Objection to Planning Application Ref: P/20/0469

In terms of formal objections we believe that the following points have ongoing applicability and are directly related to clauses, shown in bold italics and quotes, taken from a number of sections and policy statements made in anticipation of South Lanarkshire's 'Local development Plan 2' Vols 1 and 2 being the accepted standard.

In particular reference is made to the following Policy Statement which directly addresses the nature of the proposed project.

"Policy DM3 Subdivision of Garden Ground"

"The development of a new house (or houses) within the curtilage of an existing house will only be considered where it can be demonstrated that the proposal complies with the following criteria:

- 1. The proposed house(s) is of a scale, massing, design and material sympathetic to the character and pattern of development in the area and does not result in a development that appears cramped, visually obtrusive or is of an appearance which is out of keeping with the established character or is harmful to the amenity of the area.
- 2. The proposed house plot(s) and that remaining to the existing house are comparable with those nearby in terms of size, shape, and amenity and accords with the established pattern of development in the surrounding area.
- 3. The proposed house(s) should have a proper road frontage of comparable size and form to surrounding curtilages unless the proposal reflects the development pattern of the area.
- 4. The proposed vehicular access is of an adequate standard and will not have adverse implications for traffic safety or adversely affect the amenity of adjacent properties by virtue of noise or loss of privacy.
- 5. The garden space allocated to the proposed house(s) and that remaining for the existing house should be sufficient for the recreational and amenity needs of the occupants.
- 6. The proposed development will not cause an unacceptable reduction in privacy to existing houses and will, itself, enjoy a level of privacy comparable with surrounding dwellings.
- 7. The proposed development will not overshadow adjacent properties to a degree which results in a significant loss of amenity for residents or is significantly adversely affected by overshadowing.
- 8. All existing features such as trees, hedges, walls, fences and buildings that contribute to the character of the area should be retained and should not be adversely affected by the development.
- 9. Adequate parking for both the proposed and existing house must be provided within the site and must not be harmful to the established character and amenity of the area.
- 10. The proposal must not jeopardise or be prejudicial to any future development proposals in the vicinity. "

Objections

Fundamental and ongoing:

We would contend that the proposal does not comply with and in several ways directly conflicts with the above policy statement in its overall objectives and in particular:

- 1) The proposed new two storey building will severely restrict light to our property and garden and contrary to the Design Statement as there are windows on all elevations this will result in loss of privacy. (Items 6 and 7 above)
 - Moreover the size of the proposed building and the resultant increased density of housing development in this relatively small plot of land is at odds with the overall normative appearance and ambience of the surrounding properties. (Items 1 and 2 above)

 Furthermore contrary to the Design Statement the resultant garden areas are materially smaller than neighbouring properties.
- 2) The close proximity of the property to our property will result in increased levels of noise and disturbance. (Items 4 and 6 above)
- 3) "Proposals shall comply with all required parking and access standards and have no adverse impact in terms of road or public safety"

Also Item4 above

With additional driveway access to Inglewood Crescent there will be increased traffic and resultant increased hazard for the young children who are regularly dropped off and picked up by parents from school at this end of Inglewood Crescent and Dunedin Drive.

4) "Whilst some gardens may be capable of accommodating additional dwelling units, this type of proposal has the potential to adversely affect residential amenity if standards relating to distances between dwellings, garden sizes, access, parking and privacy cannot be met. In addition, this type of proposal can erode the established layout and character of an area."

This proposal does not accord with the above policy statement nor with the principles of "placemaking" which as specified in LDP2 "requires developers to demonstrate an understanding of landscape, setting and context, which reinforces the character and settlement patterns of local areas."

This is a mature settled area with a distinctive character that has evolved over many years. Houses being extended or altered in ways that exhibit an empathy with and understanding of this context is laudable but this not a building site for new development.

5) "Existing trees, woodland and boundary features such as beech and hawthorn hedgerows and stone dykes, shall be retained on site." Also Item 8 in Policy DM3 above

Large established trees have recently been removed from the proposed site in contravention of the above. Was formal permission applied for and granted?

Objections

During the period of any construction work:

A development of this scale and duration will cause severe disruption possibly to both traffic
and services. As a result of the proposed build, we cannot countenance any planned loss of
services before, during or after the period in question.

Furthermore this will not be a project that can be conducted in silence. While a normal level of work related noise is always a possibility, we feel that what is likely to be involved will be ongoing and excessive.

Legal Issue Enquiries

- 1) It was our understanding that each plot was designated for one dwelling house only. Do the deeds/feu for this property permit a subdivision of the existing plot for the proposed purposes of an additional dwelling house?
- 2) The plan included with the application that shows the 20m range within which property owners are alerted overlaps with No. 16 Inglewood Crescent, The Westwood Church Manse. However the same plan does not show this property as having been informed. What is the correct position?

Covid-19

Under Covid-19 lockdown rules there is greatly reduced opportunity to take advice in face-to-face meetings with for example legal representation. This situation significantly undermines the ability to prepare a proper case for objection within the given time constraints.

Mr R. N. Kay, Mrs M. R. Kay

2, Inglewood Crescent

Hairmyres

East Kilbride G75 8QD