.

Should read “highlighted that the Reporter dismissed the impact on the Allander Way as an issue, but actually misunderstood the route of the Way, which actually follows the Allander Water from the obelisk past the fish ladder” (PS)

- 3.5 PS (WLM) continued that the issue with Tesco in Milngavie is not about the detail of the Reporters decision – but about the principle, that there is anger in principle towards the application and its scale and size. PS (WLM) requested justification for the scale and the size of the proposals, and reasoning as to why Tesco consider this scale of store belongs in a small town? To which PP (PPC) asked if all of the anger is about the scale of the store?

- 3.6 PS (WLM) continued to question why Tesco justify that scale, that the scale was not wanted in the town and that those around this table are not just NIMBYs but also customers.

- 3.7 PP responded that Tesco was taking positive points from the report, and that the points of principle would be noted.

- 3.8 PS (WLM) also highlighted that the Report was subjective. FR (MCC) endorsed this, saying that the last application was of a scale totally unacceptable for the town of Milngavie, especially as it is in an environmentally very sensitive area, adjacent to a conservation area.

First sentence should read: highlighted that the retail capacity studies undertaken were subjective in relation to how the impact of scale was allocated locally. (PS)

- 3.9 RH (MERA) agreed with the view that the last application encroached on conservation buildings. She said that her members are concerned at the impact of any proposal on Milngavie Station which in addition to Gavin’s Mill, is a listed building and that the Reporter did not take this into consideration.

- 3.10 KR (KRG) recorded that the groups had asked for the building materials to be considered, in light of any new building being next to a conservation area, to take into consideration the building materials of adjacent listed buildings.

4. Size and Scale

- 4.1 In response to discussion about the size of the proposed store, PP (PPC) and LM(MA) reported that the design team's brief from Tesco on the size and nature of the proposed development was unlikely to change.
- 4.2 PP (PPC) highlighted that this has been discussed at length, both with the present EDC planning officials and the previous ones, such as Alan Sim. PP (PPC) highlighted that the purpose of consultation was to allow community groups the opportunity to comment on detail of the actual design. When questioned PP (PPC) confirmed that it was unlikely to change in size.
- 4.3 LM (MA) highlighted that he would welcome constructive comments on the design, and that all comments would be fed back internally.
- 4.4 LM (MA) said that the size of new store would likely to be as previously given. He explained a number of reasons for this. LM (MA) also mentioned that the costs of upgrade and modernisation would be such that any new store would have to be large enough to increase turnover to pay for this. EG (WLM) asked him to confirm that this was a reason for the size of the new store proposal. PP (PPC) urged those present to read the Constraints document that was lodged at the inquiry.
- 4.5 JE (MHC) asked if the proposed size was average for a Tesco Extra. PP (PPC) said that he understood that it was at the lower end of the average. BT (TSL) was asked for the average size of a Tesco Extra. He said that this was about 10,000 square metres, gross. Net and gross sizes of Tesco Extra stores were discussed. It was clarified that the size of the new proposal would be at the lower end of the Extra store scale.

Fourth sentence: BT said Extras were between 8,500 and 10,000 square metres, gross. (PS)

- 4.6 BT (TSL) said the old William Low building needs modernisation and that Tesco wants to give its customers a modern shopping experience. BT (TSL) explained that at the front of the present store there is not enough circulation space, and the car park is heavily congested and that at the back of store the operating and delivery areas are not adequate to deliver the service customers expect.
- 4.7 AL (TSL) confirmed that Tesco Milngavie urgently needs modernisation as the present store building does not allow her staff to give their customers the shopping experience she would wish.
- 4.8 BT (TSL) confirmed that any new building is to be designed to ensure that people will continue to shop in Milngavie and will compete with other large supermarkets in the area.
- 4.9 AL (TSL) added that the Milngavie store took more money than the store at Maryhill. To which NH (BalRA) asked why Tesco expanded the store before Milngavie. PP (TSL) explained that both faced different constraints. NH (BalRA) asked whether the store would be like Maryhill, to which BT (TSL) explained the different designs.

- 4.10 BD (BMR) highlighted that the best way forward was to recognise the problem re scale, and the concern for the scale advocated by Tesco and that this was not appropriate for Milngavie.
- 4.11 FR (MCC) added that it was sad going over this, that this was an opportunity for Tesco to get it right and there was no objection to an expansion or an improved store.
- 4.12 FR (MCC) continued that it was understood that Tesco could take positives from the report, however this was a new opportunity for a clean slate, to look at the site as new instead of tweaking the old plans, and also for looking at the site as unique for exceptional design and appropriate materials.
- 4.13 CH (BECC) noted that it was not necessary to start from the reporters comments, and asked Tesco to start again from scratch. LM (MA) responded that the team had been looking at designs for the site over a number of years, and that it was recognised internally that for the development to work there were clear criteria that it had to meet - which was to design a store that would eventually gain an appropriate ROI.
- 4.14 PP (PPC) added that the purpose of this meeting was to gather feedback from the community to feed into the next planning application, and that everything noted around the table this evening would be taken into consideration.
- 4.15 IL (BID) made the point that the location of Tesco's previous application was such that it would discourage people from shopping in the Precinct. He said that any new store should be on the actual site of the present store and its entrance should be on the town centre side. Any car parking should be between the Tesco store and the other town centre shops. This was endorsed by a number of the community representatives present and was recorded.
- 4.16 JB (MRA) re-iterated the community's view that the size/scale of what Tesco is proposing is totally inappropriate. JB (MRA) asked who had made this final decision and on being told that this was made by Tesco Board asked why they were not present at this meeting.
- 4.17 GC (TSL) and BT (TSL) reported that everything which was said at today's meeting would be relayed to the Board and that GC's job was to be the conduit for information to and from the community to Tesco's board.
- 4.18 JB (MRA) referred to Which magazine and highlighted that Tesco is Britain's bottom-rated supermarket. JB continued that Tesco needed to learn from Waitrose on Byres Road. JB (MRA) also added that she didn't want a Tesco Extra, hated Tesco Extra and wanted a Waitrose. JB (MRA) asked Tesco to give "us something we want."
- 4.19 PS (WLM) added at this point that people didn't want a bigger Tesco and that Tesco would find it difficult to find people that want it. PS (WLM) asked what the Tesco policy was when a community clearly didn't want a store of that scale and size? PP (PPS) highlighted at this point that a previous survey had been undertaken by Tesco, which showed 50% of those surveyed in support of a new Tesco store. To which PS added that there were 25% against, and 25% unsure.

Last sentence should read; PS added that this was not correct as the survey showed 50% of customers against and only 25% for and 25% unsure'. (PS)

- 4.20 KS (BNCC) summarised the disquiet that the community feels at the apparent unwillingness of Tesco to change its brief on the proposed size of a modernised store. He asked that the Tesco board do not alienate the local community and accept a longer period for a return on their investment for a modernised Milngavie Tesco store. There was a feeling of general agreement from the community representatives present on this statement.
- 4.21 CH (BECC) added that she would like the store to be drawn right back from Gavin's Mill and potentially a cafe with outside seating in place there.
- 4.22 LM (MA) advised that this and the rest of the comments would be taken into consideration.

5. Location and Linkages

- 5.1 IL (BID) added that local traders were fighting for survival. That Tesco, if positioned in the car park rather than on the existing footprint, would divide the community with the previous proposal with the position of the building against Woodburn Way. That the car park would not allow people to freely access the town centre and that the existing store offers two different links to the town centre.
- 5.2 EG (WLM) added that a new store would be more inclusive if it was on the existing footprint.
- 5.3 VB (BURRA) added that Woodburn way is a bypass to which AE (BWCC) added that it was not. That it acts as a barrier and that Woodburn Way is the town centre's biggest problem AE (BWCC) added that the road should be reduced as it only serves as a feeder just now.
- 5.4 IF (MCT) highlighted that people are currently doing their shopping and then going into town and that the new store is much more of a walk. FR (MCC) highlighted that the new store and journey into town is a psychological issue due to the layout and feels double the journey.

Last sentence should read: FR pointed out that the proposed location of the store would not only be a physical barrier to accessing the village shops but also a psychological one as shoppers would head away from the store and the village to deposit their shopping in their cars and then have to retrace their steps to shop in the village which would double their journey.(FR)

- 5.5 AE (BWCC) asked whether the issue of pedestrian movement across Woodburn Way could be re-visited by the Design team. He envisages that Woodburn Way should not be the present barrier of a dual carriageway but should be a more minor road, to help the town centre become one cohesive whole.

- 5.6 AH (BCC) highlighted that the new store is solely relying on car transport and that this would have environmental risks. RH (MERA) added that the last proposals suggested improvements to the walkways etc, and questioned why Tesco needed the back of the store to the village. RH (MERA) then questioned whether LM (MA) had designed Dobbies at Braehead, and challenged Tesco to be completely different in Milngavie.
- 5.7 LM (MA) advised that he had designed Braehead, however that it was a completely different brief to Milngavie. He also noted that all comments regarding orientation and linkages would be taken into consideration.
- 5.7 KS (BNCC) added that it was clear Tesco were working to a brief for this site, however he wanted to concentrate on the principle and for Tesco to recognise that the business model is alienating the local community. KS continued that Tesco needed to recognise that the community wants a smaller store and to accept a longer period for the ROI.
- 5.8 The question of pedestrian and traffic movement between Tesco car-park, store and the Precinct was discussed by a number of community representatives. KR (KRG) recorded the general view that good flow between the two town shopping areas was essential.
- 5.9 BD (BMR) reinforced this with an additional comment that it is important to preserve and enhance the pedestrian routes to and from various places in the town centre. This is in addition to preserving and enhancing the route of the Allander Walkway. BD (BMR) hopes that walking should continue to be encouraged in the area for shoppers and other pedestrians.
- 5.10 LM (MA) concluded that these were all interesting points and that the new store needed to concentrate on integration and creating interesting space.
- 5.11 PP(PPC) said that environmental issues were very high on Tesco's agenda in their designs. They consider that their modern designs go farther in meeting the government's targets on 'green' issues than older buildings.
- 5.12 JO (MIB) added that Tesco should be trying to improve Allander Walkway and fish ladder as a feature.
- 5.13 IL (BID) came back to the subject of scale adding that there are trends in the US moving away from large units, and that there are opportunities for Tesco to look into future and tailor shops to what people want.
- 5.14 PP (PPC) responded that Tesco have various formats of stores throughout the world including much larger stores in the far east and shopping mall developments in Europe, and that the company dedicates a large amount of resources in finding out which store type/size/format works best in each geographic region. BT (TSL) was asked how the community could influence the Board over the size of their proposed store. BT (TSL) said that the present meeting is a means of influencing the Board. The Board also have followed press reports and representations from various sources.

5.15 RH (MERA) continued the conversation highlighting that the traffic plans for Woodburn Way didn't take into account the new pedestrian crossing at the train station. RH (MERA) also questioned if Tesco were aware of the new housing development on the outskirts of Milngavie, highlighted that Milngavie and its surrounding areas were under increasing expansion and that the roads needed to take this into account. PP (PPC) responded that the transport consultants ARUPs would be made aware of this and that at the inquiry all consented developments were taken into account. PP (PPC) acknowledged that any new crossing points would also require to be modelled, where the situation had changed from the information before the inquiry.

6.0 Design

6.1 EG (WLM) asked that Tesco Design Team engage Architecture and Design Scotland at an early stage in any plans. She pointed out that at the time of the last application they had not given specific comment on Tesco's plans as they were only aware of them at a later stage in the process. PP (PPC) and LM (MA) agreed to seek the council's views on approaches to Architecture and Design Scotland, but had no difficulty in meeting them.

6.2 Following general conversation regarding the submission of the proposals to ADS, TG (EDC) highlighted that previously ADS had received the proposals in time to provide comment on them, and JE (MHC) added that ADS had concerns but felt the plans were in too finalised a stage to be able to input effectively.

6.3 PS (WLM) brought BT and PP (PPC)'s attention to the fact that a document has been produced on behalf of the Milngavie and Bearsden community groups. He presented a copy of this to BT and PP. EG (WLM) noted that this document is the result of comments from the public in the local area as well as from Community groups. PP (PPC) highlighted that Tesco had read about this in the local paper.

7. Conclusions

7.1 BD (BMR) asked if Planning Gain could be considered with this application. PP (PPC) said that this was something which would be discussed later in the process.

7.2 BD (BMR) added that there was an issue regarding planning gain, and that Tesco acts as part of the community and adds value to part of the community, and acts like a hub for people in Milngavie. PP (PPC) responded adding that the issue of planning gain had to be directly linked to the application, and that there were strict criteria that had to be followed.

7.3 FR (MCC) highlighted that Milngavie Community Council is arranging a public meeting in the near future and that they will invite Tesco to attend. FR (MCC) noted that she would like someone more senior from Tesco to attend and someone that can make a decision on the size in comparison to profit.

7.4 AH (BCC) added that she, and others, would use a new store because of convenience. However that she had concerns for the town centre and wanted to see the local authority defending the town centre.

- 7.5 VB (BurRA) added that the previous exhibition was a joke, and RM (MTA) added that the next exhibition needed to be fully transparent. PP (PPC) agreed that the next exhibition would be an improvement on the previous exhibition.
- 7.6 RH (MERA) added that Tesco needed to consider keeping the store on the existing footprint and challenged Tesco to do “more” architectural wise.
- 7.7 KR (KRG) summarised the recorded points made in this meeting, a summary of which would be circulated following the meeting. KR (KRG) re-emphasised that this was a preliminary meeting during the consultation process.

01/06/2011