

From: Nigel Kay [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 December 2020 09:12
To: McLeod, Stuart <Stuart.McLeod@southlanarkshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Review P/20/0469

Planning Permission Review

Application No: P/20/0469

For the Attention of Stuart McLeod, Administration Officer

Dear Mr McLeod

My thanks for your letter of the 4th December informing my wife and I of the intention of the applicant for the above planning request, which was refused at the end of August, to seek a review.

Following our original representation and the reasons given for the outcome of the original application I would like to make the following points.

In the main the original application was refused on the grounds of its adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding residential area, this being in particular contrary to policy clauses in the South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan and the proposed South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan 2.

The concept and impact of amenity is extremely important and includes not only specific features, facilities and services but also less tangible assets all of which together add value, not just in economic terms, to the quality of life for those who contribute to and benefit from them.

In the case of the area in question, this latter aspect of amenity is manifest in the large garden plots that each property enjoys. For over fifty years residents have chosen and invested in homes in the area because of this feature and have contributed to the maintenance and appropriate evolution of the ambience through investment in time, effort and money.

The original application ignored this important aspect of amenity in a way that would not only be extremely disruptive in the short term, creating a building site in a quiet, established residential area but also destroying the very essence of what the area offers.

We fail to see how it is within the applicant's purview to now implement his original plans and preserve the key issue of amenity.

The second point we would wish to highlight concerns what has happened in the time between the original application, its refusal and the impending request for review. The applicant in the interim has it appears divided the curtilage of 15 Dunedin Drive and sold the property with a greatly reduced garden.

Going back to the reasons for refusing planning in August, it was pointed out with respect to the issue of amenity that splitting the curtilage of the existing property to squeeze in a new two storey house, would as has now happened leave only a very small garden at 15 Dunedin Drive which would be a contributory factor in adversely impacting amenity.

Given this sale we fail to see that the planning application can be revisited in its original form, as the applicant now no longer has a property whose curtilage he is applying to divide.

Yours faithfully

R. N. Kay M. R. Kay

2 Inglewood Crescent

East Kilbride G75 8QD