

## Law, Aileen

---

**From:** McAdams, Monique Councillor  
**Sent:** 06 May 2020 10:44  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Pending Planning Application P/20/0469 : Closing date 15/5/2020

Please log this as an objection.

Councillor Monique McAdams  
Ward 9 East Kilbride West  
Scottish Labour Party



[REDACTED]  
South Lanarkshire Council  
Council Offices  
Almada Street  
Hamilton  
ML3 0AA

---

**From:** David <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 06 May 2020 10:41  
**To:** McAdams, Monique Councillor <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Pending Planning Application P/20/0469 : Closing date 15/5/2020

I wonder if I could ask for your support in challenging / objecting to the above planning permission which is looking to build a new 2 storey, 4 bedroom house in the garden of an existing property at Inglewood Crescent, Hairmyres, East Kilbride.

I believe that the proposal is totally unsuitable for this location as it will be totally out of character for this area of the town.

All existing properties are sited on large plots with substantial rear gardens giving good-sized areas for drying and recreation purposes. The proposed new build will have seriously reduced rear garden area and will also seriously reduce the rear garden area of the existing property at 15 Dunedin Drive. The layout and density of this proposal

would be totally at odds with the layout and density of the other properties in Inglewood Crescent and Dunedin Drive.

Policy DM1 in the SLC LDP2 states that any new development should enhance or make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area in which the proposed development is located and this particular proposal certainly doesn't meet such criteria. The front elevation of the proposed new house will be much closer to the public footpath than all the other properties in Inglewood Crescent and also in Dunedin Drive. The new proposed house will be only in the region of 2 metres from the public footpath whereas all the other properties in Inglewood Crescent are some 8+ metres distant from the public footpath to the nearest elevation of these other buildings. There is also a proposed overhang on the front elevation which would be even closer to the public footpath. All the existing houses in Inglewood Crescent are situated whereby their road-facing elevations are generally in line with each other. The proposed new build will be considerably out-with the existing line. Even the applicant's existing property at 15 Dunedin Drive has all street-facing elevations set far back from the public footpath, in keeping with all other houses in this location.

I do not believe that the proposal satisfies South Lanarkshire Development Plan Policy 4 (i) insofar as the proposal would introduce a cramped development which would result in both the new and existing houses being on significantly reduced plots compared to all the other houses in this location. The new house would be sited extremely close to the public footpath compared to all nearby properties which are set at least 8 metres or so back from the footpaths. I also believe that it doesn't satisfy SLDP Policy 4 (iv) as it would have significantly less open space and landscape provision than all other properties in the area and have a similar negative effect on the existing property at 15 Dunedin Drive. The applicant has already had three mature fir trees removed, clearly with this proposal in mind and it is possible that more may require to be removed to allow the construction to proceed. This proposed development does not meet Policy DM3 Subdivision of Garden Ground in keeping with all neighbouring properties as it severely reduces the garden and recreation area of the applicant's existing property and will create a similarly smaller garden and recreation area for the proposed new house.

Although the proposal shows 3 parking areas in the plans, they would be unsuitable for most large cars as it would be difficult to enter and exit a vehicle due to the restricted size of the spaces. In fact, it is unlikely that more than one vehicle would actually use the parking area which would mean that other vehicles would be parked on the public roadway of Inglewood Crescent thus negating the provision of 2 of the three parking spaces. Indeed, if there were 3 vehicles in the parking spaces it would be extremely difficult to enter the side door of the house due to the proximity of the parked vehicles. Surely it is the case that simply allocating space to comply with a planning requirement is insufficient grounds for acceptance by the planners if it can be seen that such parking provision is unsuitable for the purpose, clearly impractical and would lead to on-road parking on a regular (daily) basis. As is common practice, on road parking invariably leads to vehicles being half parked on the public footpath which is a matter of concern from a safety aspect.

During the construction phase, there will be noise, disturbance and dust for an indeterminate but certainly lengthy period which will adversely affect all neighbouring properties, particularly to 17 Dunedin Drive and also numbers 1 and 2 in Inglewood Crescent. Due to the proposal showing the building to be extremely close to the public footpath and road, there will be very little room for the storage of materials. Deliveries of materials such as concrete, sand, cement, bricks etc. and the erection of the roof trusses will be likely to cause considerable disturbance and inconvenience to all nearby properties. Construction traffic and tradesmen's vehicles will all be located on Inglewood Drive or Dunedin Drive as there is no off-road provision on the proposed site. It would be highly likely that it would entail such vehicles being parked halfway onto the public footpath and possibly very close to the road junction between Inglewood Crescent and Dunedin Drive thereby causing a safety hazard.

On a personal level, the proposed house will be sited with two sets of patio doors to the rear elevation which overlook the garden and patio area of my property at 17 Dunedin Drive. It will be an invasion of my privacy and be seriously detrimental to such privacy and my personal enjoyment of my back garden and my own patio area. In addition, the proposed house will have an overall height of some 8 metres which will seriously overshadow my back garden area and impinge on my privacy and enjoyment of my own property with some degree of loss of light. The effect of such an imposing structure overlooking my property will be overwhelming. The view of the rear (and side) elevation of this proposed relatively large house would not be conducive to my privacy, peace and enjoyment in my back garden and in my home.

Were the proposal to have been simply a tasteful extension to the applicant's existing house at 15 Dunedin Drive then I would have been unlikely to object but the current proposal is totally unsuitable for the site and totally out of character for the Inglewood Crescent / Dunedin Drive area. An overview of the locale on Google Earth or similar will show that such a cramped site to be completely at odds with all the other properties.

It should also be of some concern to the Local Council that such a development would create precedent for all other properties in this area to utilise their large gardens for similar ventures and thus ruin the existing character of the entire location and add additional pressure to local services including schools and infrastructure.

I have suggested that the proposal and objections would best be served by the Planning Officer visiting the site at the very earliest opportunity, and have suggested that in my objection.

Thanking you in anticipation for your support on this important local issue.

Mr David Hills  
17 Dunedin Drive  
East Kilbride  
G75 8QQ

**From:** David [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 May 2020 11:06  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Pending Planning Application P/20/0469  
**Attachments:** After.PNG; Existing.jpg

Further to my wife's earlier objection to this planning proposal, I wonder if I could offer some further input after consulting with a retired planner friend.

I wish to object to the Planning Application Ref. P/20/0469 for the erection of a two storey house in the garden at the rear of 15 Dunedin Drive, East Kilbride G75 8QQ and the reasons for my objection are as noted hereunder:

I believe that the proposal is totally unsuitable for this location as it will be totally out of character for this area of the town.

All existing properties are sited on large plots with substantial rear gardens giving good-sized areas for drying and recreation purposes. The proposed new build will have seriously reduced rear garden area and will also seriously reduce the rear garden area of the existing property at 15 Dunedin Drive. The layout and density of this proposal would be totally at odds with the layout and density of the other properties in Inglewood Crescent and Dunedin Drive.

Policy DM1 in the SLC LDP2 states that any new development should enhance or make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area in which the proposed development is located and this particular proposal certainly doesn't meet such criteria. The front elevation of the proposed new house will be much closer to the public footpath than all the other properties in Inglewood Crescent and also in Dunedin Drive. The new proposed house will be only in the region of 2 metres from the public footpath whereas all the other properties in Inglewood Crescent are some 8+ metres distant from the public footpath to the nearest elevation of these other buildings. There is also a proposed overhang on the front elevation which would be even closer to the public footpath. All the existing houses in Inglewood Crescent are situated whereby their road-facing elevations are generally in line with each other. The proposed new build will be considerably out-with the existing line. Even the applicant's existing property at 15 Dunedin Drive has all street facing elevations set far back from the public footpath, in keeping with all other houses in this location.

I do not believe that the proposal satisfies South Lanarkshire Development Plan Policy 4 (i) insofar as the proposal would introduce a cramped development which would result in both the new and existing houses being on significantly reduced plots compared to all the other houses in this location. The new house would be sited extremely close to the public footpath compared to all nearby properties which are set at least 8 metres or so back from the footpaths. I also believe that it doesn't satisfy SLDP Policy 4 (iv) as it would have significantly less open space and landscape provision than all other properties in the area and have a similar negative effect on the existing property at 15 Dunedin Drive. The applicant has already had three mature fir trees removed, clearly with this proposal in mind and it is possible that more may require to be removed to allow the construction to proceed. This proposed development does not meet Policy DM3 Subdivision of Garden Ground in keeping with all neighbouring properties as it severely reduces the garden and recreation area of the applicant's existing property and will create a similarly smaller garden and recreation area for the proposed new house.

Although the proposal shows 3 parking areas in the plans, they would be unsuitable for most large cars as it would be difficult to enter and exit a vehicle due to the restricted size of the spaces. In fact, it is unlikely that more than one vehicle would actually use the parking area which would mean that other vehicles would be parked on the public roadway of Inglewood Crescent thus negating the provision of 2 of the three parking spaces. Indeed, if there were 3 vehicles in the parking spaces it would be extremely difficult to enter the side door of the house due to the proximity of the parked vehicles. I think it clear to any neutral observer that it would be highly unlikely that the three parking spaces would ever be used simultaneously. Surely it is the case that simply allocating space to comply

with a planning requirement is insufficient grounds for acceptance by the planners if it can be seen that such parking provision is unsuitable for the purpose, clearly impractical and would lead to on-road parking on a regular (daily) basis. As is common practice, on-road parking invariably leads to vehicles being half-parked on the public footpath which is a matter of concern from a safety aspect.

During the construction phase, there will be noise, disturbance and dust for an indeterminate but certainly lengthy period which will adversely affect all neighbouring properties, particularly to 17 Dunedin Drive and also numbers 1 and 2 in Inglewood Crescent. Due to the proposal showing the building to be extremely close to the public footpath and road, there will be very little room for the storage of materials. Deliveries of materials such as concrete, sand, cement, bricks etc. and the erection of the roof trusses will be likely to cause considerable disturbance and inconvenience to all nearby properties. Construction traffic and tradesmen's vehicles will all be located on Inglewood Drive or Dunedin Drive as there is no off-road provision on the proposed site. It would be highly likely that it would entail such vehicles being parked halfway onto the public footpath and possibly very close to the road junction between Inglewood Crescent and Dunedin Drive thereby causing a safety hazard.

The proposed house will be sited with two sets of patio doors to the rear elevation which overlook the garden and patio area of my property at 17 Dunedin Drive. It will be an invasion of my privacy and be seriously detrimental to such privacy and my personal enjoyment of my back garden and my own patio area. As my kitchen and dining area is also rear-facing, my enjoyment and privacy of my own home will also be adversely affected.

In addition, the proposed house will have an overall height of some 8 metres which will seriously overshadow my back garden area and impinge on my privacy and enjoyment of my own property with some degree of loss of light. The effect of such an imposing structure overlooking my property will be overwhelming. The view of the rear (and side) elevation of this proposed relatively large house would not be conducive to my privacy, peace and enjoyment in my back garden and in my home.

Were the proposal to have been simply a tasteful extension to the applicant's existing house at 15 Dunedin Drive then I would have been unlikely to object but the current proposal is totally unsuitable for the site and totally out of character for the Inglewood Crescent / Dunedin Drive area. An overview of the locale on Google Earth or similar will show that such a cramped site to be completely at odds with all the other properties.

It should also be of some concern to the Planning Officer that such a development would create precedent for all other properties in this area to utilise their large gardens for similar ventures and thus ruin the existing character of the entire location.

It is my belief that the proposal and objections would best be served by the Planning Officer visiting the site at the very earliest opportunity.

I also enclose a 'before & after' view to help with the visualisation.

Thanking you in anticipation.

Mr David Hills  
17 Dunedin Drive  
East Kilbride  
G75 8QQ



EXISTING



after

