

Application No: C/04/01371/FUL

Date Registered: 24th August 2004

Applicant: Mrs Julia Armstrong
C/o 88 Biggar Road
Cleland
ML1 5PL

Development: Erection of Dwellinghouse

Location: Land West Of Junction Of Springfield Road With Craigs Road Newhouse Motherwell Lanarkshire

Ward: 52: Salsburgh Councillor David Fagan

Grid Reference: 281772 662369

File Reference: C/PL/SAS533/CM/EL

Site History: 94279 Erection of Dwellinghouse Refused July 1994
91516 Use of Ground as Caravan Site for Travelling People Refused December 1991

Development Plan: Under the terms of the Adopted Monklands District Local Plan 1991 the application site is located within an area covered by policies GB2 (Restrict Development in Countryside Around Towns) and LI 1/3 (Landscape Improvement)(Medium Quality Landscape)

Contrary to Development Plan: Yes

Consultations:

S.E.P.A.(West)	(No response)
Scottish Water	(No objection)
British Gas Transco	(No objection)
Scottish Power	(No objection)

Representations: 2 Representation Letters

Newspaper Advertisement: Advertised on 1st September 2004

Recommendation: Refuse for the Following Reasons:-

1. That the proposals are contrary to the terms of the development plan in that the proposed dwellinghouse cannot be justified under the criteria noted in Policy GB2 of the Monklands District Local Plan 1991 restricting isolated dwellinghouses in the countryside which do not require such a location.



Planning Application No. C/04/01371/FUL
 Erection of Dwellinghouse
 Land West of Junction of Springfield Road with Craigens Road,
 Newhouse, Motherwell

***Representation**
 1 Representation outwith Map Area
 Site Area 0.1 HA

Produced by
 Planning and Environment
 Headquarters
 Suite 501, Fleming House
 2 Tryst Road
 CUMBERNAULD
 G67 1JW
 01236 616210 Fax: 01236 616232
 OS Licence LA 06041L



Not to Scale



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with
 the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's
 Stationery Office. © Crown copyright.
 Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright
 and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

2. That the proposals would be detrimental to road safety at the locus in that the proposed access would generate additional vehicle manoeuvring on an unlit, derestricted road with no footways in close proximity to two other junctions.

Note to Committee:

If approved the application will require to be referred to the Scottish Ministers in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Notification of Applications)(Scotland) Direction 1997 as the proposed development constitutes a departure from the Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan 2000

Background Papers:

Application form and plans and supporting letter from NLC Social Work Department received 30th July 2004

Memo from Protective Services Section received 7th September 2004

Memo from Transportation Section received 7th October 2004

Letter from Scottish Water received 9th September 2004

Letter from British Gas Transco received 10th September 2004

Letter from Scottish Power received 6th September 2004

Letter from W Stewart, Longacre Farm, Newhouse, Motherwell, ML1 5SX received 6th September 2004.

Letter from Smarter Salsburgh, Mrs M McLaughlin , 199 Main Street, Salsburgh, By Shotts received 9th September 2004.

Any person wishing to inspect these documents should contact Colin Marshall at 01236 812376.

APPLICATION NO. C/04/01371/FUL

REPORT

1. Description of Site and Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is being sought for the erection of a dwellinghouse at a large isolated site located off Springfield Road, to the west of Salsburgh village. The L shaped site extends to some 0.7 ha and is bounded by Craigens Road to the east, Springfield Road to the south east, the B7066 to the south and open rough grazing ground to the west and north.
- 1.2 The proposals would involve the erection of a single storey dwellinghouse on a large area of ground that was once used as an unauthorised travelling peoples site. A vehicular access would be taken from Craigens Road, which leads north from the western end of Springfield Road to the open rural area. The proposed dwellinghouse would be positioned to the north of the site, providing a 10 metre depth of rear garden and two off-street parking spaces and vehicular turning facility. The front garden area would be extensive and would measure approximately 55 x 65 metres. Due to shape of the site, the frontage along the B7066 Glasgow and Edinburgh Road would extend to some 140 metres in length. No landscaping proposals were submitted.
- 1.3 The dwellinghouse would provide two bedrooms, sitting room, kitchen and bathroom. It would be finished in a render to external walls and have concrete tiles to a double-pitched roof. Its front elevation would feature two bay window features. Doors and windows would be white UPVC material.
- 1.4 NLC Social Work Department, who has confirmed that a person with disabilities would occupy the proposed house supports the proposal.

2. Development Plan

- 2.1 Under the terms of the Adopted Monklands District Local Plan 1991 the application site is located within an area covered by policies GB2 (Restrict Development in Countryside Around Towns) and LI 1/3 (Landscape Improvement)(Medium Quality Landscape)

3. Consultations and Representations

- 3.1 There were no objections from Scottish Power, Scottish Water or Transco. SEPA did not respond.
- 3.2 The Transportation Section objected on the following road safety grounds. The proposed development would take an access from an unlit de-restricted length of Craigens Road, which has no footways along its length. The proposal would result in an increase in braking and turning manoeuvres to the detriment of road safety. The new access would generate an increase in turning traffic in the close vicinity of two junctions (B7066 Glasgow and Edinburgh Road/Springfield Road and Springfield Road/Craigens Road) which are within 50 metres of each other. This is likely to result in an unnecessary additional hazard for drivers using this junction to the further detriment of road safety.
- 3.3 The Protective Services Section advised that a full site contamination survey would be required before the development could proceed. In addition a noise impact assessment would be required.
- 3.4 Two letters of representation have been submitted which state:

- The letter from the Smarter Salsburgh community group does not object to the proposals for a house at the site but seeks assurances that the applicant would not use the ground for any other purposes. It was pointed out that the site was previously used illegally as a caravan site and was an eyesore at the western approach to the village. It was also pointed out that the road junction is very busy with heavy lorries and traffic to and from the B7066.
- The letter from a neighbouring farmer points out that the applicant's family previously lived on the site in a residential caravan without the benefit of planning permission. During this time the site was used as an unauthorised caravan site for travelling people and as many as 12 caravans were on the site at the same time. There is concern that should planning permission be granted for a dwellinghouse then a similar situation could arise. The farmer objected to the previous application for a caravan site (refer planning refusal 91516) and enclosed a copy of his former letter of representation which he considers relevant to the current application. He further points out that the subsequent appeal was dismissed by the then Secretary of State for Scotland in April 1993 and, that the proposed house site is in the green belt close to an awkward and busy road junction and as such would be detrimental to road safety.

4. Planning Assessment and Conclusions

- 4.1 The proposals require to be assessed under the terms of the development plan and any other material considerations. There are no significant strategic issues.
- 4.2 Under the terms of policy GB2, isolated developments do not accord with the development plan unless there is a specific locational need. Proposals for development within GB2 areas would also require to be assessed under the following criteria: economic benefit; specific locational need; infrastructure implications and environmental impact.
- 4.3 On the basis of the information provided, the proposals are considered to be contrary to the terms of the development plan. Whilst the visual appearance of the site might improve through extensive garden landscaping works, there would be no wider economic benefit to the area. Moreover there is no locational need for a dwellinghouse at this site and additional servicing facilities would be required. As such the proposals do not meet the specific assessment criteria noted under the terms of policy GB2. Although the proposed dwellinghouse would be occupied by a disabled person this not a material consideration and does not constitute justification to allow a departure from the terms of the development plan.
- 4.4 In addition to the policy considerations, the Transportation Section considers the proposed development would be detrimental to road safety. The proposed access position would generate additional vehicular braking and turning manoeuvres on an unlit and de-restricted length of road that has no footpaths and in close vicinity of two other junctions.
- 4.5 Turning to the letters of representations, it can be noted that the site was previously used as an unauthorised travelling peoples' site. However following an appeal dismissal, this use was terminated and is largely irrelevant to the current proposal. Any unauthorised use of this site would be subject to an appropriate enforcement action by the Council. However, part of Mr Stewart's objection can be sustained in that the proposals are contrary to the development plan and would also be detrimental to road safety at this busy road junction.
- 4.6 Following consideration of the proposals it is concluded that the proposals are contrary to the terms of the development plan and would also be detrimental to road safety. Although a person with disabilities would occupy the dwellinghouse, this would not provide any material justification to overcome the policy constraints or road safety concerns noted above. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.