

	<h1>Report</h1>	Agenda Item <h1>11</h1>
---	-----------------	---------------------------------------

Report to:	Planning Committee
Date of Meeting:	27 February 2007
Report by:	Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

Application No	CR/06/0393
Planning Proposal:	Erection of 18 (2 bedroom) Flats with Basement Parking

1 Summary Application Information

- Application Type : Detailed Planning Application
- Applicant : Bavaird Developments
- Location : 180 Dukes Road
Rutherglen

2 Recommendation(s)

2.1 The Committee is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

(1) As an appeal has been received regarding non-determination of the application, Committee ratification is requested that consent would have been refused if the Committee had been able to determine the application.

2.2 Other Actions/Notes: None

3 Other Information

- ◆ Applicant's Agent: Premier Design Associates
- ◆ Council Area/Ward: 57 Stonelaw
- ◆ Policy Reference(s): Cambuslang/Rutherglen Local Plan 2002, policies RES9 (Residential Land Use Area); DC1 and SLP6 (Development Control General) are applicable. In addition policies RES6 (Residential Land Use Area), ENV30 (New Housing Development), DM1 (Development Management) and DM9 (Demolition and Redevelopment for Residential Use) are material considerations.

- ◆ Representation(s):
 - ▶ 5 Objection Letters
 - ▶ 0 Support Letters

◆ Consultation(s):

Burnside Community Council

Environmental Services

Roads and Transportation Services (North Division)

Roads & Transportation Services H.Q. (Flooding)

S.E.P.A. (West Region)

Planning Application Report

1 Application Site

- 1.1 On the north side of Dukes Road, between Springfield Park Road and St Ronans Drive, the application site extends to 875 square metres or thereby and at present contains a redundant filling station with associated vehicle repair workshop/offices (Gordon Gould & Co). In this regard, there is a single storey building (Sandstone frontage, corrugated roof) which at the rear is two storeys in height with basement lock ups, a forecourt with adjoining hard standing at the St Ronans Drive side, and redundant petrol pumps that are “boarded up,” one of which is lying on its side.
- 1.2 The area surrounding the site is residential in nature, notwithstanding the existence on the opposite side of Dukes Road, of an elevated rail line, and at road level, a small commercial unit (shoe repairs). Indeed in general terms there are three house types near to the site, namely semi detached bungalows in St Ronans Drive and two storey semi detached sandstone villas and terraced properties in Springfield Park Road.
- 1.3 At the rear of the site, there are 1980’s bungalows, two of which (no 68 and 70 St Ronans Drive) face the rear elevation of the garage building and the “basement” lock ups. The rear elevation of the garage is approximately 22 metres from the front of the bungalows, is approximately 9 metres high to the ridgeline of the roof and consists of roller shutter doors (7 of) with brick above.
- 1.4 Access to the basement lock ups is by means of a shared access with no’s 68 and 70 St Ronans Drive. It has a tarmac surface, is privately maintained and in terms of levels, is approximately 3.5 metres below the forecourt of the garage. A brick wall, 2.5 metre high for the greatest length of this boundary, separates the site from the rear gardens of houses in Springfield Park Road. At the rear of number 81 Springfield Park Avenue, the boundary is established by the gable of the existing workshop.
- 1.5 Dukes Road, as it adjoins the site, is subject to on street parking given the sites proximity to Burnside Commercial Centre and the Railway Station.

2.0 Proposal(s)

- 2.1 It is now proposed to demolish the existing workshop building and lock ups plus all the associated equipment and excavate the site so that the high level forecourt of the garage is removed and the site has a ground level comparable with the existing private access road. In addition it is proposed to:
 - (a) Erect a significant retaining wall along the ‘heel’ of the footway of Dukes Road and St Ronans Drive (and part of the rear gardens of Springfield Park Road) to stabilise the existing ground levels.
 - (b) Erect 18 flats (all two bed units) with an “L shaped” footprint, with the foot of the “L” being along St Ronans Drive. These flats will:
 - Be three storeys high with pitched roof, when viewed from Dukes Road. This storey height however will be greater when viewed from the rear, especially the two existing bungalows at 68 and 70 St. Ronans Drive.

- Have “basement” parking, with access/egress being by means of the private access at the rear of the site. In detail, 7 basement lock-ups and 21 underground spaces will be provided, entry/exit to the latter spaces being by means of a centrally positioned, roller shutter door.
- Be finished externally with modern materials (artificial stone, render and artificial slate) and have a roof design involving gable and hipped ends, hipped “secondary” roof projections, and pyramid roofs, at Dukes Road/ St Ronans Drive, above glazed corner features.

2.2 In terms of distances the proposed flats themselves will be:

- 12.7 metres away from the gable of no 74 St Ronans Drive.
- 23 metres from the front of no 68/70 St Ronans Drive.
- 17 metres from the rear of 81 Springfield Park Road (a three storey high, windowless gable elevation with pitched roof above).
- 18 metres from the front of the properties at no's 69 and 71 St Ronans Drive.

2.3 In terms of height, the ridgeline of the three storey flats will be 10 metres high when viewed from Dukes Road, this height increasing to 12.5 metres when viewed from the rear. In comparison with other properties, this will be:

- 0.6 of a metre higher than the existing two storey house at 81 Springfield Park Road.
- 13 metres higher than the front gardens of the dwellings at 68 and 70 St Ronans Drive. (The front of these properties will be approximately 33 metres away from the highest part of the roof. They presently look towards the roof of the existing vehicle repair workshop which is 3.8 metres lower than the proposal, but 6.5 metres closer.)
- 13 metres higher than the side garden of 74 St Ronan's Drive which will be 9.5 metres from the four storey gable wall which will be 11 metres high due to the basement parking.

2.4 A courtyard area, in the form of decking above the basement parking, excluding the footprint of the flats, will be provided. This will be 17.8 metres from the dwellings at 68 and 70 St Ronans Drive. Access to the upper flats would be by means of enclosed stairwells at the rear of the building. The main pedestrian entrance door to the proposed flats will be from Dukes Road with the western gable of the flats being off set from the mutual boundary by 1.5 of a metre. The eastern gable of the proposed flats will run level with the footway of St Ronans Drive. Patio doors, with 'ornamental' balconies will be included in both the Dukes Road and St Ronans Drive, elevations.

3 Background

3.1 Local Plan Policy

The site is located within a Residential Land Use Area (Policy RES9) of the adopted Cambuslang/Rutherglen Local Plan. A similar land use designation and policy (RES6) is retained in the Finalised Draft of the South Lanarkshire Council Local Plan (Finalised Draft) 2006. The principle of the development is therefore not contentious from a land use perspective.

Other policies of the adopted Local Plan are also applicable, particularly policies DC1 and SLP6 (Development Control General) which seek to ensure that all forms of development are compatible with the site's surroundings in terms of scale, mass etc. In terms of the South Lanarkshire (Finalised Draft) Local Plan policy ENV 30 – New Housing Development – is relevant, this policy requiring all new developments to comply with a number of criteria, including: (i) the proposal to have no adverse impact on existing properties in terms of overshadowing etc and (ii) the provision of satisfactory parking. In addition policy DM1 (Development Management) and DM 9 (Demolition and Redevelopment for Residential Use) are also relevant, both of which require certain criteria to be complied with in order that the development does not have an adverse impact on the area in general or adjoining properties in particular.

3.2 **Relevant Government Advice/Policy**

None directly applicable given the nature and location of the proposal. In general terms however, Scottish Planning Policy 1 (The Planning System) and the 1997 Planning Act advises that the determination of planning applications should be made in accordance with the provisions of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In addition Scottish Planning Policy 3 (Planning for Housing) encourages the re-use and redevelopment of Brownfield sites for housing in preference to Greenfield and advises that densities in urban locations close to good transport links, can, subject to appropriate design etc, be higher than normal.

3.3 **Planning History**

There have been two previous applications for the site within the last 5 years, namely:

CR/05/0404 – “Erection of 18 flats”. Withdrawn.

CR/06/0184 – “Erection of 16 flats (13 three apartment units and 3 two apartment units) with basement parking. Approved October 2006.

4 **Consultation(s)**

- 4.1 **Roads and Transportation Services** – Recommend refusal as the proposal does not provide sufficient off street parking. In this respect the appropriate Council Guidelines indicate that for 18 two bed flats, 36 spaces should be provided and the application proposes 28 spaces including 8 lock-up garages which are not considered as parking spaces in terms of the aforementioned guidelines. In addition the locality of the site has limited off street parking and therefore such spaces are at a premium. Consequently it is very important that the development provides a satisfactory provision of off street parking.

Response: It is acknowledged that the area surrounding the site is subject to on street parking due to the proximity of the Burnside shops, the railway station and existing houses, especially the nearby terrace where all parking is on street. Consequently it is of vital importance that the appropriate level of off street parking is provided in order that the existing situation is not exacerbated and that Council standards and requirements, as detailed in the ‘Guidelines for Development Roads’ are complied with and not undermined. I would add however that the proposed lock

up garages were previously considered as part of the parking provision (consent CR/06/0184) and that with flatted developments garage parking as proposed is not unusual. Nevertheless even with the lock ups only 28 spaces will be provided some 8 spaces short (22%) of the required number, a deficiency that is substantial and unacceptable from a planning or roads perspective.

- 4.2 **Roads and Transportation HQ** – Provide information relative to Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) standards/design.

Response: Noted. Given the limited area of the site, the absence of a near by water course, its location within an established urban area and the previous consent that did not include SUDS provision, I am of the view that to require the provision of a SUDS drainage scheme for the present proposal would be unreasonable and could not be justified on this occasion.

- 4.3 **Environmental Services** – Offer comments relative to noise associated with construction activity, drainage, proximity of railway line, pest control measures and ground contamination.

Response: Where appropriate and necessary, and should the application be determined favourably, conditions can be imposed on consent that will address these aspects in a satisfactory manner.

- 4.4 **Scottish Water** – No response to date. Did confirm previously however (application CR/06/0184) that they had no adverse comments. Developer should however establish contact to clarify all available options.

Response: Noted. The developer has previously been advised of this.

- 4.5 **Burnside Community Council** – Proposal will result in a degree of over development as the building fills the site excessively and will dominate neighbouring properties especially those in St. Ronans Drive. In particular the development is not in keeping with other properties in St Ronans Drive where the development would rise to the equivalent of four floors.

Response: These comments are similar to those concerns highlighted in the representations received. A full and detailed response to these concerns is provided in section 5.0 below.

- 4.6 **Scottish Environmental Protection Agency** – No response to date.

Response: Noted.

5 Representation(s)

- 5.1 Statutory neighbour notification was undertaken following which 5 letters of objection were received. The issues raised can be summarised as:

(a) Height of development, predominantly 4 storey, is too great when compared with surrounding area.

Response: The proposed development will increase the height of the building occupying the site, when compared with the existing garage workshop, by approximately 3.8 metres. The highest part of the building, however, will be approximately 6.5 metres further south than the existing ridgeline and will result in the roof height being only 0.6 of a metre higher than the ridgeline of the neighbouring two storey properties on Springfield Park Road. However when compared with the previous consent issued for the site, the gable ends of the proposed building will now be three storeys high (excluding the basement parking) and therefore the scale and mass of the building has increased substantially in relation to the nearest houses.

(b) Loss of Privacy, especially from external walkway and external courtyard.

Response: The existing properties of St Ronans Drive and Springfield Park Road, being within a suburban area, will have a level of privacy commensurate with such a location. As a result, relationships between windows to windows/gardens already exist and therefore the level of privacy will not be absolute.

The proposed flats will result in a window to window distance of at least 23 metres between the rear of the proposed block and the houses at 68 and 70 St Ronans Drive. The separation distance is less (18 to 19 metres approx) across St Ronans Drive, however the front garden area of these properties already enjoy less privacy due to their location next to public road/footways. In this respect, I consider that the 18/19 metre window to window distance involved is not unacceptable, especially when the proposed separation distances are greater than some of the established relationships in the locality. Indeed, even with the development being three storeys high, I consider that no unacceptable or inappropriate relationship in terms of privacy will be established, because of the separation distances indicated. In this regard, the proposed walkways will be 22 metres and 26 metres respectively from the common boundary of the nearest houses in St Ronans Drive and Springfield Park Road respectively, a distance that is not unreasonable given the relatively limited occasions that the access walkways will be used.

With regard to the courtyard, this will be 17.8 metres from the front of 68 and 70 St Ronans Drive, a distance which, in my opinion, is not unreasonable in terms of privacy and is comparable to other separation distances in the locality. I acknowledge however that in terms of the houses in Springfield Park Road the separation distance will be less and therefore should the application be viewed favourably an appropriate privacy wall/screen will be required and this can be conditioned as part of any consent that is issued.

(c) Child Safety issues for children in neighbouring houses.

Response: It is acknowledged that nowadays the protection of children is uppermost in parent's minds. Nevertheless it cannot be assumed that the proposal, by introducing new residents into the area, will automatically result in a greater level of danger to children than could exist elsewhere.

(d) Overdevelopment.

Response: The proposal is for flats and is therefore of a relatively high density. The majority of the flats however do have a floor area of 60 to 70 square metres which is of an appropriate and acceptable size, and the site does have good connections to public transport, where present advice encourages higher densities for reasons of sustainability (subject to all other aspects being acceptable). In addition, the design, using 'underground' parking, does allow for a more efficient use of the site area, but all factors considered, the density in itself, is not sufficient grounds for resisting the development.

(e) Increase in vehicular activity to rear of house/light intrusion from headlights.

Response: The development will increase vehicular activity at the access/egress to the development. This itself, however, is not unusual or unique as the majority of houses in the locality will already experience traffic

movements/noise close to their properties and from a planning point of view, this must be acknowledged. In my opinion therefore the increase in traffic, resulting from the vehicle movements associated with 18 flats, (two more units when compared with the consent that has been issued) is not sufficient justification to resist the development.

In darker months, headlights will be used and there is potential for headlights etc. to be seen/illuminate neighbouring gardens/windows, especially when the houses of Springfield Park Road have windows that generally look down the proposed access. This area however is already used by cars (entering or leaving the two houses or the existing 7 lock ups) and therefore the proposal will not introduce a new factor into the locality, notwithstanding that it will be more intensive. I do not believe however that, this increase in intensity will be significant enough to warrant refusal of permission as an existing high brick wall partially screens the road and the fact that headlights are directed downwards to illuminate the road.

(f) Height of building contravenes predetermined restrictions in title deeds in that it is more than two storeys.

Response: A copy of the burdens imposed in the title associated with a neighbouring house has previously been lodged in support of this aspect and it would appear that there is a restriction on building height. This however is a legal matter of title and not a material planning consideration. In any event, the applicant's solicitor has previously advised (application CR/06/0184) that an appropriate application can be made to the Land Tribunal to address this matter.

(g) Loss of sunlight.

Response: The existing building at present occupies an elevated, southern location when compared with the bungalows at 68, 70 and 74 St Ronans Drive. At present it casts a shadow towards these properties and photographic evidence of this has previously been lodged. In this regard, the shadow will be to the front or side of these properties rather than their rear "private" gardens and the midday shadow is at its longest in the winter months when the sun is lower in the sky.

In addition, the properties at Springfield Park Road, being to the west of the site and having the gable of the garage adjacent to the mutual boundary will currently be in shadow early morning. The properties on the eastern side of St Ronans Drive will not be affected at present as the existing garage building is set back within the site and therefore the shadow is unlikely to encroach on these houses. If it did however, it would be to their front gardens.

Clearly, the proposed building, being of greater height, will alter the existing situation. Consent however was previously issued for a similar form of development at the site when it was considered that whilst there would be some change to existing day light/shadow patterns, this would not be to a significant or material extent that could justify the withholding of consent. Clearly therefore it is the differences between the present proposal and the consented scheme that have to be considered and assessed.

In simplistic terms the main difference relates to the provision of an additional two flats; with application CR/06/0184 the flats will be two storeys high adjacent to the nearest neighbouring properties whereas with the present proposal the building will be three storeys high beside the neighbouring houses. As a result a windowless three storey gable elevation with basement parking will be 16.7

metres away from the rear of the nearest house in Springfield Park Road and 12.7 metres away from the side of number 74 St Ronans Drive. Clearly the height of this building along with the separation distances, differences in ground levels and orientation in terms of the sun's movement throughout the day will result in shadowing of the nearest houses to an extent and degree which in my opinion will be significant and have a material impact on the present level of amenity associated with these houses.

(h) Noise from roller shutter door associated with entrance/exit to basement parking.

Response: It is acknowledged that due to the mechanical opening of such shutters there will be potential for noise. I am aware however of such shutters being used at other residential developments, directly below flats. I am therefore confident that an appropriate, relatively quiet, roller shutter can be used and a condition requiring further details of the shutter etc can be imposed to ensure this should consent be issued.

(i) Potential pollution from demolition activity and safety concerns. (There have been previous pollution incidents)

Response: As advised by Environmental Services, appropriate investigations will be necessary in terms of potential site contamination etc. Conditions in this respect will therefore be imposed if consent is issued. In addition, it would be the responsibility of a contractor and/or site owner to ensure appropriate pollution control and safety measures are employed on site and there are no reasons why this should not occur.

(j) Use of surrounding roads by construction vehicles

Response: The roads surrounding the site are public roads, and therefore any vehicle, including construction vehicles, that are taxed, insured and where necessary, have a valid MOT are at liberty to use them. Nevertheless should the application be determined favourably, the applicant would be advised of this concern and a request for all construction traffic not to use the neighbouring residential streets (St Ronans Drive and Springfield Park Road) would be made. The absence of construction traffic however cannot be guaranteed as it is essentially due to driver responsibility.

(k) Parking of vehicles on pavement, police will be informed.

Response: Noted. Anyone is entitled to contact the police should they believe a traffic offence is/has been committed.

(l) Reduction in width of rear access will create in claustrophobic environment.

Response: The rear wall of the development (3.8 metre high at the basement parking) will be 17.8 metres away from the front of 68 and 70 St Ronans Drive; and the gable of number 74 will be 12.7 metres from the three storey block situated above the basement parking, at the junction between the private access and St. Ronans Drive. Nevertheless, it is not unusual to pass by the side of a building when negotiating an access and having regard to the aforementioned separate distances and the scale of the development I am not persuaded that an inappropriate, claustrophobic environment will be created.

- (m) **Access will be formed over ground not owned by applicant; potential dispute regarding access rights and there is insufficient space in yard for vehicles to move.**

Response: Similar to (f) above, this is a legal matter rather than a material planning consideration.

- (n) **Increased traffic in local roads.**

Response : Traffic will be generated by the proposal but I do not believe this will be to a significant or material extent. Indeed, the proposal may be “balance neutral” given that the previous filling station/garage would have been significant in terms of traffic arriving and leaving the site. In addition, Roads & Transportation have not objected to this proposal on the basis of its impact on the road network.

- (o) **Properties may be rented rather than purchased.**

Response: In planning terms it is not material if the proposed flats are sold or leased. In any event, other flats nearby are available for rent.

- (p) **Property will be 4 storey high.**

Response: The proposal will provide three floors of accommodation when viewed from Dukes Road. I accept and acknowledge however, that when viewed from the rear of the site, the change in level and the basement parking will increase the height of the development when viewed from this position. This difference in height is recognised in this report.

- (q) **Potential damage to property during construction.**

Response: It is supposition to suggest that neighbouring property will be damaged and a competent contractor will employ best practice to ensure that this does not occur. In any event it is the developers/contractors responsibility rather than the planning authorities, to ensure safe and appropriate work practices and protection of neighbouring property.

- (r) **Re-siting of existing British Telecom Pole.**

Response: Again, it would be the developer's responsibility to re-site the telecom pole in conjunction with BT and this should be possible with the minimum of disruption to customers.

- (s) **Dismay at the previous issue of consent.**

Response: The report prepared for application CR/06/0184 explained in detail the reasons and justification for the issue of consent and I am convinced that this decision was soundly based given all material planning considerations.

- 5.2 Overall whilst recognising that the neighbours' have a number of concerns I am of the view that the majority of them do not merit support from a planning perspective. The increased mass and scale of the proposal when compared with the previously issued consent, does however generate concern as the impact of the larger building will in my view, have serious and adverse consequences for residents neighbouring the site especially in terms of loss of sunlight and physical presence.

6 Assessment and Conclusions

- 6.1 The site at Dukes Road already benefits from detailed planning consent for the erection of 16 flats and therefore this aspect must be acknowledged in the assessment and consideration of this application. In this connection the principle of

residential development has therefore been established and consequently it is the detailed matters associated with the proposal that will be critical to the assessment of this application. Indeed in terms of the representations received, the use of the site for residential purposes has not been raised as an issue.

- 6.2 In general terms the difference between the consented proposal and this application is the provision of an extra two flats as a result of the building being increased in height and size at the gable ends of the building. This difference in terms of the relationship that will be established with adjoining houses is significant as the whole scale, mass and physical presence of the development will alter with the resultant impact on the general character of the locality and the amenity of neighbouring residents in particular.
- 6.3 Both the adopted and Finalised Draft Local Plan promote and encourage appropriate development. In this context the relevant development control/management policies seek to ensure that all forms of development take account of the local context and built form and be compatible with adjacent buildings and surrounding streetscape in terms of scale, massing, design, external materials and impact on amenity. Clearly the applicable policies are designed to protect residential amenity and in the first instance it is in this regard that the application must be considered.
- 6.4 In terms of detailed considerations, the impact of sunlight on neighbouring houses is of fundamental importance. In this connection and with the issue of consent CR/06/0184 it was accepted that there would be an impact but it was considered that this would not be to a material or detrimental extent. With the addition of two flats as proposed and given the relationship this will established with neighbouring properties in terms of height and proximity, I do have serious concerns that the additional flats will result in the overshadowing of neighbouring properties to a material and unacceptable extent that will be detrimental to the amenity of the affected properties. Indeed the consented proposal was two storey adjacent to the nearest properties and this was purposely designed to ensure an acceptable relationship.
- 6.5 In terms of road related matters the Divisional Engineer is of the view that the proposal has insufficient off street parking and that it is of vital importance to ensure that Council standards, as they relate to off street parking, is provided. This in terms of the locality of the site assumes greater importance given the extent of on street parking that presently takes place and existing parking restrictions. Consequently it is very important to ensure that an appropriate provision of parking spaces is provided and in this regard the proposal has a deficiency of at least eight spaces (22%) of the required number. This from a roads perspective can not be supported.
- 6.6 The views expressed in the representations have received careful consideration, but in this instance, I am of the view that overshadowing (amenity) and parking issues aside, there are no other issues of substance that can justify the refusal of consent notwithstanding that the development plan clearly favours the principle of the proposal.

7 Reasons for Decision

- 7.1 Detail aspects associated with the proposal are unsatisfactory from a planning point of view. In particular the scale and mass of the proposal will result in adverse amenity considerations for neighbouring properties and insufficient off street parking is proposed. As a result the proposal fails to comply with policies RES9, DC1 and

SLP6 of the adopted Local Plan and policies ENV30, DM1 and DM9 of the Finalised Draft Local Plan.

Iain Urquhart
Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

12 February 2007

Previous References

- ◆ Planning Application Report CR/06/0184

List of Background Papers

- ▶ Application Form
- ▶ Application Plans
- ▶ Neighbour Notification Certificate dated 5th December 2007
- ▶ Cambuslang/Rutherglen Local Plan 2002
- ▶ South Lanarkshire Local Plan (Finalised Draft) 2006
- ▶ Scottish Planning Policy 1 "The Planning System"
- ▶ Scottish Planning Policy 3 "Planning for Housing"
- ▶ Previous applications CR/05/0404 and CR/06/0184
- ▶ Consultations
 - Building Standards Services (Cam/Ruth Area) 18/12/2006
 - Environmental Services 28/12/2006
 - Burnside Community Council 04/01/2007
- ▶ Representations
 - Representation from : R Aboudan and S Shehab, 75 Springfield Park Road
Rutherglen G73 3RG, DATED 09/01/2007
 - Representation from : Helen & William Galloway, 79 Springfield Park Road
Burnside G73 3RG, DATED 09/01/2007
 - Representation from : Mrs Ruth J Coyle, 77 Springfield Park
Burnside
Glasgow G73 3RG, DATED 17/01/2007
 - Representation from : Mr & Mrs William Arthur, 68 St Ronans Drive
Rutherglen G73 3SS, DATED 27/12/2006
 - Representation from : Tom Carey, 74 St Ronans Drive
Rutherglen G73 3SS, DATED

Contact for Further Information

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Steven Clark, Team Leader, King Street, Rutherglen
Ext. 847 5140 (Tel: 0141 613 5140)
E-mail: Enterprise.cam-ruth@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 1 The proposal is contrary to Policies RES9, DC1 and SLP6 of the Cambuslang/Rutherglen Local Plan in that the proposal is not compatible in terms of scale and mass with the neighbouring properties and would therefore have an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the locality in general, and the neighbouring properties in particular.
- 2 The proposal is contrary to Policies ENV 30, DM1 and DM9 of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan (Finalised Draft) 2006 in that the proposal does not respect the local context of the site in terms of scale, proportions or massing and it does not make provision for a satisfactory level of off street parking. In addition the proposal is not sympathetic to the scale and mass of adjacent buildings and will result in the overshadowing of said properties or their gardens to an unacceptable extent and degree.
- 3 In the interests of residential amenity in that the proposal, by virtue of its size, scale, and massing would represent the over development of a restricted site and result in an incongruous, overpowering and obtrusive form of development within the locality to the detriment of the area in general.
- 4 In the interests of the residential amenity of the neighbouring houses as the proposal by reason of its height and proximity to common boundaries will unreasonably restrict sunlight to neighbouring properties to a material extent and degree thereby resulting in the said properties being overshadowed to a detrimental extent.
- 5 The proposal is contrary to the Council's Roads Development Guidelines in that the off street parking associated with the proposal is insufficient to accommodate the requirements of the development and therefore it is more than likely to result in the parking of vehicles in nearby streets which are already congested thereby exacerbating existing unsatisfactory traffic conditions.

For information only

For information only

