

**Law, Aileen**

---

**From:** Hamilton Park South Action Group  
**Sent:** 19 March 2021 13:20  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application P/21/0029  
**Attachments:** Planning submission HPS Action Group.docx

Dear Planning Department

Please find attached our submission. We extend our sincere apologies for the length of the document, due to the number of issues which required to be addressed.

Many thanks

Hamilton Park South Action Group

Dear Planning Department

We would be most grateful if you would include this submission, as part of the planning application process for P/21/0029.

We are writing to you as Hamilton Park South Action Group, and represent Hamilton Park South (HPS) owners. Our group was formed some years ago, in response to the legally protected woodland, which is the subject of this planning application, coming under threat.

Our efforts have focussed on protecting, and preserving this area, identified as a valuable amenity and facility area for South Lanarkshire and its residents. As you will be aware, there is a significant history of ongoing action, financial investment, time, and effort, in relation to this important issue.

We would like to register the following concerns, in addition to those already lodged:

- **Crucial organisations** have not been contactable, since the circulation of the Neighbour Notification Notice, due to unprecedented factors e.g. SEPA, Woodland Trust, RSPB. Vital support to our objections is therefore unavailable at this time.
- **Access** – We are struggling to identify a construction exclusion zone, or the necessary turning point for large emergency and utility vehicles, separate to parking areas. Any such area may have implications for additional woodland removal.
- **Large scale destruction and damage indicated by Tree Reports, e.g.:**
  - 40% of all tagged trees surveyed are proposed for removal (73 of 186)
  - Pedunculate Oak trees listed for removal, despite applicant's 2019 report stating '5.5 Because of their age, size and wildlife benefits the Pedunculate Oak population is particularly worthy of protection. Any development should aim to preserve these trees.' 'A collection of mature Pedunculate Oaks are a particularly positive feature of the woodland.'
  - All tagged trees have had their tags changed since the previous 2019 Tree Report, making it impossible for us to cross check the details
  - Multiple untagged trees and flora proposed for removal –no data provided – 2019 report states 'a diverse woodland structure is present. A wide range of age classes means flora is present at all levels, from the ground layer to the upper canopy.'
  - 2019 Tree Report '4.11 Practically the entire site falls within the RPA of one or more tree. Only isolated areas of a few square metres exist that are not calculated as being an RPA'. The proposed road alone appears to invade at least 8 tree RPAs.
  - 2019 Tree Report '4.12 Even within areas not calculated as being an RPA, natural regeneration can normally be found. The stocking of the woodland is very dense and the main reason that some areas appear devoid of trees on the Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) is that the trees present have a diameter of less than 150mm at 1.5metres and, therefore, were not included within the report.'
- **Tree Report – confusion or omission of key findings**

Current report states 'a number of trees and shrubs would require to be removed, but the best trees will be retained, and the impact in arboricultural terms would be relatively small.' This is in stark contrast to the previous tree report(s) commissioned by the applicant, the most recent being 2019 (all bold text below contained within original report), e.g.:

- '3.6 The woodland, collectively, provides many benefits and is particularly valuable for wildlife habitat; containing, as it does, undisturbed varied structure with several veteran native trees.'
- '3.7 There are very few areas – greater than a few square metres – that are not within one or another tree's Root Protection Area (RPA). The author cannot identify any area that would not require significant tree removal to accommodate access roads or buildings.'
- '4.21 All trees surveyed are located close to the grounds of Hamilton Park North, Hamilton College and adjacent to internal and public roads (Bothwell Road). As such **the woodland is of high amenity value.**'
- '4.22 As mentioned above a mix of native, non-native and naturalised species are present in this isolated mature woodland. Some birds' nests, Woodpecker activity, native ground flora and veteran trees were observed. **Therefore the woodland is of high conservation value.**'
- '4.23 The trees can be readily viewed by neighbours and by passers-by. As such, **the woodland is of high landscape value.**'
- No woodland management plan is evident (as advised in 2019 report)
- A difference in species of trees listed and surveyed is evident
- Lack of detail re 'flora present within this mainly mature broad-leafed woodland'
- '5.1 ....the site is densely stocked mature woodland with many benefits provided, not least wildlife habitat. The author cannot reasonably see any point within the site boundaries where construction would not impact significantly, on the woodland structure.'
- '5.7 It is to be stressed that.....category C (Grey) trees collectively are of much higher retention desirability. Therefore, again losses should be minimised.' Over 50 category C trees are proposed for removal.
- '6.1 .....all trees should be monitored by a competent arborist on a suitable cycle. This would help meet the landowner's duty of care (Occupier's Liability (Scotland) Act 1960)' – no maintenance by applicant evident to date
- '6.5 The trees on site have the potential to provide habitat for protected species....Should removal of any trees be required, expert advice should be sought from a suitably qualified conservationist. Destruction of wildlife habitat may be a contravention of "The Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004".'
- '6.8 All remedial tree work should be carried out to standards set forth in "BS3998 2010: Tree Work – Recommendations".' Considerable remedial work, including urgent work identified, however none listed in current report, and no evidence of any undertaken to date

- **Applicant's solicitor's submissions 8 Feb 2021 (x2)**

- The solicitor asserts....'right to a reasonable use of their property' -however, all the evidence available indicates the applicant continues to not adhere to the legal duty and responsibility to:
  1. Protect the land from any/all development
  2. Carry out maintenance
  3. Comply with public health & safety/landowner's duty of care (Occupier's Liability (Scotland) Act 1960), e.g. see above multiple unmet maintenance needs identified 2019 (some urgent), including potential risk to pedestrians & road users on Bothwell Road
- 'development can proceed.....for the ultimate benefit of the woodland and the neighbouring proprietors' – All the information available to us stresses that the proposed development would be seriously detrimental to both the woodland and local residents

- 'There is no legal connection between the neighbouring flats and the development site' – our specialist Lands Tribunal legal team challenged the applicant's attempt to change the title deeds, as the land is legally designated as 'amenity', and the deeds directly refer to HPS as 'the Development Land'
- 'neither fair nor reasonable for objections seeking to preserve unentitled amenity at the applicants expense' – the legal status of the land is protected 'amenity', and we are confused as to why the applicant would take ownership for the purposes of development
- 'access arrangements which are safe and which will have no significant impact on traffic flow' – All the evidence available, and daily experience of Bothwell Road, contradict this claim. We are unclear if the proposed road is single track, which would further increase both risk and impact
- 'any objections on the grounds of privacy ...be disregarded as not being legitimate or reasonable' – The proposed development would have significant impact in terms of privacy
- 'Tree Preservation Order.....would have been taken into account by your Council when considering.....that development' (HPS) – This is an inappropriate comparison, as several major changes have occurred in the intervening period, post planning consent for HPS e.g.
  - Title burdens established – protected amenity land
  - Scientific findings re climate crisis – increasing & ongoing
  - International/global climate emergency declared
  - Public awareness & education re climate emergency
  - Resulting changes in Government policy, including planning
- **Applicant's solicitor's submissions 15 & 16 February 2021**
  - Emails have been presented out of context, and therefore could be argued as biased towards the applicant and misleading
  - 'My clients have agreed now to all of the residents requirements' – this claim is not supported by the evidence available to date
  - Email 12 September 2016 – 'in exchange for your clients withdrawing their objections to this Tribunal application and to supporting our clients future planning application for the development of the ground' – Any offer by the applicant, to date, has been predicated upon HPS owners supporting planning applications for multiple properties, and allowing the title burdens to be removed, to allow development. As the applicant proceeded to planning application without an agreement in place, the terms of the offer are no longer applicable, and therefore could be argued as invalid. The applicant proceeded to planning application in the knowledge that our residents are unable to meet (face to face or virtually), and respond to the February 2020 offer, due to Government COVID restrictions, however would have responded, as soon as restrictions/safety allowed. For clarification, our solicitor made contact at the end of 2020 to enquire re the stakes and taping in the woodland.
  - Email 12 September 2016 – terms of the offer by the applicant - '2. The Title will be burdened to ensure that the ground will be preserved in all time coming for woodland and amenity and will not be subject to any further development' – We are deeply confused by this statement, as it confirms the applicant is fully aware of the current Title burdens, and that the proposed development is in direct breach of these
  - We would again stress that there is no agreement between HPS owners and the applicant, and no guarantee there would be any such agreement in the future. Any inference re a future agreement could be argued as misleading, mere conjecture or speculation, and therefore, wholly irrelevant to this application

• **Applicant's Written Response To Representations From The Public - Planning Portal 1 March 2021**

1. Woodland Maintenance - Applicant notes a proposal to develop a plan for "Long Term Management of the Woodland" following the completion of a Provisional Ecological Appraisal (PEA) however no management or maintenance of the woodland has been carried out by the applicant, to date, and there is understandably a complete lack of belief from local owners and residents that this position will change.
2. BATS and BIRDS – The applicant's proposals regarding these species fails to address the extensive damage and disruption which the proposed development will impose on a much wider range of wildlife and the natural environment.
3. PEA - 'The applicant would expect any recommendations from ecological consultants on this issue to be incorporated into the conditions of consent' – All the information available, to date, indicates the applicant has not adhered to legal duties and responsibilities in relation to the woodland, therefore, there is arguably no evidence to support the implementation of 'recommendations'. Also, the PEA was not available online at the time of creating this document.
4. Green Space - 'only a small piece of the proposed development area of the site is actually zoned as 'Green Space' - 'chosen as the majority of it sat out with the LDP 'Green Space' allocation' – These statements are confusing as the plans show approximately 90% of the proposed new builds would be on Green Network.
5. TPO – The proposed development site is the last indigenous woodland area on Bothwell Road and the proposals will destroy this tranquil natural area and disturb the wildlife within it, as well as removing a large number of protected trees.
6. 'the benefit to biodiversity that maintaining the linear continuity of the woodland habitat brings' – The proposed development will not only destroy a considerable area of woodland, but also split the remaining amenity land into three or more separate entities. This will be devastating to the natural habitat.
7. Right of Way – The applicant states that no Right of Way exists for residents of Hamilton Park South (HPS), however a Right of Way has been established, and could be applied for, across the site, due to regular use as a link for over 20 years by the wider public (not only by HPS residents). It must be stressed that HPS was created with open/unhindered access to the amenity land.
8. 'legal burden is also under review and should not be viewed as a material consideration to the application.' – The legal burden remains wholly intact, and we are confused, as any attempt to review this would involve the Lands Tribunal for Scotland, and notification to HPS residents. We have not been informed of any review (which HPS specialist Lands Tribunal legal team would challenge).
9. 'The applicant would be prepared to enter into a legal agreement associated with any proposed consent to this effect' – please see above – not applicable to this application.
10. Gifting the site – Scottish Forestry has noted in its report that the level of grant funding available for Community Woodland would be insufficient to cover maintenance costs and this would result in a financial burden being transferred to owners. In addition, the owners would be inheriting a site which has been subject to many years of neglect, requiring significant investment to bring it up to acceptable routine maintenance standards. The neglect also presents potential public health and safety risks, which are of serious concern.
11. 'screening belt' is a vague term, open to interpretation, and there is no guarantee any screening would be adequate, or remain in situ long term.

12. 'mitigate the loss of approximately 16% of the current woodland area' – As per previous objections, this figure is inaccurate, and the percentage loss would be significantly higher, if the correct calculations are applied.
13. 'a legal agreement to secure this (Scottish Forestry agreement re compensatory planting) as part of a proposed consent would be acceptable to the applicant' – The evidence base available, to date, does not support that the applicant adheres to legal duties and responsibilities, re the woodland, therefore, it could be argued that this is speculative, irrelevant and unreliable.
14. Road Safety – Although only 2 dwellings are proposed they will each have a minimum of 7 double bedrooms which, depending on occupancy rates, could result in over 7 vehicles per property. 14, or more, additional vehicles is not insignificant (as noted by the applicant). We would stress that permitting housing development access from school grounds could be argued as setting a dangerous precedent.
15. 'pedestrian routes to the school are not encouraged through the car park access' – However, pedestrian activity (not only pupils) is ongoing in this area.
16. 'the natural surveillance brought to the site from the presence of the proposed dwellings could enhance pupil safety in the vicinity' – HPS has overlooked the site 24/7, for over 20 years, with no safety issue, or potential concern noted. There is therefore no evidence to support this claim.
17. We are concerned re 'statements of intent' forming part of the decision making process, as the applicant appears to continue to neglect duty of care and legal responsibilities and duties re the woodland.
18. 'all issues have been addressed', and 'on balance, it can be argued that there are benefits to all parties involved should the application be approved' – The evidence base available to us, over many years, directly conflicts with these statements. The proposed development would entail no benefit, and multiple, major losses for South Lanarkshire, both in terms of history, natural environment, amenity, natural heritage, access to nature, recreation, and the physical and mental health, and wellbeing of its residents, council tax payers, and visitors.

Should any further information be helpful, we are more than happy to provide additional details, including any aspect of the communications between the applicant's solicitor and our Lands Tribunal specialist legal team.

We would like to express our gratitude to South Lanarkshire Council for considering this submission, as part of the application process.

Hamilton Park South Action Group

## Law, Aileen

---

**From:** Hamilton Park South Action Group  
**Sent:** 22 September 2021 22:15  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Fwd: Planning Application P/21/0029  
**Attachments:** Planning Objection 22 September 2021.docx; Petition 22 Sept 2021[1839].docx

Please find attached objections and a petition relating to the above planning application.

Many thanks

On behalf of Hamilton Park South Action Group

**Planning Application Reference Number P/21/0029 - Land at Bothwell Road. Hamilton**

**Applicant Mr Shahid Chaudhary – Erection of two dwelling houses, with associated studio flats above attached garages, raised decking at rear, and formation of access.**

We refer to the above Planning Application submitted to South Lanarkshire Council on 8 January 2021 with a subsequent amended application submitted on 18 August 2021.

Comprehensive objections to the original Application were submitted in January 2021, relating to the following:-

- The proposals will lead to the destruction of the local environment, in particular the protected woodland and scrubland;
- The development will destroy the site which is designated as High Amenity Value; High Conservation Value; and High Landscape Value;
- Road Safety issues in relation to site access through the grounds of Hamilton College and at a busy junction onto Bothwell Road;
- Overall disregard to Global Warming and the pursuit of improving the Environment, especially when the International COP26 Conference is being held in Glasgow this year.

**We wish all of our original objections to be considered when this latest application is being processed.**

In addition please note our further objections to this latest Application by Mr Chaudhary, where the applicant focusses on two main areas:-

**1. Location of buildings in relation to Green Network and Green Space.**

The new proposal involves reducing the overall footprint of the new houses and relocating them outwith the Green Network / Green Space boundaries. This relocation of the buildings does not address any of the overall concerns and objections previously submitted in relation to damage to the environment, wildlife and woodland. The new houses would be located beyond the building line of the existing flats and would be detrimental to the current outlook and landscape of the area.

**2. Impact of the development of proposed houses on the surrounding woodland.**

The applicant goes to great lengths to criticise the findings of South Lanarkshire Council's Arboricultural and Biodiversity Officers as well as the report by Scottish Forestry in relation to the condition of trees and the disruption which will be caused to the woodland by the proposed development. There is nothing in this revised application which addresses the objections to the original application submitted in January 2021 and the applicant questioning the integrity and experience of Council staff is surprising.

This latest application refers throughout to the creation and maintenance of a Woodland Management Plan to be implemented following the development of the houses. It should be noted that the applicant has now owned this site for many years and in that time has never made any attempt to carry out any maintenance to this woodland.



As an example please note attached photos of trees overhanging the wall onto the pavement on Bothwell Road down to a height of 4 feet from the ground. This is currently presenting a hazard to pedestrians and cyclists using the pavement and provides no confidence that the applicant would be likely to carry out his proposal for a Woodland Management Plan as part of the proposed new development, given his failure to address any maintenance issues to date.



### **Flooding**

The proposed amendment involves building on a steep slope. This gradient currently acts as a natural drainage route for flood water. As previously stated, flooding is a recurring issue in this area. The proposed buildings would block the natural drainage route, thereby increasing the flooding risk to Hamilton Park South properties.

### **Impact on Residents**

We would like to take this opportunity to request that the applicant actions the following, as a matter of some urgency:

1. Fulfil the 'burdened property' legal obligation to protect the land from any changes or development, i.e.:
  - a. Withdraw Planning Application P/21/0029
  - b. Desist from any future plans or planning applications to change or develop the land
2. Fulfil the 'burdened property' legal obligation to maintain the land, i.e.:
  - a. Undertake all urgent maintenance, including all related to significant health and safety risks
  - b. Create and undertake a medium and long term maintenance programme to meet all outstanding needs and issues
  - c. Reimburse Hamilton Park South residents for all maintenance costs incurred to date.

## **Conclusion**

**We wish to record the adverse impact of the applicant's actions and omissions on residents over many years.**

Finally, Sir David Attenborough recently stated that 'the natural world is in crisis, because of us', and we are facing 'irreversible damage to the natural world, and the collapse of our societies'. The solution is 'within our power, if we start making the right choices'. We respectfully request South Lanarkshire Council to support local residents, by continuing to make 'the right choices'.

We thank South Lanarkshire Council for accepting these and all previous objections, which we hope will be given full consideration, when deciding the outcome of the application.

**Hamilton Park South Action Group**

**Please read in conjunction with the attached Petition.**

**22 September 2021**

**Planning Application Reference Number P/21/0029**

**Applicant Mr S. Chaudhary**

**To :- South Lanarkshire Council Planning Department**

We, the undersigned, wish to formally object to the above Planning Application, including the amendment submitted in August 2021.

We understand this relates to the erection of two dwelling houses, with associated studio flats above attached garages, raised decking at rear, and formation of access.

We, **the 161 Objectors listed below**, respectfully request that South Lanarkshire Council considers all of the objections, both previous and current, as part of the decision making process.

Thank you

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ADDRESS</b>
Colin Taylor	59 Hamilton Park South
Yvonne McKeown	61 Hamilton Park South
David Cameron	63 Hamilton Park South
Jean Russell	65 Hamilton Park South
Paul Williamson	67 Hamilton Park South
Mohammed Arshad	69 Hamilton Park South
Kate O'Connor	71 Hamilton Park South
David Houston	73 Hamilton Park South
Sheila Houston	73 Hamilton Park South
Alastair Houston	73 Hamilton Park South
Wendy Richard	73 Hamilton Park South
Baillie Douglas	73 Hamilton Park South
Rita Faccenda	75 Hamilton Park South
Anne Marie Donellan	79 Hamilton Park South
Dawn Allen	81 Hamilton Park South
Nicolas Barrios	81 Hamilton Park South
Marcus Barrios	81 Hamilton Park South
Carmen Barrios	81 Hamilton Park South
Andrew McLaughlin	27 Hamilton Park South
John B Lawlor	29 Hamilton Park South

Russell White	31 Hamilton Park South
Angela White	31 Hamilton Park South
Mark Horgan	35 Hamilton Park South
Katherine Sheridan	35 Hamilton Park South
Thomas Callaghan	37 Hamilton Park South
Jose Claro Simeos Machado	39 Hamilton Park South
Vivian Rezende Mendes	39 Hamilton Park South
Alan McCulloch	41 Hamilton Park South
Rebecca Lennon	45 Hamilton Park South
Cameron McCann	45 Hamilton Park South
Jonathan Gray	47 Hamilton Park South
Chloe Toal	47 Hamilton Park South
Blake Gray	47 Hamilton Park South
Tahira Idress	49 Hamilton Park South
Morven McPherson	51 Hamilton Park South
Olivia McPherson	51 Hamilton Park South
Anne Trevorrow	53 Hamilton Park South
Rhona Hall	34 Hamilton Park North
Iain Hall	34 Hamilton Park North
Brian Hall	34 Hamilton Park North
Andrew Weir	78 Kennishead Road, Glasgow G46 8NY
Jessie Ewart	78 Kennishead Road, Glasgow G46 8NY
Caitlin Ross-Weir	10 Chestnut Drive, BA20 2NL
Keira Ross-Weir	10 Chestnut Drive, BA20 2NL
Paul Weir	32 Hamilton Park North
Dylan Weir	32 Hamilton Park North
Bridget Power	40 Hamilton Park North
Dr Christine Power	40 Hamilton Park North
Izabella Power	40 Hamilton Park North
Brian Gaughan	42 Hamilton Park North
Sharon Law	42 Hamilton Park North
Mr Wm Benham	36 Hamilton Park North
Mrs C. Benham	36 Hamilton Park North
Rod Frame	30 Hamilton Park North
Margaret Frame	30 Hamilton Park North
Mrs Sharda Verna	28 Hamilton Park North
Yogi Verma	72 Brocketsbrae Road, Lesmahagow ML11 9PT
Anti Verma	72 Brocketsbrae Road, Lesmahagow ML11 9PT

Nina Verma	72 Brocketsbrae Road, Lesmahagow ML11 9PT
Vinay Verma	72 Brocketsbrae Road, Lesmahagow ML11 9PT
George Davenport	39 Hamilton Park North
Linda Davenport	39 Hamilton Park North
Mark Evans	49 Hamilton Park North
Kerry Evans	49 Hamilton Park North
Heather Duddy	33 Hamilton Park North
Jane Fraser	38 Hamilton Park North
Linda Francis	15 Hamilton Park North
Colin Brooks	68 Hamilton Park North
Margaret Brooks	68 Hamilton Park North
Anthony Jones	60 Hamilton Park North
Robert McArthur	66 Hamilton Park North
Jim Connor	74 Hamilton Park North
Janette Connor	74 Hamilton Park North
Tom Barr	78 Hamilton Park North
Chris Locketti	76 Hamilton Park North
Margaret McAllister	62 Hamilton Park North
Monica Rapallini	64 Hamilton Park North
Linda Jameson	31 Hamilton Park North
John Jameson	31 Hamilton Park North
David Adams	21 Hamilton Park North
Anne Adams	21 Hamilton Park North
Elizabeth Stark	25 Hamilton Park North
Sandy Stark	25 Hamilton Park North
Reece Codona	17 Hamilton Park North
Amanda Wood	11 Hamilton Park North
Irene Snelling	7 Hamilton Park North
Janice Stillie	1 Hamilton Park North
Jim McKenzie	5 Hamilton Park North
Shona McKenzie	5 Hamilton Park North
Patrick Davidson	19 Hamilton Park North
Celia Graffin	27 Hamilton Park North
Nora Costello	46 Hamilton Park North
John Costello	46 Hamilton Park North
Janette Graham	44 Hamilton Park North
Gordon Graham	44 Hamilton Park North
Stuart Gallagher	52 Hamilton Park North
Bryne Gallagher	52 Hamilton Park North
Ellenor Gallagher	52 Hamilton Park North

Daniel Gallagher	52 Hamilton Park North
Graham Patrick	51 Bothwell Road, Hamilton
Lesley Patrick	51 Bothwell Road, Hamilton
Paul McCluskie	57 Bothwell Road, Hamilton
Gemma McCluskie	57 Bothwell Road, Hamilton
Paul Howells	28 Parkholme Court, Hamilton
Scott McCann	32 Parkholme Court, Hamilton
Alan Anderson	32 Parkholme Court, Hamilton
Elizabeth Bannantyne	2 May Street, Hamilton
Isabelle Mackie	8 May Street, Hamilton
Jacqueline Trainer	30 Allanshaw Gardens, Hamilton
Miriam Gwynne	14 May Street, Hamilton
Nigel Gwynne	14 May Street, Hamilton
Rosemary Scanlon	55 Bothwell Road
David Brewster	c/o 55 Bothwell Road
Martha Yuill	8 Park Holme Court, Hamilton
R Fairbairn	6 Park Holme Court, Hamilton
Gary McNair	46 Park Holme Court, Hamilton
Fomi Toki	34 Park Holme Court
Gunavathy Veerasamy	36 Park Holme Court
Arumugan Veerasamy	36 Park Holme Court
Kavaind Veerasamy	36 Park Holme Court
Susan Whyte	22 Park Holme Court
Viktor Silva	26 Park Holme Court
Colin Graham	1 May Street, Hamilton
Anne Graham	1 May Street, Hamilton
Matt Glasstone	13 May Street
Laura Glasstone	13 May Street
Shona Anderson	15 May Street
Andrew O'Neill	15 May Street
A. McLaren	67 Bothwell Road
T. Jamieson	67A Bothwell Road
S. Douglas	4 Hunterless Gardens, Glassford
S. Dean	61 Bothwell Road
D. Stannage	25 Reid Street, Burnbank
Elizabeth Creeley	2 Silverwells Court, Bothwell
Mary F. Creeley	2 Silverwells Court, Bothwell
Marjory Good	2 Hamilton Park North
Gordon Anderson	6 Hamilton Park North
Ann Anderson	6 Hamilton Park North
Stuart Baird	8 Hamilton Park North
Katie McTear	10 Hamilton Park North

[illegible]
