

9 Tulloch Gardens
Grangepark
Motherwell

6 September 2005

Mr P Shiach
North Lanarkshire Council
Department of Administration
Civic Centre
Motherwell

Dear Mr Shiach

11 Tulloch Gardens, Motherwell – S/05/00824/FUL
Submission in respect of Site Visit and Hearing scheduled for 9 September 2005

I refer to your letter dated 30 August regarding the site visit and hearing scheduled to take place on Friday 9 September 2005. Please find enclosed, submissions prepared in respect of my objections raised against the abovementioned planning application. I would be obliged if these could be circulated to members of the committee.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter

Yours Faithfully



Catherine Johnstone

OBJECTIONS TO S/05/00824/FUL

EXTENSION AT 11 TULLOCH GARDENS

Purvis & Purvis
(Chartered Building Surveyors)
LUDPITS, LUDPIT LANE
ETCHINGHAM
EAST SUSSEX TN19 7DB

1ST SEPTEMBER 2005

Hearing and Site Visit scheduled for the 9th September 2005

Response to North Lanarkshire Council's letter of invitation of the 30th August 2005

1.00 CAR PARKING

- .01 The original proposal by the Applicant in their Application has been revised by the substitution of the ground floor sitting room in the front part of the proposed extension, with a garage. This revision has been made to address the loss of one car parking space as a result of the proposed extension.
- .02 The Council's Planning Department advised us on the 15th June 2005 that should the proposed garage not meet the Council's or any other accepted Standard in respect of it's internal dimensions, then the Council would revert back to the Applicant suggesting that the original scheme (with sitting room) is re-adopted and that an additional car parking space is formed alongside the existing driveway in the front garden of No. 11.
- .03 The proposed length of the garage at 6 metres is obviously possible and adequate for a popular car such as a Ford Mondeo, but we would question whether the width of 2.45 m is achievable (including the construction of the external walling and support of the floor above) and whether this width is adequate. The width of a Mondeo is 1.92 m which would leave at best a space (gap) of 0.43 m between the side of the car and the garage wall, but when taking into account the thickness of the car door construction/internal trim and a gap on the other side of the vehicle, in reality a gap of 0.13 m would be left to exit via the driver's door – less than 6 inches. We would suggest that this gap is wholly inadequate to exit a vehicle and under Paragraph 3.1 of the report, it is confirmed that the Council's Transportation Section agrees and have advised the Council that 'the dimensions of the proposed integral garage are too small to be practical'.

Therefore, it is suggested that the proposed garage does not replace the loss of one car parking space caused by the proposed extension, and if granted Planning Permission, there would only be a single practical car parking space for this property.

- .04 We suggest that Members should also bear in mind that on the Application drawings the existing bedroom 3 has been shown (both on the existing and proposed layouts) to be a 'study'. Of course this room was originally designed and intended by the Developers as a third bedroom and this layout was also approved by the Council prior to the development of this Estate.

Therefore, it is considered that the current proposal for extending No. 11 will result in reality in a change from a three bedroom house to a four bedroom house, where of course one car parking space (and a garage that could not be used for off-street parking) would be wholly inadequate.

- .05 Any additional on-street parking caused by inadequate off-street car parking at 11 Tulloch Gardens will obviously increase vehicle activity at this critical point of the turning head, and we consider that this would adversely affect road and pedestrian safety now and in the future, introducing hazards to other vehicle users, but particularly pedestrians and children who play in the cul-de-sac, including the those of the Applicant.

Any additional on-street parking would also affect the layout of the turning head for refuse vehicles and fire appliances.

(See photographs 1 to 3 attached showing the existing parking congestion.)

- .06 There is in our opinion a most simple solution to these objections available to the Applicant and that is for 11 Tulloch Gardens to be extended on the other side, whereby all of the accommodation originally proposed by the Applicant (without a garage) can be easily achieved and, more importantly, the existing facility of three car parking spaces (most suitable for a four bedroom house) would remain unaltered.

Extending on the other side of No. 11 can be achieved quite simply by the conversion and alteration of the existing landing/hallway and cupboards, off the existing stairwell.

Furthermore, the Applicant would not have to compromise their needs and would benefit from a genuine four bedroom house with suitably sized ground floor living accommodation and three car parking spaces.

2.00 9 TULLOCH GARDENS

- .01 In respect of 9 Tulloch Gardens there is a current Application with the Council for a two storey extension next to No. 11. Our concern is that should the Council grant Planning Permission for No. 11, then the Application for No. 9 may be prejudiced as a consequence.

No. 9 is a semi-detached property with 7 Tulloch Gardens and can only be extended on one side next to No. 11. No. 11 has, however, the advantage of being able to extend on the other side of their property away from No. 9 – No. 9 of course does not have this option.

- .02 It is proposed by the Applicant not to build any form of construction beyond/over the boundary with No. 9, but to achieve this and so as not to limit space within the extension, the detailing at the eaves and the gable of the proposed extension to No. 11 cannot be replicated to match the existing and will not match the overhanging detail to the other end elevation of No. 11, changing an appropriate symmetrical eaves line to a very poor asymmetrical and a most unbalanced appearance.

This in itself will look odd in the street scene and detract from the original elevational treatment of the other properties on the Estate.

If the other side of No. 11 was chosen for the extension, this problem would not occur and the extension would contribute to the street scene, rather than spoil the existing pleasing appearance of this part of the Estate.

Distribution P. Shiach Esq, North Lanarkshire Council
Mr. & Mrs. P. Johnstone
File





