

	Delegated Report	Reference no.	P/19/0158
		Date	25 April 2019

Planning proposal:	Residential development including formation of vehicular access (Planning Permission in Principle)
Location:	Land 50M Northwest Of 3 Millburn Road Millburn Road Ashgill Larkhall South Lanarkshire

Application Type : Permission in principle

Applicant : Mr. Douglas Collins
Location : Land 50M Northwest Of 3 Millburn Road
 Millburn Road
 Ashgill
 Larkhall
 South Lanarkshire

Decision: Application refused

Report by: Area Manager (Planning & Building Standards)

Policy reference:

Policy 3 - Green Belt and Rural Area
 Policy 4 - Development Management and Place Making
 Policy 16 - Travel and Transport

Supplementary Guidance 2 – Green Belt and Rural Area (2015)

Policy GBRA4: Small Scale Settlement Extensions

Proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 (Volumes 1 and 2) (2018)

Policy 4 - Green Belt and Rural Area
 Policy 5 - Development Management and Place Making
 Policy 17 - Travel and Transport

Assessment

Impact on privacy?	No
Impact on sunlight/daylight?	No
Impact on amenity?	No
Traffic issues?	No
Adheres to development plan policy?	No
Adverse comments from consultees?	No

Consultations

Roads Development Management Team

Summary of response

Have recommended that a decision on the application be deferred. Whilst two car parking spaces are proposed per

dwelling it should be noted that houses with four or more bedrooms require three car parking spaces. There is a lack of detail submitted with the application to provide the evidence/comfort that twelve houses, an access road and car parking spaces, complete with turning space so that vehicles could enter and leave Millburn Road in forward gear, garden space, landscaping areas and space for refuse collection could all be fitted in to this constrained site.

Environmental Services

Have no objection to the proposal subject to a condition requiring the submission of a comprehensive Site Investigation report for the Council's approval and an informative advising the applicant of appropriate hours for audible construction activities at the site.

Scottish Water

Have no objection to the application.

Representation(s):

▶	3	Objection letters
▶	0	Support letters
▶	0	Comment letters

Planning Application Delegated Report

1 Application Summary

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission in principle for residential development within the site including the formation of a vehicular access. As the application is for planning permission in principle no details have been submitted with the application in terms of any indicative layout or detailed design aspects. However, a supporting Planning Statement has been submitted with the application which advises that the site has the potential to accommodate a maximum of twelve residential units with the exact number of units being determined in due course.
- 1.2 The application site extends to approximately 0.36 hectares and is located on the north side of Millburn Road, Ashgill. The site previously formed part of a railway line with the southern boundary of the site being demarked by one of the bridge abutments, which previously carried the railway line across Millburn Road, the other abutment to the south side of Millburn Road having been removed many years ago. The site is raised significantly above the level of neighbouring houses which adjoin the sites southern boundary. Until recently, the site had an extensive vegetation cover including a number of mature trees. However this has been removed with the submitted Planning Statement advising that these operations were undertaken to provide potential assistance to Scottish Water in respect of proposals to install a new section of sewer pipe through part of the site.
- 1.3 The Planning Statement advises that access to the site would be taken off Millburn Road, which runs along the south eastern boundary of the site, with the formation of the access being facilitated by the demolition of the existing bridge abutment which currently demarks the boundary. It is also proposed that the ground levels within the site, which are raised due to its former use, would be reduced to bring them more in line with that of the adjoining farm land which lies to the north-east of the site. The proposed development would include the provision of new structure planting along the site's north-eastern boundary and the intention would be to submit full details at the matters specified in conditions stage.

2 Representation(s)

- 2.1 Statutory neighbour notification procedures were undertaken and the application was advertised in the Hamilton Advertiser under the headings Development Contrary to the Development Plan and Non-Notification of Neighbours. Following this publicity three letters of representation have been received. The grounds of objection are summarised below:

- a) **I would like to question the action of allowing permission in principle on a decommissioned railway line. I have never seen properties being built on such an unstable site. When we built our home here nearly 40 years ago the railway track was a green belt area; is this not still the case? These old railway lines are a lifeline to wild animals who use them as corridors to link up with other green areas. They should be kept open where possible as pathways for nature to allow wild animals a safe passage and join up with other areas where they can be safe and undisturbed.**

Response: The site is within the established greenbelt in terms of both the Adopted Local Plan and the emerging plan. On this basis the proposal is contrary to local plan policy as it would constitute new residential development in the Green Belt without appropriate justification. This is discussed in detail in Section 3 of this report.

With specific regard to former railway lines, the proposal is also considered to be contrary to Policy 16 - Travel and Transport of the adopted Plan which highlights

the need to preserve disused railway lines to provide future public access routes. In this connection the contribution of the site as a 'wildlife corridor' must be acknowledged and should not be undervalued.

- b) **Can we be assured that a survey will be carried out prior to the embankment being reduced to ground level in order to establish that the process is not going to release any harmful materials into our environment or, indeed, a plague of rats or other vermin.**

Response: As highlighted above, it is considered that the application is contrary to local plan policy and this is discussed in detail in Section 3 of this report. In relation to the potential for harmful materials being released as a result of any proposed reduction to ground levels the Council's Environmental Services raised no objection to the application subject to a condition requiring the submission of a comprehensive site investigation for the Council's approval. Accordingly the mineral and chemical composition of the embankment would be investigated and appropriate remedial action identified.

- c) **The smells emanating from the sewage works and the drains leading to them can be overwhelming at times especially in the warmer drier weather forcing us to stay indoors with the windows closed. This can only increase as it is already stretched in capacity. Can we be assured that this will not increase as a result of the barrier of the embankment being removed and the addition of further dwellings.**

Response: The Council's Environmental Services raised no adverse comments in relation to any potential increase in odours as a result of the proposed development. In this connection the waste water generated by an additional 12 houses is unlikely to be materially significant in terms of the volume of material/waste presently processed at the nearby waste water works. Any odour issues should in the first instance be reported to Scottish Water who own and operated the near-by sewage works.

It must also be acknowledged that if the 'embankment barrier' was removed it would ultimately be replaced by a number of houses which could potentially, in part, act as a 'replacement' physical barrier.

- d) **I have lived in my property for almost 17 years and have seen a considerable increase in traffic on the road including many heavy goods vehicles in excess of 30 tons or more. The road is used as a rat run for those wishing to avoid the Garrion Bridge. Can we be assured that the future safety of the road will be guaranteed should this application be granted. Another factor is the increased amount of traffic since planning permission was granted to open a fast food outlet opposite my home.**

Response: The Council's Roads Development Management Team have recommended that a decision on the application be deferred due to insufficient detailed information being submitted with the application to justify the proposal. The merits of the application are discussed in detail in Section 3 of this report.

- e) **We have no idea what the proposed layout is at this stage - how many houses, type, height or size of houses and how they will fit in with the character of the area. It is assumed there will be multiple detached homes planned for the site. The layout and design would need to be confirmed by Planning. As comments on this cannot be made at the moment we would appreciate the ability to do so if this proposal is allowed. I trust we will be afforded the opportunity to comment further as this application progresses.**

Response: If planning permission in principle was to be issued a detailed layout including the design and number of dwellings proposed would have to be

submitted for the Council's approval through the submission of a detailed or matters specified in conditions application. Such an application would require statutory neighbour notification procedures to be undertaken by the Council.

- f) **There are concerns regarding noise and disturbance. Not only during development stages but also on completion. Local sewage works can become noisy but the large embankment and tree foliage was always a natural sound proof barrier from this. Since removing the trees, and ultimately the entire railway, there will no doubt be increased noise and smell from the sewage works.**

Response: The Council's Environmental Services raised no objection to the application subject to a condition requiring the submission of a comprehensive site investigation report for the Council's approval and an informative advising the applicant of appropriate hours for audible construction activities at the site. As discussed above, they have raised no adverse comments in relation to any potential increase in odours as a result of the proposed development.

- g) **The applicant has stated that the land is level and free of trees, which is clearly not the case. The applicant, without warning, proceeded to clear the old railway embankment of all mature trees and shrubs and in so doing has totally destroyed the natural habitat for countless insects, birds and small mammals. There may have been protected species among them and his actions were nothing short of criminal. Mr Collins made it very clear he was selling all trees for profit and planning to sell this site to a developer for houses.**

Response: Whilst it is unfortunate that the vegetation was removed from the site planning permission was not required for the work undertaken. The submitted Planning Statement advises that the clearance works were initiated to provide potential assistance to Scottish Water in respect of proposals to install a new section of sewer pipe through part of the site. There is no recorded information confirming the presence of protected species at the site.

- h) **The applicant is attempting to get approval for totally monetary gain at the expense and inconvenience of all the people who live here. He showed he does not care for the environment by totally devastating the area of flora and fauna. Mr Collins did this without a by your leave to any adjoining neighbours and with no considerations for the local wildlife and trees. I have seen all kinds of wildlife and birds which depended on this area and now it is gone thanks to Mr Collins. There are also bats a protected species who hibernate in the Stone railway bridge over winter and live in it during the summer. If the wall is removed it will kill them all.**

Response: As discussed, whilst it is unfortunate that the vegetation was removed from the site planning permission was not required for the works undertaken. In addition in terms of the alleged presence of bats their protection could be addressed by the imposition of a suitable condition should the application be determined favourably. The merits of the application are discussed in detail in Section 3 of this report.

- i) **From the destruction of all the trees and even before this date I have had to put up with chain saws going most dry days as Mr Collins is selling all the trees he cut down to men who come in with their trucks and saw up the wood. He has turned the place into a business trying to get rid of all the trees he cut down.**

Response: The Planning Service has visited the site on several occasions in relation to the above matter. However, no business as described was operating from the site at the time these visits were undertaken.

- j) **Scottish Water say once they know how many dwelling are allowed they will investigate if the present water works can cope with more. Millburn Road drainage system is already struggling to cope with all the usage in the area because most days there is a distinct smell of raw sewage in the air coming from the drains running down the road. We have a clay drainage pipe which lies below the proposed site. This drainage pipe prevents flooding of our home and garage, and has played an essential role for 35 years. We fear this pipe may be damaged or broken by the removal of this earth causing mass flooding to our home. We have been in contact with Scottish Water and the Council regarding this concern and we will hold the developer accountable for any flooding to our home as a result of this pipe being blocked, damaged etc.**

Response: Scottish Water were consulted on the application and have advised that they have no objections to the application. Any damage to property would be a legal matter which would require to be resolved by the parties involved. In addition should the drainage pipe run through the site there should be a formal wayleave agreement confirming its presence and maintenance/repair obligations.

- k) **An increase in housing means an increase in traffic generation. Millburn road is a small, narrow road with poor street lighting. If permission is given a properly developed road should be put in place with roadside drainage, street lighting, pavements and road signs continued much further down Millburn Road and the blind corner issue addressed. The corner where the servicing road to the area is proposed is a blind corner which although should be 30 miles an hour cars travel far faster and do not slow until they get to the junction of Millburn Road and Ashgillhead Road at the mini roundabout. Local road users give no regard for dog walkers, cyclists or pedestrians. This site would have to be made safe for residents, road users and works traffic. There is currently no pavement or road markings with drivers taking this bend at speed. The proposal could also lead to vehicles overhanging the highway at a bend to the detriment to other road users. Conflict will occur between pedestrians, cyclists, farm traffic and road users.**

Response: The Council's Roads Development Management Team have recommended that a decision on the application be deferred due to insufficient detailed information being submitted with the application to justify the proposal.

- l) **The pavement has been destroyed down Millburn Road at the proposed site by the parking of heavy machinery and trucks on the pavement and it has sunk under all the heavy machines this developer parks up there. It is now a muck hole that forces people to walk on the road at a dangerous blind corner.**

Response: As discussed above, the Council's Roads Development Management Team have recommended that a decision on the application be deferred due to insufficient detailed information being submitted with the application to justify the proposal.

- m) **Damage to cars parked in the area, stolen cars, burnt-out vehicles and drunk drivers use this quiet country road to disguise their illegal actions. An increase in traffic will only exacerbate the problem.**

Response: The above issues are matters for Police Scotland to address where appropriate.

- n) **The proposed removal of the sandstone railway bridge and bank of material covering the whole site will be a massive disruption due to the huge amount**

of material involved. With noise, road closures, traffic disruption and access problems for residents.

Response: These matters have generally been addressed above. The merits of the application are discussed in detail in Section 3 of this report.

- o) The site will have to be tested for contamination due to it being a decommissioned railway line as no one knows what substances lie below this large mound of earth which could be a health hazard. The area is littered with old coal mines. From experience, specialist and expensive foundations are needed in this area when building houses and subsidence/demolition has been a problem in the past.**

Response: Whilst Coal Authority records highlight that areas of coal and other mineral extraction are present within the surrounding area the application site is not located within a Development High Risk referral area which has the potential for instability or a degree of risk to the surface from the legacy of coal mining operations. If planning permission in principle was to be granted for the proposal the permission would incorporate a condition requiring the submission of a comprehensive site investigation and geotechnical report for the Council's approval.

- p) I would like Planning to consider if the use of heavy machinery trucks etc. could cause damage to the foundations of our home if there is a danger of old mine workings here. The reason we got to build here nearly 40 years ago was because of the demolition of previous house due to subsidence. The applicant should get a report from the Coal Board and have the area tested by machinery to make sure there are no workings in the area.**

Response: As discussed, the site is not located within a Coal Authority Development High Risk referral area. Whilst it is considered that the proposal is contrary to local plan policy it should be noted that any damage caused to individual properties by the proposed development would be a legal matter which would have to be resolved between the parties concerned. In addition with appropriate site investigations and engineering design solutions, especially in relation to foundations, it should be possible to develop the site should consent be issued.

- q) Tonnes of earth were used to build up this land to allow for the bridge crossing at Millburn Road. The overlooking of our property and loss of privacy in our garden is a major concern. Our home is on one level and there would be overlooking issues if two storey houses were constructed on the site.**

Response: Whilst it is considered that the proposal is contrary to local plan policy any form of residential development would have to ensure that there was no significant adverse impact on the amenity of adjacent properties in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy.

- r) The security and privacy of our home is also at risk. We have been subject to break-ins and crime previously with damage to our home and injury to our pets. This mound of earth has already been used by local youths to throw stones, sticks and dirt into our garden and onto our roofs. We have faced harassment in the past and damage to our cars and fence line, not to mention the broken glass, littering, drunken actions and arsonist actions which have needed the assistance of local fire units and police to control. We have been unable to enjoy our back garden due to verbal abuse and insults being directed at us from people on the embankment. This makes it impossible to enjoy our outdoor activities with our family and friends in**

addition to general duties such as washing the car, maintaining the garden and generally enjoying the outdoors.

Response: Matters relating to security and anti-social behaviour are for Police Scotland to address where appropriate. The planning system cannot control or regulate such behaviour.

- s) **Visual impact is also an unknown at the moment with the possible reduction in sunlight and overshadowing as site is right next to my home. If this mound of earth is not levelled; prospective new houses will ultimately be overshadowing our entire back garden, garage and driveway reducing sunlight enormously. I would suggest if permission is given the dwellings are limited to one storey to fit in with existing homes in the area.**

Response: Whilst it is considered that the proposal is contrary to local plan policy any development approved would have to ensure that there was no significant adverse impact on the amenity of adjacent properties in terms of overshadowing and loss of daylight.

- t) **The large sandstone wall may have been listed due to age and interest and this is certainly a factor that will have to be considered before development commences.**

Response: The wall referred to is not a listed structure.

- u) **We have already lost views of woodland and our wildlife. We do not wish to lose views to a large brick wall or overbearing dwelling.**

Response: Loss of view is not a valid planning consideration.

- v) **There is insufficient parking due to Millburn Road only being a small narrow minor road. If cars park here they park on the pavements to the detriment of local residents who cannot get space to turn into and out of their driveways. If cars park on the road it causes issues with traffic as there is not enough room to safely pass. More houses can only exaggerate this problem. The road would preferably have to be widened to allow so much more traffic.**

Response: The Council's Roads Development Management Team have recommended that a decision on the application be deferred due to insufficient detailed information being submitted with the application to justify the proposal.

3 Assessment and Conclusions

- 3.1 The applicant seeks planning permission in principle for residential development including the formation of a vehicular access. The determining issues in consideration of this application are its compliance with local plan policy and its impact on the visual amenity of the area and on the local road network.
- 3.2 As discussed above, the application site comprises a section of former railway embankment which is raised significantly above the level of neighbouring houses. Until recently, the site had an extensive vegetation cover including a number of mature trees. The vegetation on the site has now been removed and the submitted Planning Statement advises that these operations were undertaken to provide potential assistance to Scottish Water in respect of their proposals to install a new section of sewer pipe through part of the site. The supporting Planning Statement also advises that the proposed development represents an opportunity to round off the boundary of the settlement of Ashgill at this location, that the scale of the development is proportionate to the size and character of the existing settlement and that the proposal would represent a logical extension to the village of Ashgill.
- 3.3 In terms of local plan policy, the application site is located within the Green Belt in the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan and is covered by Policy 3 - Green

Green Belt and Rural Area. This policy states that the Green Belt and the rural area function primarily for agriculture, forestry, recreation and other uses appropriate to the countryside. Development which does not require to locate in the countryside will be expected to be accommodated within the settlements identified on the proposals map, other than in the following circumstances:

- i. Where it is demonstrated that there is a specific locational requirement and established need for a proposal.
- ii. The proposal involves the redevelopment of derelict or redundant land and buildings where significant environmental improvement can be shown.
- iii. The proposal is for conversion of traditional buildings and those of a local vernacular.
- iv. The proposal is for limited development within clearly identifiable infill, gap sites and existing building groups.
- v. The proposal is for extension of existing premises or uses providing it is of a suitable scale and design. Any new built form should be ancillary to the main use.

3.4 The policy goes on to say that in both the Green Belt and rural area isolated and sporadic development will not be supported. In addition to the above, Policy GBRA4: Small Scale Settlement Extensions of Supplementary Guidance 2: Green Belt and Rural Area is relevant to the assessment of the application. Proposals for new houses on sites adjoining existing settlements will be required to meet the following criteria:

- The development shall maintain a defensible settlement boundary through the retention of existing features or enhancement through additional structural planting.
- The proposals should respect the specific local character and the existing pattern of development within the settlement and be of an appropriate small scale that is proportionate to the size and scale of the existing settlement.
- Development of the site should have no adverse impact on the amenity of any existing dwellinghouses within the settlement, particularly in terms of overlooking, privacy or overshadowing.
- Proposals should incorporate substantial boundary landscaping proposals, to minimise the developments impact on rural amenity and ensure appropriate landscape fit.
- Proposals should be able to be readily served by all necessary infrastructure including water, sewerage and electricity and be able to comply with all required parking and access standards.
- Proposals should have no adverse impact in terms of road safety.
- Proposals should have no adverse impact on biodiversity, including Natura 2000 sites and protected species, or features which make a significant contribution to the cultural and historic landscape value of the area.
- In the case of development affecting a listed building or a property within a designated Conservation Area, proposals shall comply with the guidance and criteria contained in the SG on the Natural and Historic Environment.

3.5 In terms of the assessment of the application it is considered that the proposal for residential development on the site does not accord with Policy 3 - Green Belt and Rural Area of the

adopted Local Development Plan as it cannot be justified under any of the circumstances listed. It has not been demonstrated that there is a specific locational requirement and established need for the proposal; the proposal does not involve the redevelopment of derelict or redundant land, it is not for the conversion of traditional buildings nor is it for limited development within clearly identifiable infill, gap site and existing building groups and it does not relate to an extension of existing premises or uses. The proposal is therefore clearly and irrefutably contrary to Policy 3. In addition the proposal is also considered to be contrary to Policy 16 - Travel and Transport of the adopted Plan which requires the preservation of disused railway lines to provide future public access routes.

- 3.6 Similarly, the proposal is not considered to be in accordance with Policy GBRA4: Small Scale Settlement Extensions of Supplementary Guidance 2: Green Belt and Rural Area as it would not meet the criteria listed. As the application is for permission in principle not all of the criteria listed within this policy is relevant to the assessment of this type of application e.g. in relation to listed buildings and conservation areas and some of the criteria listed is more relevant to the assessment of a detailed planning application. However, in terms of the sites Green Belt designation it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the criteria listed as the proposal would involve the removal of an existing physically strong and defensible Green Belt boundary with limited scope for its replacement with substantial boundary landscaping within such a narrow site. In terms of the access, parking and road safety requirements it should be noted that Roads Development Management have raised concerns regarding the lack of detail submitted with the application to provide the evidence/comfort that twelve houses, an access road and car parking spaces, complete with turning space so that vehicles could enter and leave Millburn Road in forward gear, garden space, landscaping areas and space for refuse collection could all be fitted in to this constrained site.
- 3.7 Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that the applicant has submitted a representation to the South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 objecting to the current settlement boundary of Ashgill and that he is seeking the inclusion of this Green Belt land as an opportunity to round off the settlement boundary at this location. In this regard, the site was assessed by the Council at the call for sites stage and was not found to accord with strategy. As discussed above, the site comprises a section of former railway embankment which is raised significantly above the level of neighbouring houses and until recently the site had extensive vegetation cover, including a number of mature trees. It is considered that the site provides a clearly defined physical settlement boundary to Ashgill. The Call for Sites assessment noted that road access to the site would be difficult to achieve due to its limited frontage.
- 3.8 The site was subject to strategic environmental assessment (SEA) which found that it would have significant environmental effects, particularly in relation to biodiversity, flooding and landscape. The site was also considered at the Examination of the South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan (2015) where the Reporter did not consider that it should be released from the Green Belt concluding that 'its location and configuration as a very narrow strip of land would not represent a logical extension to the settlement'. The Council considers that this conclusion is still applicable and valid as there has been no material change in planning considerations and that the site should remain in the Green Belt. The Council is currently preparing 'Schedule 4' documents of unresolved representations. These will be submitted to the Planning and Environmental Appeals Division (DPEA) this month with a view to a Reporter being assigned to carry out an examination. This site is subject to a Schedule 4 since it is an unresolved representation to Local Development Plan 2.
- 3.9 In view of all of the above and the legal requirement to determine and assess all planning applications in terms of the provisions of the development plan, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to local plan policy as it would constitute new residential development

in the Green Belt without appropriate justification. As such, it is considered that planning permission should be refused for the reasons stated below.

4 Reason for decision

- 4.1 The proposal raises significant amenity, environmental and infrastructure issues and fails to comply with Policy 3 - Green Belt and Rural Area and Policy 16 - Travel and Transport of the adopted South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan (2015), Policy GBRA4: Small Scale Settlement Extensions of Supplementary Guidance 2: Green Belt and Rural Area (2015) in addition to Policy 4 - Green Belt and Rural Area and Policy 17 - Travel and Transport of the Proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 (2018).

Delegating Officer: Steven Clark

Date: 26 April 2019

Previous References

None

List of Background Papers

- ▶ Application Form
- ▶ Application Plans
- ▶ South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2015 (adopted)
- ▶ Supplementary Guidance 2 - Green Belt and Rural Area (2015)
- ▶ Proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 (2018)
- ▶ Supporting Planning Statement dated January 2019
- ▶ Neighbour notification letter dated 07.02.2019
- ▶ Press advertisement, Hamilton Advertiser dated 21.02.2019

▶ Consultations

Roads Development Management Team	15.03.2019
Environmental Services	05.03.2019
Scottish Water	12.02.2019

▶ Representations

Mr. Derek Taylor, 1 Millburn Road, Ashgill, Larkhall, South Lanarkshire, ML9 3BG	Dated: 28.02.2019
Mrs. Jean Smith, 3 Millburn Road, Ashgill, Larkhall, South Lanarkshire, ML9 3BG	Dated: 21.02.2019
Mr. and Mrs. Strachan, The Annex, 3 Millburn Road, Ashgill, ML9 3BG,	Dated: 27.02.2019

Contact for further information

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

Jim Blake, Planning officer, Montrose House, 154 Montrose Crescent, Hamilton, ML3 6LB

Phone: 01698 453657

Email: jim.blake@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

Planning Application

Application number: P/19/0158

Reasons for refusal

01. The proposal is contrary to Policy 3 - Green Belt and Rural Area of the South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan as it would constitute new residential development in the Green Belt without appropriate justification.
02. If approved, the proposal would set an undesirable precedent which could encourage further similar applications for development prejudicial to the Green Belt designation.
03. The proposal is contrary to Policy 16 - Travel and Transport of the South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan which safeguards former railway lines for walking and cycling.
04. The proposal is contrary to Policy GBRA4 - Small Scale Settlement Extensions of Supplementary Guidance 2: Green Belt and Rural Area as it does not comply with the criteria listed.
05. The proposal is contrary to Policy 4 - Green Belt and Rural Area of the Proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 as it would constitute new residential development in the Green Belt without appropriate justification.
06. The proposal is contrary to Policy 17 - Travel and Transport of the Proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2 which safeguards former railway lines for walking and cycling.

Informatives

01. This decision relates to drawing numbers:

Reference	Version No:	Plan Status
Application Site Boundary		Refused