

[REDACTED]

From: Philip McMahon <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 May 2020 10:58
To: Planning
Subject: P/20/0469 FAO Morag Neill

The following comments are sent on behalf of
Mr Philip McMahon
Mrs Gerardine McMahon
21 Dunedin Drive
East Kilbride
G75 8QQ
[REDACTED]

Please regard this communication as an **objection** to Planning Application P/20/0469 - Construction of 4 bedroom detached villa at 15 Dunedin Drive

Although we are not 'consultees' in the terms of this planning application, we feel compelled, as adjacent neighbours, to comment as follows.

We would initially like to focus on South Lanarkshire Council's Document DM3 - Subdivision of Garden Ground

Criterion 1

It is difficult to comment on design, use of materials etc from website available drawings. However, the proposed site plan would give the strong impression that this second house is being shoehorned into the existing garden space resulting in a cramped appearance/existence.

Criterion 3

The building proposal locates the front of the property substantially nearer to the footpath than other properties on Inglewood Crescent/Dunedin Drive.

Criterion 5

Our impression is that both the 'donor' and recipient gardens will be heavily compromised in relation to space and other long-existing gardens in this area. These plots were sold on the strict understanding (according to our title) that only one detached bungalow or villa could be built on each plot. Was No 15 different?

Additionally, our home and adjacent properties (including, we presume, No 15) purchased additional (wood)land in 1979 from East Kilbride Development Corporation to be used solely as garden ground Ref: Land Register of Scotland D. Burdens Section 3 SECOND. Presuming No 15 did participate in a similar transaction, does this mean that the proposed development is being facilitated by the availability of this added ground or, worse still, being built upon?

Criterion 6

Although it will impact marginally on our property with seating areas being 'viewable' from upstairs windows, clearly the privacy of No 17 will be unerringly affected.

Criterion 7

The same reservation applies here as for Criterion 6

Criterion 9

Parking bays would appear to be a drawing exercise for planning approval rather than the expectation that three cars will be accommodated there and still enable access to/from the side door and 'wheelie' bins.

In conclusion, we would like to make a further five comments.

1. This proposal is overdevelopment on this particular site in this particular area. Does East Kilbride need another 4 bedroomed villa with new ones being built all around the town - Benthall Farm, Merlin Gardens, Thornton View, Ocein Drive, Landsdale and the Cala Development on Eaglesham Road. We are sure this list is not exhaustive.

2. Will this proposal set a precedent for garden ground (protected or otherwise) in this area?

3. With an absentee landlord/lady at 1 Inglewood Crescent, is provision being made to ensure that the likely impact on that property is being taken into consideration?

4. We understand that a previous owner lodged a similar application for 15 Dunedin Drive and this was rejected. We are unaware why it was rejected. If our information is correct and should this application be successful what material/legal planning change has taken place to enable this?

5. Is consideration being given to current Covid-19 restrictions and, in particular, the inability to hold face-to-face meetings?

Sent from my iPad