



**Community Resources**  
Executive Director **Norrie Anderson**

Mr Robert Freel  
Secretary  
Stonehouse Community Council  
75 Lockhart Street  
Stonehouse

**Our ref:** FOI130407  
**Your ref:**  
**If calling ask for:** Kay McVeigh  
**Phone:** 01698 454721  
**Date:** 13 April 2007

Dear Mr Freel

**Request for Information**

I refer to your request for information, received on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2007.

Please find enclosed the information requested:

- o The land purchase at Udstonmill Road is currently being negotiated but at the time of writing has not been finalised.
- o No outline designs have as yet been produced. The land negotiation involves more than one landowner and confirmation that both land strips are secured is required before we can determine building position and orientation.
- o The timescale is dictated by the land purchase however we are keen to see as early a site start as possible on this project. Once the land purchase is confirmed I can then seek a programme from the design team that will take all the stages of design and consultation into account.
- o Once a feasibility stage design is produced, we will seek to consult locally on the proposals – we will contact the Community Council and other community groups affected by the proposals at that stage to seek feedback on the design.
- o I have enclosed a copy of all internal reports, e mails, correspondence and documents related to the integration of social work daycare accommodation in conjunction with the new community facility.

In line with the terms of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002, the Council has in place a procedure by which a review of the way in which we handle requests for information can be carried out. If you are dissatisfied by the way the Council has dealt with your request or about any decision made in connection with your request, and wish a review to be carried out, please inform the Council of this by 18 June 2007. In requesting a review, it would be helpful if you could quote the reference number found at the top of this letter and state the matter which has given rise to

Council Offices, Almada Street, Hamilton ML3 0AQ Phone: 01698 454721 Fax: 01698 454861  
Email: [kay.mcveigh@southlanarkshire.gsx.gov.uk](mailto:kay.mcveigh@southlanarkshire.gsx.gov.uk)



your dissatisfaction. Requests for review should be sent to:

Mr. W. Dunn  
Legal Services Adviser  
Corporate Resources  
Montrose House  
154 Montrose Crescent  
Hamilton, ML3 6LL

Alternatively, you can request a review via email: [foi.reviews@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:foi.reviews@southlanarkshire.gov.uk).

Any review will be handled by staff not involved in the original decision.


Should you not be satisfied with the outcome of our review, you will then have the right to appeal to the Scottish Information Commissioner. The Commissioner will decide whether your request has been dealt with properly, in accordance with the Act. The Commissioner's contact details are as follows:

Scottish Information Commissioner  
Kinburn Castle  
Doubledykes Road  
St Andrews, Fife  
KY16 9DS  
Telephone: 01334 464610  
Fax: 01334 464611  
e-mail: [enquiries@itspublicknowledge.info](mailto:enquiries@itspublicknowledge.info)

For further details, please see the Commissioner's website at [www.itspublicknowledge.info](http://www.itspublicknowledge.info).

If you require further information or assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me. My contact details are given below.

Yours sincerely,



**Kay McVeigh**  
**Personnel Manager**



COMMUNITY RESOURCES

**BRIEFING NOTE**

**To:** LINDA HARDIE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**Circulation To:** ALISTAIR MCKINNON, HEAD OF SUPPORT SERVICES  
TOM BARRIE, HEAD OF SUPPORT SERVICES, SOCIAL WORK RESOURCES

**From:** CLELAND SNEDDON, CHANGE & DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

**Author:** CLELAND SNEDDON, CHANGE & DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

**Date:** 31 MARCH 2006

**Subject:** STONEHOUSE COMMUNITY FACILITY – SITE INVESTIGATION AND BRIEFING

**1. Introduction**

This briefing note follows up on the site investigation survey commissioned by Community Resources on land at Murray Drive, Stonehouse to determine development potential for a new community facility and adult daycare centre. The briefing is also accompanied by an outline revised development brief based on existing let plans to be discussed with Social Work Resources and Facilities & Cultural Services.

**2. Background**

Community Resources were requested to bring forward proposal for a £1.6m replacement community facility in Stonehouse to replace the ageing Institute and Public Hall facilities. In conjunction with Planning and Building Control, the project team reviewed available Council land to host the development and assessed the suitability of the three principal development options within the village’s greenbelt line: Tileworks Park, Stonehouse PS site and Murdoch Park. The latter site was considered unsuitable for development leaving a more detailed consideration of the first two.

The preferred site was indicated as a development of the new community facility on the site of Stonehouse PS as a phase one to the eventual development of the new primary school in 2010 connecting onto the community wing. This was in line with the primary school community wing model being developed in a number of other sites across South Lanarkshire as an attempt to make best use of built assets and, following feasibility design work, a full public consultation exercise was carried out.

The feedback from the local community participating in the consultation events was overwhelmingly negative. Whilst accepting that those with strong interests are more motivated to comment than the general population, the level of negativity expressed is reflective of a groundswell of opinion. Following consideration of the feedback, it was agreed that Community Resources would investigate alternative sites and consider a joint development with a Social Work adult daycare centre. A review of the limited sites currently within Council ownership highlighted the area of Murray Drive and it was agreed that formal site survey work be commissioned.

**3. Site Investigation Report Conclusions**

The report highlights that the site is covered by loose sand and uncompacted silt to depths of approximately 12m with the rock bed being found as far as 30m under the surface. The soils would have poor load bearing capacity requiring piling to rock level. Additionally there is a horizontal shelf in the site that would require substantial retaining walls adding further to the cost of development. In summary the site is assessed as very difficult from both a topographical and a soils perspective – although it would be possible to arrive at solutions to allow for development, these would have very significant cost implications and be outwith the budget potential for the development.

**4. Approach from Local Developer**

An initial approach from a local developer to offer a more suitable site at Udstonmill Road tied in to land releases for residential development elsewhere in the village was rejected due to the current Local Plan consultation programme. A subsequent verbal offer to gift the land “without prejudice” to the Council was followed up with an email from his legal representatives with a few conditions. A further contact this week indicates that a formal signed offer will be made by his legal representatives to gift the land fully “without prejudice” to the Council for this development – he has been advised to direct this to the Estates Service. It has been explained to him that, if he did so, he would be at risk and there is no tie in with his outstanding planning applications.

As an aside to this offer, doubt has been expressed as to whether the developer has any ownership of the land in question or only has “options”

on the disposal of the land. This would need to be clarified on receipt of his formal offer. The site appears to be best site viewed to date and would more closely meet the community facility and daycare centre needs.

## 5. Draft Revised Development Outline

Facilities & Cultural Services have completed a consultation exercise with all standard building users at the Institute and Public Hall to determine their accommodation requirements. The major clash has always been the requirements for daytime main hall accommodation predominantly involving a registered childcare provider and large scale groups such as mother & toddlers.

Appendix A provides a summary of the standard let programme with a few outstanding queries – all other lets are occasional or ad hoc. Appendix B suggests an accommodation schedule that potentially would provide for these lets and incorporate accommodation for social work daycare users. There would be implications for the adult daycare service from this model by restricting access to large hall accommodation at certain times on certain days (see appendix A for schedule) however as the daycare programme is not always facility based, this might be acceptable (large hall accommodation is available more than 50% of the daycare service time).

An indicative cost profile is drafted based on this accommodation schedule indicating a project cost of £3.575m which would require a capital contribution of £1.975m from Social Work Resources however this should still be lower than the cost of a stand alone new build with equivalent facilities.

## 6. Recommendations

It is recommended that;

- Estates Service be encouraged to pursue and investigate the Udstonmill Road site offer;
- A project group be established with representatives from Social Work Resources and Facilities and Cultural Services to refine the accommodation schedule and let programme into a full brief.
- Agreement be sought from Social Work Resources to make their capital contribution to make up the capital shortfall in the combined development.
- Subject to progress on the site, HTR be commissioned to prepare a desktop site investigation report to assess development potential.

**7. Further Information**

For further information please contact Cleland Sneddon, Change & Development Manager on tel 01698 455369 or e mail [cleland.sneddon@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:cleland.sneddon@southlanarkshire.gov.uk).

**UDSTONMILL ROAD,  
STONEHOUSE**

**INTEGRATED COMMUNITY  
FACILITY BRIEFING**

**September 2006**

## **1 Purpose**

- 1.1 To provide information on the integrated community facility requirements to enable the development of a full design brief for the newbuild replacement community facilities and adult daycare facilities to serve the village of Stonehouse.

## **2 Background**

- 2.1 The need for eventual replacement of existing community facilities in Stonehouse has been highlighted in a number of earlier briefings. It has been clear for some time that the existing halls cannot be cost effectively upgraded to meet modern requirements and that the best solution would be to rationalise provision. Following consideration of potential development sites in December 2004, it was suggested that the preferred model for community facilities in Stonehouse would be to provide them in an integrated development with the proposed replacement Stonehouse Primary. An initial feasibility design was developed that formed the basis of a full public consultation programme in autumn of 2005.
- 2.2 The public consultation exercise was heavily attended at a series of public meetings and open evenings and a significant proportion of the respondents indicated that a joint development on the school site was the least preferred option. The Council investigated 4 alternative sites within its ownership including a full site survey of land at Murray Drive – none of which offered good development potential. Following on from an approach by a local developer, land at Udstonmill Road in private ownership was identified and permission was sought to carry out an intrusive site survey and topographical survey (copies available from HTR).
- 2.3 The development is based on the closure of Stonehouse Institute and Stonehouse Public Hall with the revenue costs from these sites being transferred to the new facility. Education Resources wish to retain Stonehouse Library at its present location in the centre of the village. It is therefore proposed to retain Stonehouse Senior Citizens Centre, which is part the same building, rather than replace this facility at the proposed new school/ community facility.

## **3 Assumptions**

- 3.1 The comments below in the schedule of accommodation are derived from a design session with Facilities and Cultural Services (FACS) and information gathered from Social Work Resources. It is assumed that the daycare facilities will support adults with learning disabilities which are often accompanied by physical disabilities however it is possible that the client group will change to adults with physical disabilities only.

## **4 Schedule of Accommodation**

- 4.1 The following table gives a suggested schedule of accommodation for the proposed new facility. It is anticipated that the final accommodation requirements would be determined following consultation with the local community but would be kept within the overall floor area proposed.



<b>Location</b>	<b>Area m2</b>
External Play Area	
Stage, Wing Space & Storage	30
Main Hall	200
Server, Kitchen & Bar	16
Main Toilet Core & Store	40
Kitchen Storage & Main SW Kitchen	32
Servery	4
Meeting Room	24
Arts & Crafts	24
Landscape Garden Area	
SW Dining / Café Space	80
Groupwork A	20
Groupwork B	20
Groupwork C	20
MS Room	25
Personal Care A & B + Laundry	36
Office & Manager	30
Plant Room	28
Quiet Room	12
Staff	8
Locker Area Recess	22
Store & Comms	16
Wheelchair Store	8
Reception & Office	16
Entrance & Arrival	45
Main Hall & Community Store	32
Lesser Hall	128
Youth Area / Change	16
Rascals Office	9
Total	941
Circulation Space @20%	188.2
Sub Total	1129.2

**5 Other Considerations**

- 5.1 The Early Years establishment have a requirement for access to an external soft play area (please refer to Registration Standards applied to Education Resources nurseries).
- 5.2 In relation to the detailed designs (room layouts, services, finishes, colour schemes, etc) it is anticipated that FACS and SW staff will be invited to contribute to the design process at the appropriate time.

## Stonehouse Community Facility

Location	Area m2
External Play Area	
Stage, Wing Space & Storage	30
Main Hall	200
Server, Kitchen & Bar	16
Main Toilet Core & Store	40
Kitchen Storage & Main SW Kitchen	32
Servery	4
Meeting Room	24
Arts & Crafts	24
Garden Area	
SW Dining / Café Space	80
Groupwork A	20
Groupwork B	20
Groupwork C	20
MS Room	25
Personal Care A & B + Laundry	36
Office & Manager	30
Plant Room	28
Quiet Room	12
Staff	8
Locker Area Recess	22
Store & Comms	16
Wheelchair Store	8
Reception & Office	16
Entrance & Arrival	45
Main Hall & Community Store	32
Lesser Hall	128
Youth Area / Change	16
Rascals Office	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>941</b>
<b>Circulation Space @20%</b>	<b>188.2</b>
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1129.2</b>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Fagan, Paul  
**Sent:** 21 April 2006 09:15  
**To:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Subject:** RE: Stonehouse

Thanks, Cleland. I'll give you a call soon.

Enjoy your week end.

Regards,

Paul

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Sent:** 20 April 2006 18:39  
**To:** Fagan, Paul  
**Subject:** RE: Stonehouse

Hi Paul

Quick update for you – site investigations have been undertaken on a couple of sites recently – interim advice is that they are not good but we await the full reports (I'm not optimistic having spoken to the engineers). We are still therefore seeking a suitable site and have had some discussion with developers locally (be cautious about communicating this bit of info widely).

The facility we are investigating would be a joint community hall and social work daycare centre for learning disabled adults – the model would be similar to the Murray Owen Centre in EK. Whilst layout design work has not been commissioned (until we know the site) – indicatively we are looking a building of 1100 m2 or thereby. Be careful of this information as it is yet to be tested in detail with Social Work, Facilities & Cultural Services and ultimately by the community through consultation. Also, be careful of comparisons with the buildings it is replacing – I fell into this trap when doing the earlier consultation – the square meterage of the other two facilities is much greater but large spaces in both the Institute and Public Halls are in disuse and are uninhabitable (had I only known the buildings better at the time I could have responded more fully at the public meetings). The size and make up of facility I am looking at is based on existing let plans (all groups have now been contacted and their needs discussed by FACS) and actual needs as opposed to like for like replacement.

In relation to external funding, the priority of Stonehouse is a bit in question - overall not necessarily deprived enough for Euro funding and the Council is being ever more precluded from accessing a number of the new BLF strands despite our presentations to D Khanani. Would be keen to look at any options but we need to manage any expectations from community based partners and the relationship they would have with the Council. I haven't heard of the Development Trust but if it has the players I am thinking of, we may be cautious of the agenda they are pursuing (e.g. housing release under the guise of community development – I have heard it called Stonehouse Ahead by one).

Can't make Friday but wished Mark well this week – would like to grab a coffee and a chat when you're next up. Hope the above is of interest.

C

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Fagan, Paul  
**Sent:** 20 April 2006 13:51  
**To:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Subject:** Stonehouse

Cleland,

Can you provide an updated position on the Stonehouse Community Centre. I know you have been considering some potential sites. Have any conclusions been reached? Also, what activities –or potential activity- is planned for the venue? And are we aware –at this stage- of the approx. sq.m (and how this compares with that of the existing provision?)

Are there potential opps. for leveraging in external funding? A new local trust – Stonehouse Development Trust- have requested that I join their board. Perhaps they could be used as a vehicle to attract lottery funding: what do you think?

Any info. would be appreciated. And –when you have time, perhaps we can catch up for a chat. (Though work-talk will be banned from Marks night out!).

Kind Regards an give my best wishes to Judith and Rebecca.

Paul

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Sent:** 27 February 2006 13:55  
**To:** Fagan, Paul  
**Cc:** Murray, Ian  
**Subject:** RE: Funding

Hi Paul – sorry, I have had no contact with the club. They may have approached SL Leisure direct?

C

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Fagan, Paul  
**Sent:** 27 February 2006 11:47  
**To:** Murray, Ian; Sneddon, Cleland  
**Subject:** FW: Funding

Colleagues,

Are you aware of this project? And/or any discussions that have taken place?

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Skillen, Caroline **On Behalf Of** Burns, Jackie (Councillor)  
**Sent:** 23 February 2006 16:17  
**To:** Fagan, Paul  
**Subject:** FW: Funding

(Sent on behalf of Cllr Jackie Burns)

Paul,

I attach the undernoted e-mail sent by John Cuthbertson, Secretary, Raploch Bowling Club on 26 October 2005 to Michael Docherty, Linda Hardie and Eddie McAvoy. Can you find out what response was given to Mr Cuthbertson?

Regards.

*Jackie Burns*

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jlcuthb@aol.com [mailto:Jlcuthb@aol.com]

**Sent:** 26 October 2005 10:20

**To:** Ahmad, Mushtaq (Councillor); Burns, Jackie (Councillor); Casserly, Sam (Councillor); Tremble, Murray (Councillor)

**Subject:** Funding

Gentlemen, please see attached letter I recently sent to L Hardie, M Docherty and E MacAvoy.

As Larkhall Councillors you will appreciate the work we do on behalf of the community. Your support with this would be greatly appreciated by both the club and the community. Any additional information is available on request

PLEASE NOTE: THE ABOVE MESSAGE WAS RECEIVED FROM THE INTERNET.

On entering the GSi, this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet (GSI) virus scanning service supplied exclusively by Energis in partnership with MessageLabs.

Please see <http://www.gsi.gov.uk/main/notices/information/gsi-003-2002.pdf> for further details.

In case of problems, please call your organisational IT helpdesk

**Sneddon, Cleland**

---

**From:** McGlynn, Michael ENTR  
**Sent:** 31 July 2006 17:46  
**To:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Cc:** McDowall, Colin  
**Subject:** RE: St Ninian PS

Cleland

With regard to the below, could you let us know how matters are progressing or not as the case maybe.

Thanks

Michael

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Sent:** 05 July 2006 13:50  
**To:** McGlynn, Michael ENTR  
**Cc:** McKinnon, Alistair  
**Subject:** RE: St Ninian PS

Michael – thanks very much – this is really helpful. I expect the site survey report from HTR in the last week of July – if the ground looks good for development, I'll give you a ring to set up a meet.

Thanks again

C

-----Original Message-----

**From:** McGlynn, Michael ENTR  
**Sent:** 05 July 2006 11:59  
**To:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Cc:** McMillan, Stuart; Gimby, Ron; McDowall, Colin  
**Subject:** RE: St Ninian PS

Cleland

This issue came to us very late in the day in preparation of the local plan for Committee approval. However, at the Committee itself we reported verbally that was an ongoing review/investigation of community facilities in Stonehouse and as such sought approval to make reference to this in the published version of the plan which will come out on the 3<sup>rd</sup> August. In respect we have added the following text to the written statement:

“In Stonehouse the Council is reviewing the provision of halls in line with this integrated approach. A site for a new community centre which may incorporate other Council facilities is therefore being sought and land south of Strathaven Road on the western edge of the village is being considered. Whilst the suitability of this site has still to be confirmed that land remains in the Green Belt however this could be altered depending on the outcome of the review”

In light of the above, we have not identified a site on the local plan proposals map; however the above text provides a ‘hook’ in which to do this provided the review/investigation proves that this is a suitable site.

The above approach has been discussed with Cllr Jackie Burns who is comfortably with it.

Hope this keeps you informed and could I suggest that we get together sometime in late July/early August to discuss this in a bit more detail. Should you wish to discuss in the

meantime give me a call.

Regards

Michael

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Sent:** 28 June 2006 08:23  
**To:** McGlynn, Michael ENTR  
**Subject:** FW: St Ninian PS

Michael – please see note to Stuart below (I hadn't realized he was on leave) – can you consider the issue at Stonehouse and provide a bit of advice.

Thanks

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Sent:** 28 June 2006 08:20  
**To:** McMillan, Stuart  
**Cc:** Forbes, Joanne; McKinnon, Alistair  
**Subject:** FW: St Ninian PS

Hi Stuart

Per the note from Joanne below – we didn't do a formal site investigation for Union Street but rather we did a site suitability report for the new community facility on the Tileworks site in conjunction with Ron Gimby. This confirmed the site was unsuitable for a number of reasons (roads access, services, apparent drainage, public transport, etc) for our purposes but not that the land either side of Union Street was unsuitable for development generally.

I spoke to Iain Urquhart last night when we were at Carluke regarding the land at Udstonmill Road in Stonehouse which we are currently site surveying. He has explained that the site has not been included in the final draft of the local plan which is going to cause some difficulty in our pursuing it for community facility/ social work daycare development. I had spoken to Colin McDowall about this site a couple of times noting it was looking like our only viable option in the village and had recently advised Ron we were actively pursuing site survey work. Joanne's team have also been helping us liaise with the two land owners. I need your advice about how to recover this position within the final consultation phase to allow us to pursue the site in the event the site survey report is positive.

Can you consider the above and give me a call to discuss.

Thanks

C

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Forbes, Joanne  
**Sent:** 27 June 2006 17:31  
**To:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Subject:** RE: St Ninian PS

Cleland

I will have someone look into this but I do not recall any such report in the past year. It is possible that a report went through Education or Community Committee some time in the past reallocating the land or even referring to the reallocation as part of

the project report.

Do you have a plan of the area that was to be transferred and if so can you drop it off?

On another matter entirely could you pass details of the ground condition report that you had done at Union St, Stonehouse to Stuart McMillan in the Local Plan Team please as obviously this could affect the proposals for land release!

*Regards*  
*Joanne Forbes*  
*ext. 5139*

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Sneddon, Cleland  
**Sent:** 27 June 2006 11:18  
**To:** Forbes, Joanne  
**Subject:** St Ninian PS

Hi J

Another query via legal I wonder if you can help with. Some time ago we proposed a transfer of land from Education (part of St Ninians PS) to Community to allow the forming of pitches at Jock Stein Sports Barn as part of the Hamilton ICF project. Once the transfer to Community was complete, the land was then to be leased to SLL as a variation to the overarching lease (which is what involves Legal).

The legal services officer who was dealing at the time has now left and Lynne Jamieson is picking through files for incomplete pieces of work. Before she approaches SLL's legal reps – can you confirm that eth transfer of land did actually take place between Education and Community?

Thanks again

C