

	<h1>Report</h1>	Agenda Item <h2>6</h2>
---	-----------------	--------------------------------------

Report to:	Planning Committee
Date of Meeting:	10 October 2006
Report by:	Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

Application No	CR/06/0184
Planning Proposal:	Erection of 16 Flats (13 Three Apartment and 3 Two Apartment) (3 Storey High) 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) Grant Detailed Planning Permission (Subject to Conditions – Based on Conditions Listed)

2.2 Other Actions/Notes : The Planning Committee has delegated powers to determine this application.

3 Other Information

- ◆ Applicant's Agent: Premier Design Associates
- ◆ Council Area/Ward: 57 Stonelaw
- ◆ Policy Reference(s): Cambuslang/Rutherglen Local Plan 2002, Policy RES 9 (Residential Land Use Area) applicable. In addition a similar policy (RES 6) of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan (Finalised Draft) 2006 is also relevant.
- ◆ Representation(s):
 - ▶ 12 Objection Letters
- ◆ Consultation(s):

Environmental Services

Roads and Transportation Services (North Division)

Scottish Water

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”.
- 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 two house types adjoining the site, namely semi detached bungalows in St Ronans Drive and two storey semi detached sandstone villas in Springfield Park Road.
- 1.3 At the rear of the building, 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, where it adjoins the site, is used for parking given the sites proximity to Burnside Commercial Centre and the Railway Station.

2 Proposal(s)

- 2.1 It is now proposed to demolish the existing workshop building & 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 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 (a brief engineering methodology statement detailing this aspect of the proposal has been lodged)
 - (b) Erect 16 flats (13 three apartment and 3 two apartment units) with an “L shaped” footprint, with the foot of the “L” being along St Ronans Drive. These flats will:
 - Be predominantly 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 & 70 St. Ronans Drive.

- Be two storeys high at each end of the building (again when viewed from Dukes Road) - immediately to the rear of no. 81 Springfield Park Road and to the side of 74 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 being by means of centrally positioned, roller shutter controlled, doors.
- Be finished externally with modern materials (artificial stone, render and artificial slate) and have, due to the changes in height and building angles, an interesting roof design involving gable 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, the three storey element of the development being 28 metres away.
- 17 metres from the rear of 81 Springfield Park Road (a two 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 on the central three storey element of the development will be 10 metres high when viewed from Dukes Road. 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.
- 8 metres higher than the dwellings at 68 and 70 St Ronans Drive. (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.)

2.4 On the two storey “wings” of the proposal, the ridgeline of the roof will be 1.3 metres higher than the existing building, when viewed from no 81 Springfield Park Road, but 1.5 metres further away. At the other end of the building on St Ronans Drive, the ridgeline of the proposed two storey section will be 5 metres higher than no 74.

2.5 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.

- 2.6 When the application was first lodged, consent was sought for 17 flats. The proposal however has since been revised to 16 flats, and the drawings amended by reducing the height of the development adjacent to 74 St Ronans Drive from three to two storeys, with basement parking.

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 2006.

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 has been one previous application for the site within the last 5 years, namely: CR/05/0404 – “Erection of 18 flats”. Withdrawn.

4 Consultation(s)

- 4.1 **Roads and Transportation Services** - Originally recommended that the determination of the application be deferred due to outstanding issues relative to parking, structural engineering requirements and the need for the access to have a dropped kerb vehicular footway. Following receipt of revised drawings, now offer no objection subject to conditions.

Response: Noted.

- 4.2 **Roads and Transportation HQ** – Advised that structural issues at this stage - the retention of Dukes Road etc – requires further details.

Response: Noted. A condition regarding the submission of such can be imposed.

- 4.3 **Environmental Services** - Offer comments relative to noise associated with construction activity, drainage, possibility of asbestos in building, 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 adverse comments. Developer however should establish contact to clarify all available options.

Response: Noted. The developer has been advised accordingly.

- 4.5 **Burnside Community Council** - Proposal will result in a degree of over development as the building is too high for its location and it fills the site excessively. In addition, the building will dominate neighbouring properties and is “right up to the

pavement on St. Ronans Drive”; there is potential for loss of privacy and light and there have been previous contamination problems associated with the site.

Response: These comments were lodged prior to the drawings being amended by the applicant. In addition the issues raised 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.

5 Representation(s)

5.1 Statutory neighbour notification was undertaken following which 7 letters of objection were received. Furthermore, following the receipt of the revised drawings, all those who had lodged representation were contacted again, and a further five 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. In addition, the two storey elements of the proposal, will be only 1.4 metres higher than the existing garage.

The proposed flats, when viewed from the houses at the rear of the site, will result in a greater scale of building when compared with the existing. As described above, this increased height, however, will be further away from the houses overlooking the rear of the garage and will be comparable with adjoining properties; while nearby at the Burnside Commercial Centre, three storey tenements already exist. In addition, elsewhere in the area, three storey flats have received consent (Lower Bourtree Drive; Greystone Avenue). Therefore the introduction of a building of a height greater than some of the neighbouring properties is in itself, assuming all other planning considerations to be satisfactory, not sufficient reason for resisting a proposal.

(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 with neighbouring properties 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 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 16 flats, 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, given the existing high brick wall partially screens the road and the fact that headlights are directed downwards to illuminate the road, this increase in intensity will be significant enough to warrant refusal of permission.

(f) Height of building contravenes predetermined restrictions in title deeds in that it is more than two storeys and higher than the ridge height of the existing garage workshops.

Response: A copy of the burdens imposed in the title associated with a neighbouring house has 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 advised 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 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 this existing situation. Nevertheless, although the ridgeline of the proposed building will be 3.8 metres higher than that of the existing workshop/garage, it will be further away from the properties at 68 and 70 St. Ronans Drive. At present the change in level is 10 metres and the distance between these houses and the highest part of the roof is 27 metres. The new roof will be approximately 13.5 metres above the ground level of the bungalows but the proposed ridgeline will be 33 metres (approximately) from the front of the houses at 68/70 St Ronans Drive. Consequently, there will be a very limited change in the angle at which daylight/sunlight reaches these properties around midday. I do not consider, therefore, that the level of sunlight and daylight reaching the houses will be altered to an extent that would justify a refusal of planning permission.

In a similar manner, the properties at Springfield Park Road will see the ridge height of the two storey element next to them increased by approximately 1.4 metres. This elevation of the building, however, will be moved back from this boundary by 1.5 of a metre, which in part will compensate for the increased height and thus minimize the early morning daylight/sunlight impact on these properties. The dwellings on the eastern side of St Ronans Drive will experience a change resulting from the erection of the proposed building (3 and 2 storey) opposite them. In this case, however, the shadow cast by the proposed building will impact in the evening as the sun sets and the shadow will be to the front of the house rather than the "private" rear garden area. In this connection the bungalows opposite also have relatively long rear gardens (20 metres), and direct sunshine will still reach these properties for a substantial part of the day. In view of the above and having regard to the separation distance I do not consider that the daylight/sunlight impact on these properties will be sufficient to justify a refusal of consent.

In conclusion I accept that there will be some change to the existing shadow and daylight patterns. I do not believe, however, that this is to a significant or material extent, or could justify the withholding of consent.

(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 and the presence of asbestos. 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 two 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) Safety concerns in the rear access forecourt due to increased traffic and the absence of a pavement.

Response: The speed of the traffic entering the forecourt along with the available forward visibility should mean that the proposal does not have a significant detrimental affect on safety, when compared with the existing

situation. Furthermore although privately owned and maintained, a slabbed footway to the two houses does exist.

- (n) **Access will be formed over ground not owned by applicant; potential dispute regarding access rights.**

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

- (o) **Lack of detail re ventilation from underground car park, bin position etc.**

Response : I accept that the drawings do not indicate ventilation details and therefore a condition requiring the submission of this can be imposed. I would add however that the roller shutter door may not be of solid construction and therefore this may provide the required ventilation. An area within the basement is however identified for refuse storage.

- (p) **Possibility of a collection of wheelie bins being stored in St Ronans Drive being unsightly.**

Response : With all flatted developments there are issues relating to bin collection and in this regard, the applicant has advised that arrangements will be made for the bins to be emptied and returned to their storage area on the same day. This may involve the bins being positioned kerbside in St Ronans Drive during the appropriate collection day, similar to other wheelie bins in the street. This itself is not unusual or sufficient ground to resist the proposal.

- (q) **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.

- (r) **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.

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

Response : The proposal will provide, at its maximum, three floors of accommodation and when viewed from Dukes Road, will be three and two storeys high. 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.

- (t) **Poor design/external materials.**

Response : The design of the flats is similar to others in the area; likewise so are the proposed external finishes. It is however accepted that the design/materials may be modern, but I do not consider them to be of a ‘poor’ quality or standard.

- (u) **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.

(v) Re-siting of existing British Telecom Pole.

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

- 5.2 Overall whilst recognising the neighbours' concerns, I do not believe that either individually or collectively they are of sufficient weight or merit in planning terms to justify a refusal of consent.

6 Assessment and Conclusions

- 6.1 The site at Dukes Road is, in terms of the general character of the locality within a residential area close to Burnside Commercial Centre. In land use policy terms, the proposal complies with the provisions of both the adopted and Finalised Draft Local Plan, and therefore the principle of the proposal can be considered acceptable; and in terms of the representations received, the use of the site for residential purposes has not been raised as an issue. Indeed the redevelopment as proposed will remove a "non conforming" land use from the area which itself has possible amenity benefits.
- 6.2 Clearly, it is the details associated with the proposal that will be the main determining factors. In this regard, the proposal will result in the scale and mass of the building within the site being increased but this, by itself, is not sufficient justification for resisting the development. In addition, whilst acknowledging that the house types in the immediate surrounding area are either two storey or bungalows, the roof ridgeline of the three storey element of the proposal, as viewed from Dukes Road, will only be 0.6 metres higher than the neighbouring two storey houses. Consequently in terms of height, the proposed flats will not be visually imposing. Indeed, three storey flats do exist nearby.
- 6.3 In terms of detailed considerations, it is the impact of sunlight on neighbouring houses which is of importance. As detailed earlier in section 5.0 above, I do accept that there will be an impact on some properties, but for the reasons advanced, I do not believe that the impact will be sufficiently material or significant to justify the refusal of consent, all other aspects considered.
- 6.4 The design of the flats, in particular, the roofscape and basement parking will be relatively unusual and the proposed external finishes are also modern. Individually and collectively however they are, in aesthetic and amenity terms, acceptable, similar external finishes being used nearby in a flatted development.
- 6.5 None of the various consultees has offered adverse comments in respect of the proposal, and therefore in servicing and infrastructure terms, there are no obstacles to the development.
- 6.6 The views expressed in the representations have received careful consideration, but in this instance, I am of the view that the issues raised cannot provide a basis for refusing consent. The development plan clearly favours the principle of the proposal and as there are no detailed reasons for resisting the development. I am of the opinion, therefore, that consent should be issued.

7 Reasons for Decision

- 7.1 The proposal complies with the provision of the adopted Local Plan and all detail considerations are satisfactory from a planning point of view.

Iain Urquhart
Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

2 October 2006

Previous References

- ◆ None

List of Background Papers

- ▶ Application Form
- ▶ Application Plans
- ▶ Neighbour Notification Certificate dated 2 June 2006
- ▶ 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 Application CR/05/0404
- ▶ Letter Dated 24 August 2006 to all those who had lodged Representations (names and addresses below)
- ▶ Fax dated 1 September, with enclosure, from Christal Construction Management
- ▶ Letter dated 7 September 2006 from MacDonalds, Solicitors.
- ▶ Letter dated 19 September 2006 to MacClay Murray and Spens, Solicitors
- ▶ Previous Applications CR/97/035 (King Street/Caledonia Avenue), CR/01/0083 (Lower Bourtree Drive), CR/01/0194 (Greystone Avenue) and CR/01/0196 (Castlemilk Road).

- ▶ Consultations
 - Burnside Community Council 26/06/06
 - Environmental Services 30/06/06
 - Roads and Transportation Services (North Division) 03/07/06
 - Scottish Water 18/07/06

- ▶ Representations
 - Representation from : Mr & Mrs William Arthur, 68 St Ronans Drive
Rutherglen G73 3SS, DATED 23/06/06
 - Representation from : Helen & William Galloway, 79 Springfield Park Road
Rutherglen G73 3RG, DATED 27/06/06
 - Representation from : Mark Mulholland, 73 Springfield Park Road
Rutherglen G73 3RG, DATED 28/06/06

- Representation from : Tom Carey, 74 St Ronans Drive
Rutherglen G73 3SS, DATED 14/06/06
- Representation from : Jim and Janet Stroyan, 67 St Ronans Drive
Rutherglen G73 3SS, DATED 14/06/06
- Representation from : Maclay Murray & Spens, 151 St Vincent Street
Glasgow G2 5NJ, DATED 16/06/06
- Representation from : Mary Reade, 69 St Ronans Drive
Rutherglen G73 3SS, DATED 21/07/06
- Representation from : Ruth & Anne Marie Coyle, 77 Springfield Park Road
Rutherglen G73 3RG, DATED 03/07/06
- Representation from : Ruth J & Anne Marie Coyle, 77 Springfield Park Road
Rutherglen G73 3RG, DATED 11/09/06
- Representation from : Tom Carey, 74 St Ronans Drive
Rutherglen G73 3SS, DATED 06/09/06
- Representation from : Mr & Mrs William Arthur, 68 St Ronans Drive
Rutherglen G73 3SS, DATED 06/09/06
- Representation from : Helen & William Galloway, 79 Springfield Park Road
Rutherglen G73 3RD, DATED 06/09/06

Contact for Further Information

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

Steven Clark, Team Leader, Royal Burgh House, 380 King Street, Rutherglen
Ext 5140 (Tel : 0141 613 5140)
E-mail: Enterprise.cam-ruth@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

CONDITIONS

- 1 That the development hereby permitted shall be started within five years of the date of this permission.
- 2 That the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the plans hereby approved and no change to the design or external finishes shall take place without the prior written approval of the Council as Planning Authority.
- 3 That before any development commences on site or before any materials are ordered or brought to the site, details and samples of all materials to be used as external finishes on the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as Planning Authority.
- 4 That before development starts, full details of the design and location of all fences and walls, with particular regard to the mutual boundary with Springfield Park Road, including any retaining walls to be erected on the site, shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as Planning Authority.
- 5 That before the flats hereby permitted are occupied or brought into use, all the fences or walls for which the permission of the Council as Planning Authority has been obtained under the terms of Condition 4 above, shall be erected and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Council.
- 6 That before the development starts, a report from a professionally qualified source describing the soil and ground conditions prevailing over the application site (including details of the nature, concentration and distribution of any contaminants, or petrol storage tanks), shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as Planning Authority and the development shall not be commenced until such action as is recommended by this report to remove or render harmless any such contaminants or tanks, has been implemented and completed to the full specification and entire satisfaction of the Council. The developer shall give the Council at least 7 working days notice in writing prior to the commencement of any decontamination or storage tank removal works on the site.
- 7 That before the development starts, a report/survey from a professionally qualified source in accordance with MDHS 100 'Surveying and Sampling of Asbestos Containing Materials' detailing the nature, concentration and distribution of any asbestos within the application site and in particular the building to be demolished, shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as Planning Authority and the development shall not be commenced until such action as recommended by this report, in order to remove, or render harmless, any such asbestos, has been implemented and completed to the full specification and entire satisfaction of the Council. The developer shall give the Council at least 7 working days notice in writing prior to the commencement of any asbestos work on the site.
- 8 That prior to any work commencing on site further details of: (a) the proposed roller shutter for the basement parking area with particular regard to noise generation and associated considerations; (b) ventilation details, in particular the

point of discharge, for the basement parking, and (c) the arrangements for the storage and emptying of wheelie bins, including the storage area and return arrangements on collection day, shall be lodged for the written approval of the Council as Planning Authority and thereafter the approved details shall be implemented on site to the satisfaction of the said Authority.

- 9 That prior to work commencing on site, further details of the height of the privacy wall in the courtyard area, coloured blue in the drawings hereby approved, shall be lodged for the written approval of the Council as Planning Authority and thereafter the approved details shall be implemented and retained on site to the satisfaction of the said Authority.
- 10 That before the flats hereby approved are completed or brought into use, all of the parking spaces shown in the approved plans shall be laid out and constructed to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads and Planning Authority and thereafter shall be available for use and maintained to the entire satisfaction of the Council.
- 11 That before the development hereby approved is completed or brought into use, a dropped kerb vehicular access to the site shall be constructed in accordance with the specification and to the satisfaction of the Council as Roads and Planning Authority.
- 12 That prior to any work commencing on site a detailed methodology statement, with appropriate drawings and calculations, from a recognised professional firm of structural engineers shall be submitted for the written approval of the Council as Planning Authority, this statement detailing and confirming the retention proposals for the adjacent public roads and thereafter the approved details shall be implement on site to the satisfaction of the said Authority and thereafter the retaining structure shall be maintained in perpetuity by the applicant or their successors .

REASONS

- 1 To accord with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.
- 2 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 3 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 4 These details have not been submitted or approved.
- 5 In the interests of amenity and in order to retain effective planning control.
- 6 To ensure the site is free of contamination and suitable for development.
- 7 To ensure the site is free from contamination
- 8 These details have not been submitted or approved.
- 9 To safeguard the residential amenity of the area in general and the adjoining properties in particular.
- 10 To ensure the provision of adequate parking facilities within the site.
- 11 In the interest of public safety
- 12 To ensure the retention and integrity of the adjacent public roads.

For information only

For information only



