

Appendix 7

**Applicant's Comments on Further Representations
Submitted by Interested Parties in the Course of the
Notice of Review Consultation Process**

Pauline

Many thanks for your correspondence with regard to Statement of Observations.

I would like to Reply to this document as follows: -

Point 2.2

This area has become an area for the building of 2 House Plots under the GBRA5 Policy due to the development opposite and the defensive road boundaries.

Point 2.3

We have only applied for enough land to accommodate 2 House Plots the same size of Footprint of those opposite and the rest of the site is being used for Sightlines which would be required under the Roads Regulations, Septic Tanks and for SUDS which would also be required for this site.

Point 2.4

This Proposal would integrate into the Local Community as its in keeping with the house sizes opposite.

Point 2.5

a) This site in Planning Policy is a Development Site under the GBRA5 Policy.

b) I find it very hard to understand why the Planning Department can say in one hand that each Planning Applications is assessed individually on it's own merits (see 3.1a) and then say that this would lead to pressure on development due to the lack of defensible boundaries when our proposal shows a road to the front with houses opposite, a road to one side and a house to the other side surely this would create a defensible boundary to this area and our build line is in keeping with the adjacent properties.

c) With regard to size and scale these proposed house plots are the same footprint as the houses opposite so find it hard to understand how the Planning department can keep going on about size and scale and there not with the in keeping of the area,

Point 3.1a Response section

Examples of other similar sites were given along with details of the comparable sites. I find this difficult to understand how the Planning Department choose to dismiss these examples as these were passed by S.L.C. Planning department and this is where the problem lies.

This is where i would like to debate this point at the Review Hearing as obviously I find this evidence to be crucial in this case.

Point 3b Response section

The houses were originally passed for a courtyard development then after a further application to change this application to 2 house plots along with a large area of land and new road from originally application was passed without very little comment from the planning department and so this is what created our site under the GBRA5 Policy.

That's where i find it strange that when referring to our application which qualifies under the GBRA5 Policy we keep hearing about Scale, design, areas of ground etc. obviously i would like to debate this point at the Review Hearing as well as i think the area of land that was used for that development should come into question when assessing our case.

Point 3d Response Section

Again we hear of no defensive boundaries and yet in this section Planning Department state the site is bound by Newton Road to the South and West not mentioning the Houses also adjacent to the North or the Houses opposite the front of the site. These defensive boundaries as stated by this quote from planning allow these boundaries to qualify under the GBRA5 Policy as defensive boundaries so our side has defensive boundaries on three sides.

The field to the East which is open to the remainder of the field (Which is to the rear of the site) and can't be counted as potential development at this point as each application should be based on its own merits.

Point 3e Response Section

Why the Planning Department say there's scope to increase the number of dwellings on site bewilders me as firstly this application should be assessed on the application before them and also with any Planning Application we must take into account sufficient Road Splays, Septic Tanks infiltration beds and allow for SUDS etc which is why this area of land is included within the Planning Application Site as per any Planning Application.

1 - Objection

With regard to the objection made by the owner of 94 Franklin Place, Westwood, East Kilbride G75 8LS

This has been respected and could be taken care of by a Planning condition.

Summary

This Application qualifies under the GBRA5 Policy. S.L.C. Planning Department have refused this application and dismissed all previous evidence of similar sites. They have also created this corner site to qualify under GBRA5 Policy by allowing the Application site opposite when they allowed a further application to change the original application from a courtyard effect into the monstrous site for 2 Houses along with large areas of land and different access. S.L.C. Have also agreed under point 3d that our site is bounded on at least Two sides by defensive Road Boundaries which also qualify as boundaries under the GBRA5 Policy not to mention the houses adjacent to our proposal which would qualify as three sides not taking into account the houses opposite.

I would ask the Review Body to have a site visit followed by a debate to allow us to present our case and review previous sites Granted that were given as evidence which S.L.C. Planning have dismissed to take into account.

In addition if the Review Body don't allow us to debate our case then i would ask that they overturn the Refusal Decision Notice and Grant Permission to allow us to build two houses on this site.

Much Appreciated.
Robert Murray (Agent)